

# FREE TRADE FANTASIES

## "A Brief History of the Future: Citizenship of the Millennium" by Mike Moore, Shoal Bay Press, 1998 (ISBN 0-908704-77-1) - Dennis Small

*"The world is full of contradictions, and they change from day to day" - Mike Moore (p.67).*

*The article that follows is a critical review of the latest book by Mike Moore, the man from Aotearoa/New Zealand who has just been appointed the new Director General of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). To quote from the title page of his own book, "Mike Moore held the portfolios of Overseas Trade and Marketing, Tourism, Recreation and Sport in New Zealand's Fourth Labour Government from 1984-90. Later he became Minister of Foreign Affairs and External Relations and a deputy Finance Minister. He served briefly as Prime Minister before the 1990 General Election. He became a member of the Eminent Persons on Trade Group in 1989.*

*Mike Moore used his book as part of his self-promotion to be the new WTO Director General. He was backed by the US in his campaign for the position. Moore has been the butt of some ridicule in Aotearoa/NZ because of the bombastic crudity and simplicity of his views on free trade and the future of capitalism in general. Ironically, in his book he again provides plenty of ammunition for those who oppose the WTO/World Bank/IMF/etc. agenda for the world.*

According to the future as envisaged by "Mad" Mike Moore, the leading intellectual and seer of the NZ Labour Party, the dawn of the new Millennium heralds a marvellous new age of capitalist achievement, a "brave new world" (one of his favourite phrases) that would even make Aldous Huxley smile. If only we could/would recognise it, dammit!

### **Mystical Musings of Mad Mike**

Mike's latest book, "A Brief History of the Future", with its coyly unassuming title modelled on Stephen Hawking's famous depiction of Time and the Universe, sets out to rally the recently somewhat rattled ranks of the free trade/foreign investment brigade. As usual, Mike is self-deprecatingly modest about his achievements: he has "contributed" to New Zealand and to his party by being the person **"to lead the charge for this kind of economic internationalism"** over the last decade or so (p.46). Indeed, there is no doubt that he would like to be remembered as one of the great heroes of world globalisation and in this sense the book is a sort of *self*-obituary, Mike's personal dedication to his anticipated future glory in the advancing annals of capitalist civilisation. He warmly celebrates what he believes is the triumph of Western capitalism over its enemies, and the safety of "strategic resources" like Middle Eastern oil upon which his own globe-trotting, affluent lifestyle depends (p.117).

Given that this book was also obviously a carefully calculated part of Mad Mike's self-promotion to be the new Director-General of the World Trade Organisation(WTO)/GATT, it is written with all the grace and uncton that one would expect of him at his greasy, ingratiating best. There are plenty of obsequious, crawling quotes for his powerful American mates to appreciate. How about this one, quoting US Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright: "If we choose to hide behind walls rather than tear them down, our products will face higher tariffs . . . we will have no success at all in promoting higher environmental and labour standards" (p.46). Or this, again dutifully citing Madeleine, with regard to supposedly benefitting poorer countries: "Protectionism is an economic poison pill . . . Nations that have embraced economic reform are more likely to move ahead with political reform" (p.52). Or his own considered, thoughtful judgement that:"President Bush's new world order held out a promise that this would be the century of persuasion, unlike the last century which was one of imperialist coercion" (p.130).

It does not matter in all of this about US hypocrisy and cynical posturing - after all Moore is very well versed in this sort of stuff himself. To quote from my own study of free trade on the matter of alleged benefits for poorer countries: "While Moore was later pitching a message that the 'prices of tropical products would rise faster than the temperate zone products which are imported by many developing countries' (*"Protectionism and the Uruguay Round"*), his Government

was opposing international commodity agreements precisely because such agreements could mean higher than acceptable prices - the very kind of prices he was offering as bait to poorer countries" ("The Cost of Free Trade: Aotearoa/New Zealand at Risk", CAFCA, 1996, p.6). He still has the gall to say that he wanted, and wants, developing countries to benefit from higher agricultural prices (p.55).

In fact, Moore was very pleased that the GATT-sponsored International Dairy Agreement was continuing to prop up prices for NZ. Meantime, coffee, cocoa, etc. producers were free to suffer market forces but protectionism was of course essential for the civilised peoples of "developed" countries like us. The centrepiece of the Labour Government's policy was a Cabinet paper on opposition to commodity agreements which included a revealing input from Treasury. It took years to get this particular paper from Moore despite repeated polite requests (at the time I was working for a very middle-class non-government organisation[NGO]) and in the end I had to resort to use of the Official Information Act (OIA). So much for his continual proclamation about the need to safeguard and extend democratic debate. More humbug!

As for the US's dedication to open markets, we need look no further than the current tariffs that the Clinton Administration has slapped on NZ dairy products - tariffs of around 130% on butter, for example. The latest US move has been to threaten our lamb imports. As former agricultural trade envoy, Brian Chamberlin, has indicated, the GATT Uruguay Round was disappointing in its "modest" outcome for NZ "and has been spoiled because a number of countries have not honoured the spirit of it" (see editorial in *The Independent* - "Fact and Fantasy on the path to Free Trade", 9/12/98). Most prominent among such countries is the US. In fact, the hypocrisy of the US on these issues is notorious but then Moore is an inveterate power junky, or at least "groupie". Since globalisation in so many ways means primarily the spread of American values throughout the world, Mike is a dedicated and fawning agent of this process (p.43).

When Moore was Trade Minister the then Labour Government, arm in arm with the corporate media, was assiduous in systematically suppressing open discussion on the Uruguay Round GATT negotiations, something that National did its best to emulate. There was continual, cargo cult hype orchestrated by the Government and a pervasive, conspiratorial blanket of silence over any dissent.

In the late 1980s, so far as I am aware, I was the only individual in the country researching GATT from an explicitly critical perspective. I challenged Moore's position in the press. On the rare occasion, the prevailing censorship relaxed as a token gesture. Later, at a Labour Party fund-raising fair in Christchurch where the organisation for which I was then working had a stall, Moore came seeking me out to contest my criticisms. He was obviously keen to try and stamp out any such dissidence. We had a brief exchange. When I pointed out the dominance in the NZ Business Round Table of transnational corporations (TNCs), he walked away and that was the end of what face-to-face debate I have ever had with Mike.

His attitude aptly reflects his acknowledgement and acceptance of the "realities" of power (p.73), an attitude that indeed permeates his book(s) and his own political career. Ultimately, Moore is the extreme conformist, desperately eager to conform to the market forces which dominate what he sees as the shape of the future. For Mike, our living standards "are frequently beyond our control" (p.50). Indeed, what we believe is also "frequently beyond our control". He frankly declares: "Like it or not, the world economy will always drive us; we will never drive it" (p.49). The great visionary leader of *free* trade is certainly a driven man. He wants to present a new, updated determinist philosophy of "freedom" for the West. As an ideologue of the new global capitalism, Mike has a gospel to impart; and as a representative of the "world economy", he wants fervently to crush his critics and any unbelievers.

Moore believes in the divine and benign hand of the Market weaving its magic in the creation of a glorious new Information Age, yet another advance in the progress of civilisation following the Industrial Age. It is always inevitably on and upward for Mad Mike as we are blindly swept forward to our rampant eternal consumerist destiny by economic/technological determinism. There is clearly a kind of Business Round Table mysticism about all this. Well, almost always inevitably on and upward. . . The nasty recurring problem is that there are doubters and heretics like

the reviewer who stir up people even against the great seer and helmsman himself. And this in turn causes problems for the Inevitable . . .

On the one hand for Mike, such stirrers are swimming hopelessly against the inexorable tides of History/The Future; on the other, they somehow still might succeed in upsetting the whole apple-cart. He repeatedly inveighs against resistance to his version of evolutionary "progress" - we have "no going back on the changes that are upon us" (p.12). Quoting TNC guru, Peter Drucker, he declares that change is "irreversible", and reinforces his message that "the world economy is in control" (p.49). The supposed alternative model is North Korea or Albania - has he been to the new globalising Albania?! Instead of fruitlessly gnashing our teeth, we must instead make the transition to Alvin Toffler's "Third Wave" society as best we can.

Yet it could all come unstuck because "History is never a straight line" (p.36). If only we would all gratefully accept the inspired leadership of people like Mike himself . . . As well, despite his predominantly (confused!) determinist version of History/The Future, he persists in offering the parody of free choice: "A new solution is required. That solution lies in economic internationalism, based on rules decided upon by sovereign governments" (p.14). Ministers, governments and taxpayers will "have to take more control . . . as the impact of globalisation reaches into every facet of domestic life" (p.68).

### **Democratic Demolition**

It might seem a long road from Moore's seeking me out for personal reprimand at a Labour Party fair to the 1996 SIS break-in at Aziz Choudry's Christchurch home under the auspices of the current National Government but there is an constant, overall pattern of censorious official concern. Opposition to free trade/foreign investment is deeply threatening to the emerging corporatised State and the interests it represents, and as our movement has grown the more threatening this dissidence has become to those in power.

Among Pakeha, GATT Watchdog has been to the fore in the struggle against these corporate elitist interests, certainly the leader in opposition to trade agreements like the GATT/WTO, APEC(Asia/Pacific Economic Cooperation), and the Multilateral Agreement on Investment(MAI). Hence the ready manipulative legalism of the Government today as it gerrymanders the Security Intelligence Service(SIS) law to suit the new era of globalised commercial totalitarianism. The National Government has been glaringly exposed and embarrassed by its abuse of civil liberties but is absolutely committed to the ever continuing TNC-takeover of governmental functions with all this means for the repression of individual human rights. The SIS had already been specially strengthened with a legalised mandate to operate according to TNC-defined perceptions of NZ's "international well-being" or "economic well-being".

Predictably enough, Moore was one of the Labour Party speakers strongly in favour of the amendment to allow the spy organisation to break into citizens' homes. He sits too, of course, on the relevant Parliamentary committee. Whatever the rhetoric on some issues, Labour remains firmly locked into the globalisation process and all its implications. Mike is on Labour's front bench and is still the Opposition spokesperson on Foreign Affairs and Trade.

In the "Acknowledgements and Preface" to his book, Moore says of free trade that "the powerful elite of business people, politicians and intellectuals are out of touch with the general population, the people who can see the pain of these policies but not the gain" (p.9). He goes on to observe that the "elite throughout the world have more in common with each other than with their constituents . . ." Furthermore, this is not new but was "also true of the princes and merchants of earlier times". Consequently, his book is in part an attempt to overcome the lack of understanding by us plebeians - to "overcome this democratic deficit" as he puts it. He will graciously explain to us *why* what is happening to us is for our own good. There are several things here that typify Moore's grossly superficial and simplistic style: the bombastic, egotistical arrogance; the fundamentalist elitism; and his potted and potty, garbled understanding of both history and contemporary times.

Perhaps what shines through most of all is the persistent, pretentious hogwash. Journalist Ian Wishart was once a Cabinet press secretary to Mike Moore and he has admitted to having "taken part in a cynical but highly effective manipulation of the news media. We might be getting too

much heat on an issue, so we contrive to release something else to distract attention. Everytime we did that, the media fell for it . . . The agenda of much that you see in the news has been set by corporate and Government PR people" (*Foreign Control Watchdog*, no. 83, December 1996, p.3).

If Moore is long versed in efforts at fashioning his own corporate image, nothing is sillier than his self-portrait as the great democrat. Moore shares with Roger Douglas, Richard Prebble and some others the notoriety of those Labour/National politicians who have done most damage to NZ democracy over the past 15 or so years. The odium of Labour's notorious "fish-and-chip" gang has never left him while Rogernomics has implanted a deeply distorting imprint on his mind-set. Mike facilitates TNC-takeover of Aotearoa/NZ even as he postures about a constitution to safeguard liberties and cynically calls for more transparency on the international treaty-making process (p. 83). On the one hand, he holds that democracy has a "competitive advantage" - it now has a "dollar value" (p.75); on the other, "governments everywhere are incapable of controlling the changes that are being thrust upon us" (p.107). But, says Mike:"We need not lose our faith in a democratic purpose. It's the type of response that must change" (p.107). So he is striving to point the way ahead for us all, to chart a response tailored to the demands of the TNCs to which he is so subservient.

These days Mike is pretty testy about his rather tattered image. As he says, "A decade ago I saw myself as a patriot in my campaign for freer trade and a more open global economy" - but now he has been "caught in a backlash. We are seen by some to be selling out our country and even accused of trying to abolish the nation state. The opposite is the truth" (p.9). More modest than Mike, I would like however to lay the main claim for helping reduce him from rooster to feather duster. Ever since my first public attack on his policies, I have documented and analysed them in various publications over the years starting with nos. 327 and 328 of the *New Zealand Monthly Review* around the turn of the decade. So Mike's ten years of decline and fall in public opinion would be a fair time estimate. From small beginnings . . .

It is interesting to see that Mike is still trying hard to marginalise his critics. For instance, he is careful not to cite any publications critical of his position - he has not the integrity to do this. Whenever he refers to his critics, or his leftist opponents in general, he simply resorts to abuse, e.g. critics of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund(IMF) are "deranged misfits . . . people who tuck their shirts into their underpants . . ." (p.71). Opponents of the MAI are "deranged nationalists". Moore really starts to slobber at the mouth on these occasions and should be treated as he so richly deserves. Originally, he says of his book that he was going to call it, "no shins unkicked" (*Press*, 3/9/98). When Mike kicks you in the shins the idea is to kick back twice as hard and aim higher. His general style is aggressively ad hominem - indeed, he is a self-avowed "shin-kicker". He enjoys political brawling. It is then most amusing that he continually shoots, or rather kicks himself in the foot, throughout his book!

If the democratic accountability to which Moore gives lip service is to mean anything, then a constant critical searchlight should be focused on the implications of free trade/investment - something Moore has given his very best to avoid and obfuscate. There is certainly plenty in his book to scrutinise and lay bare and, indeed, critical analysis could be applied to just about every page if we were to bother with all the detail, a pretty pointless exercise to say the least. But Moore has played a significant role in the Labour Party, in government, and even been briefly Prime Minister. He clearly continues to have big power ambitions, as well as being the politician most visible in both promoting and justifying free trade/investment. It is therefore worthwhile to take a close look at the main things that he has to say, if only the better to rubbish them.

### **Corporate Captive**

It is an indication of the present parlous state of the NZ Labour Party, and more generally of democratic socialism in Aotearoa/NZ today, that the foremost ideologue of this party is so very much a partisan capitalist parroting the corporate propaganda of the New Right. Mike has clearly been prime material for cultivation by this globalist ideology, and although he may occasionally preen and plume about its "intellectual extreme" (e.g., p.92), he has been in practice one of its most active agents, all the more so since he *acts* under the Labour banner. Moore's performance, in fact, is an eloquent testimony to Labour's co-optation by the processes of TNC

takeover, by globalisation. Labour, like National, depends on the largesse of big business and today, more than ever, this means TNC business.

Electoral success may indeed mean virtually the total sell-out of principles as under Rogernomics; and GATT/WTO/MAI/APEC-style free trade/investment is just Rogernomics on a global or a regional scale. However, with the erosion of anything in parliamentary Labour that is meaningfully alternative to the sort of values represented by Britain's Blair and NZ's Moore, the potential is yet accumulating for a future socialist resurgence, a potential that groups like CAFCA are hard at work in building.

The sources that Moore quotes in his book are often vague, often uncited with regard to actual publication, and he scarcely ever gives page references. However, one has only got to look over his page and a half of "Bibliography and Further Reading" at the end to see his heavy dependence on conservative (especially American) literature. Mike is obviously proud to display this. Well-known right-wingers like Peter Drucker(three citations), Patrick Moynihan(two), Samuel Huntingdon, Stephan Schmidheiny, Adam Smith(two), Julian Simon, Toffler(three), and naturally enough, Mike Moore himself(five!) dominate the sources of his inspiration.

Moore draws a lot on popular trendy social projections as in Toffler("the profound and prolific American futurist", p.12) and John Naisbitt(author of "Megatrends"). Overall, the influence of the US corporate line is very evident and certainly informs the text of his book. He is influenced by "megatrends" like "the triumph of the individual"; "free-market socialism" (whatever that could possibly mean); and "the privatisation of the welfare state" (pp.26,27).

Undoubtedly, the oddest and most revealing source that Mike uses is a book by James D. Davidson and Lord William Rees-Mogg called "The Sovereign Individual"(1997). This is a blatantly obscene publication that exults in the creation through globalisation of the ruling ten % of the world's population that will enjoy freedom and wealth at the expense of the rest, i.e. it predicts the coming power of the **sovereign individual** and how to thrive as one in the new Information Age. It is all unashamed Social Darwinist stuff and could quite justly be described as the expression of an *evil* political philosophy.

Although CAFCA is diametrically opposed to the philosophy expounded in "The Sovereign Individual", there is yet an interesting confirmatory crossover in that here we have some ultrarightists who openly point to, indeed embrace, the sort of outcome about which we continually warn and fight against. However, Moore is happy to draw on this book to support his own views about the positive benefits of globalisation! Davidson and Rees-Mogg specialise in financial/investment advice to the super-rich and unlike Moore can take a very apocalyptic view of the future (see also their earlier book, "The Great Reckoning", 1992). Their main concern is all about how to make maximum profits in those wild, tumultuous times when blood runs in the streets.

The writings of Rees-Mogg and Davidson reflect a kind of sophisticated Ayn Randism, the far right American "Objectivist" cult once the province of fringe groups like Zap in Christchurch but now being broadcast by former public servant Lindsay Perigo on the spreading Radio Pacific network, an illustration in itself of the workings of globalisation. Rees-Mogg and Davidson update this sort of exultant self-love to exploit the conflicts and instabilities in a world of capitalist crisis. The powerful rich and greedy are set to thrive if they make the right choices, especially if they act on this duo's "expert" advice. Sovereign states are reduced to sovereign individuals maximising their interests as members of an international elite; disintegrating societies are the playground of those few effectively employing competitive computerised systems for individual gain. Capitalist competition and barbarism go hand in hand in a rather more realistic portrayal of the new information age than Moore's fond fancies.

Mike cites "The Sovereign Individual" in the course of his text on several occasions. An especially ironic quote is a reference that Moore uses in connection with his grievance of being catapulted from "hero to traitor in a decade" when - so sadly maligned - he "was working for jobs in New Zealand" as well as to "help transfer wealth to poorer countries in the Pacific" (p.89). In saying he was driven "in part" to write his own book because of that most unkind and undeserved perception, Mike appeals to a prediction in "The Sovereign Individual" that "reactionary losers" and "demagogues" will respond in this sort of resentful manner against the heroic leaders

of globalisation. They will torment "countries that have been at the forefront of reform and stand to benefit disproportionately from 'market-friendly globalism' like New Zealand". Mike certainly prefers the company of winners like his friend Michael Fay of "Winebox" fame than these ingrates.

Rees-Mogg and Davidson are two very unpleasant characters who want to profit from the sufferings, misery, hunger and poverty of most of humankind. How then can they possibly be Moore's soul-mates and fellow spirits?! Of course, one might take a charitable view and consider Mike to be a political clown, a buffoon who does not even understand some of the publications he quotes. Either way - **be warned!**

It is worth noting here that the Davidson/Rees-Mogg connection to NZ's experience of the free market runs even deeper than so far indicated. In November 1995, Davidson and Rees-Mogg were listed as among the owners, along with various other unprepossessing types, of the exclusive Wharekauhau Lodge in the Wairarapa, a resort venue touted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade for jet-setting overseas investors (see article in *Foreign Control Watchdog*, no. 84, May 1997, for the original story). One of the owners has even apparently had close links with overseas' terrorists, although not the sort of terrorists that our SIS or the Overseas' Investment Commission (OIC) worries about. ACT's founder, Roger Douglas, is also listed as an owner of the Lodge. This revelatory finding by Bill Rosenberg neatly confirmed our anticipations of the growing links between the international far right and the privatisation of government in NZ. Moore's keen appreciation of "The Sovereign Individual" seems to reflect then this quite sinister connection, whatever might be his own understanding.

### **Hustling Hunger**

One of the most glaring contradictions in the book, given the author's record, is Moore's explicit premise that his approach can encompass benefits for poor countries and NZ. A puff-piece by Helen Tunnah of the NZ Press Association on Moore's application to be the director general of the WTO actually claimed that Moore fits the requirement for the job to go "to a person from a *developing* nation" (*Press*, 8/12/98). Moore has the backing of the National Government in his bid and burnt up plenty of tax-payers' money to fund his campaign. The newspaper reported that: "The WTO has essentially agreed the job should not go to a candidate from a developed country . . ."

According to NZ official propaganda then, "NZ fits the mould" of a developing country, "not being a world economic super power but considered mature enough now to be respected in its own right by Europe and America, and to be independent in its views" (*Press*, 8/12/98). In other words, Moore was compromise candidate for the "two powerhouse camps of Europe and the US" which really run the WTO. Whatever the exact nature of Moore's own motivations, he effectively ran as an option for the Western developed bloc to help it keep complete control of the TNC-driven liberalisation agenda, and, in particular, force agricultural "reform" on developing countries.

Of the other three contenders who had been in the race for the WTO's top job one came from Thailand, one from Morocco, and one from Canada. So there were two candidates from developing countries and two from developed countries, i.e. if we dismiss the official propaganda line for the gross garbage it so obviously is. In the end, the choice came down to Moore or the Thai candidate. What is important to note is that NZ belongs to a little known white anglo-saxon grouping called CANZUS, comprising Canada, Australia, NZ and the US. This is a strategic Pacific Rim alliance and these countries, excepting the US, constitute the key element within the WTO's agricultural free trade Cairns Group. However, the Cairns Group, in turn, was instigated by the US as a ginger group that could co-opt some major Third World nations into the agricultural "reform" process (see e.g. "Recolonization: GATT, the Uruguay Round & the Third World", Zed Books/Third World Network, 1990, p.76). Among other objectives, liberalisation of agriculture is designed to undermine food security (self-reliance) in the Third World and increase its dependence on Western food imports.

Mike, whatever the flannel he tries to put across in his book, can in truth boast of impeccable credentials in the US plan to use food even more systematically as a weapon against the world's poor. He has been a member of the so called Eminent Persons' group which was closely linked

with the US Multilateral Trade Negotiations Coalition, a TNC grouping that pushed the American agenda in the GATT Uruguay Round. Moore has boasted of his friendship with leading American strategists of the time like Clayton Yeutter and Bill Brock. As Minister of External Relations and Trade, Mike proclaimed inspiration for the NZ Government from the Multilateral Trade Coalition. Among Mike's other TNC-connected links have been those with the London-based Trade Policy Research Centre.

For his work in the Labour Government on GATT issues, Moore was regarded as "one of America's best allies" by the US special trade negotiators in agricultural matters (*Christchurch Star*, 3/10/1988). In fact, a former US Ambassador to NZ congratulated the NZ Government on its influence in *pushing* Third World nations to "economic reform" (*Christchurch Star*, 3/10/1988).

Another of Mike's mates has been John Block, who when he was US Agriculture Secretary, blatantly called on "developing countries" to yield sovereignty to US food imports as part of their Uruguay Round obligations (see editorial in *The Ecologist*, vol. 23, no. 6, Nov/Dec, 1993, pp.219-222). An earlier US Agriculture Secretary, Earl Butz, once bluntly and brutally signalled the reality of American intentions (and practice) when he declared that food was a "weapon" - it was "a powerful tool in our negotiating kit" ("How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger", Susan George, Penguin, 1976, p.16). Mike has been an eager agent in fostering this capacity and in undermining Third World food security.

In August 1990, Moore, in his role as Minister of External Relations and Trade, advocated a deal whereby the northern economies got "changes governing international investment, services such as shipping, intellectual property and copyright. But NZ has determined the cost will be an agricultural agreement" (*Press*, 11/8/90). This, as we have noted, was right in line with US objectives too. Indeed, Moore was effusive in his praise for the original US free trade proposal for agriculture, even saying that the US had claimed the "moral high ground" (*Press*, 2/9/88). Imperialism lives!

In 1987 Moore was accusing Brazil and India, which were leading the Third World opposition to the GATT Round, as giving NZ its problems in international trade negotiations. Mike could be openly cynical while at the same time claiming the moral high ground himself. Among all his flowery rhetoric he could come out with the ready admission that the NZ Government would use any argument "it could to achieve its perceived self-interest". But, mind you, this self-interest was the world's too . . . (*NZ Listener*, 21 March 1987, pp.22-25). The same old stuff is paraded again in 1998 without a hint of embarrassment (e.g. see p.56).

### **The Muddled Mind of Michael Moore**

Moore constantly strives in his book for the deep generalisation or even profound paradox resonant in incisive insight but instead only winds up deeper in his capitalist contradictions, which reflects a truth of a different sort. Confusions are rife throughout, along with misleading generalisations. Sometimes the errors are "howlers", e.g. once when supposedly quoting the "World Health Organisation Report 1998", Mike refers to a prediction that by the year 2000:"The global population about 5.8 billion now, will increase to about 8 billion"!(p.61).

Early on in the book he claims, citing the WTO Director General, that:"Over one and a half billion people's living standards have doubled in the past decade and a half" (p.9). What is not mentioned is what is happening to the rest. Mike's whole perspective can be pertinently compared with that expressed in another book by a recent visitor to Aotearoa/NZ - Professor Chossudovsky of the University of Ottawa, and Research Fellow at the Centre of Developing Area Studies, McGill University, Montreal. He is presumably one of Mike's "few deranged misfits on the edges of obscure universities" (allegedly too with shirt tucked into his underpants) that we saw earlier included by Moore among the supposed opponents of the World Bank/IMF ( p.71).

Chossudovsky has taught as Visiting Professor at academic institutions in Western Europe, Latin America and Southeast Asia, has acted as economic adviser to governments of developing countries, and has worked as a consultant for several international organisations. His latest book is titled "The Globalisation of Poverty: Impacts of IMF and World Bank Reforms" (Zed Books, 1997) and he charts the effects of international capitalist "reform" across the globe with an array of country case studies. The title of his book speaks for itself. A quote can give the fla-

your:"In the developing world the burden of the external debt has reached two trillion dollars: entire countries have been destabilised as a consequence of the collapse of national currencies, often resulting in the outbreak of social strife, ethnic conflicts and civil war" (p. 15). Meantime, some 750 global corporations dominate the world economy continuing to force fundamental changes in the patterns of production and distribution. As can easily be anticipated, Mike never comes to grips with his critics at this kind of level of analysis.

At one point, Moore does recite some familiar facts about TNCs, including that TNCs "have almost twice the economic power of the poorest 80% of the world's people" and control more than 25% of the world's economic activity, with a third of all international trade taking place within TNCs, i.e. between branches of the same TNC (p.47). But he is incapable of drawing some of the obvious implications about the likely use of such economic power. Having totally rejected any Marxist/socialist analysis, Moore has no ability to interpret the workings of economic structures into forms of political power, other than in inconsistent ways or in the most mundane of observations. Anyway, as we have already seen, he openly identifies with the world's "powerful elite" and now as a great global leader, refers to his distant unionist/social work origins in a very furtive, cute fashion - *psst*, "*Let me now admit a secret . . .*" (p.54). It is all very conveniently self-serving.

When Mike does make a really pertinent observation, he usually misapplies it. For instance, he declaims that:"Vested interests will always conspire against the rest of us to protect themselves. It's when they combine to control both the market and the politicians that we have to fear" (p.41). What is he talking about here? - the GATT/WTO?; the Business Round Table?; the Rogernomics cabal? No, none of these: he is still attacking old-style protectionism, not the free market elite. He is very critical of "cosy, crony capitalism and the moral hazard created by laws from which the powerful can benefit" (p.56). Yet Rogernomics implemented crony capitalism of the most blatant, banana-republic sort with a few well-known beneficiaries. On the very same page Moore actually gives a quote from the Round Table about how NZ sovereignty has purportedly been enhanced by the opening up of the economy through trade agreements like the GATT/WTO and APEC. Interestingly enough, he repeats here National Party propaganda about how the Government is shedding debt when in fact the country's actual debt is greater than ever.

One major theme running through the book is Moore's struggle with the conflicts of globalisation. He tries for the profound paradox: "At first glance these twin movements of globalisation and localisation, even tribalism, look like a clash of contradictions. Not so: they are opposite sides of the same coin. As people experience globalisation, they will want more and more to assert their individuality, independence and cultures" (p.15). This is a good thing says Mike. However, he is worried too:"The world today is therefore less certain, more unstable" (p.118);and, moreover:"The nation state is everywhere under siege by tribal impulses" (p.142). Oh dear, what can the matter be? Well, Mike tells us that "a powerful worldwide movement is gathering political momentum" with lots of bids for indigenous independence. In early 1999 it was the causes of ethnic groups like the Kosovo Albanians and the Kurds (long repressed with Western collaboration) which caught the world's attention.

But, again, Moore still maintains that the indigenous worldwide movement is a good thing although "the situation is fraught with problems as the most mischievous and extreme among these groups argue that self-determination and sovereignty mean separate governments, a separate state" - cynical Nato allies with regard to the Kosovo Albanians perhaps?! (p.143). Instead, cultural sovereignty should be distinguished from political sovereignty (p.151). If Mike certainly addresses big, urgent questions here his failure to recognise the disintegrative impact of globalisation on societies leaves him with fundamentally flawed understanding. Indigenous peoples are often responding to further exploitative inroads upon their lands and values.

### **Contradictions Galore**

Moore's contradictions mirror his fall from grace. He embraces "international cooperation" yet promotes greater competition worldwide. He calls for efforts to overcome the "democratic deficit" while pushing programmes for corporate/plutocratic rule. All through his book glaring contradictions stand out. Moore is elitist in the grossest and most simplistic manner, e.g. his state-



ment that "the powerful elite of business people, politicians and intellectuals are out of touch with the general population" as if all these people have our best interests at heart (p.9). You can hardly get more Orwellian than that. "Orwellian", moreover, is a term that Mike picks up and misuses in his book. Ironically enough, however, he can even warn about Orwellianism and politicians in the context of describing how democracy thrives on information and the competition of ideas! (p.44).

Since he rejects Marxism (or any socialist perspective) completely, is certainly no environmentalist, and indeed is a committed "born again" capitalist, Mike has no critical, analytical framework at all - only aggrieved antagonism to his own critics. His basic guru is Alvin Toffler and the supposed transition to the New Age civilisation where the world's population, or at least some of them, can thrive on the exchange of information and more or less ignore mounting problems over poverty, socio-economic inequalities, environmental damage, and resources like food, land, water and minerals (pp.46 & 170). Try eating information!

Yet even Mike's interpretation of Toffler's thesis is revealingly selective. For instance, he does not cite in his bibliography, Toffler's "Powershift: Knowledge, Wealth and Violence at the Edge of the 21st Century" (Bantam, 1990). In this particular book, Toffler points to what he sees as deepening division between the information "fast" and the information "slow", and to "a significant shift of power from individual or groups of nation-states to the Global Gladiators. This amounts to nothing less than the next global revolution in political forms" (p.465). "Global Gladiators" for Toffler are a diverse grab-bag of movements and entities: religions, drug cartels, TNCs, regional organisations like the European Union(EU), private armies and other groups/groupings with international influence and deployment. But Mike still tries to cling to much of the traditional notion of the nation state even while demolishing it in the changes that he himself outlines for the new world order.

Moore asserts that his book "argues that the interests and independence of sovereign states are safeguarded and promoted through international agreements, treaties and institutions" (p.16). Whereas he acknowledges that some analysts have suggested the information age will spell the end of the nation state, Mike disagrees although his arguments only wrap him further into the contorted trap of his own making. Power is supposedly going to devolve according to "the principle of subsidiarity" - i.e. "decision-making power should be devolved to the lowest level of power consistent with the nature of the problem" (p.15). As in Aotearoa/NZ we watch the gathering assault on local government - against citizen participation in decision-making on the use of local facilities and resources with the threat of the totalitarian privatisation of everything from waste to water, we can only marvel whether Mike actually lives here or is totally zapped into his free market fantasy-world. And this follows his career as a Rogernome in the fourth Labour Government.

David Lange was so ignorant, weak and silly as a Prime Minister that he trusted Roger Douglas and then had to call for a cup of tea (and later a lie-down) when he started to wake up to what he had unleashed. On the one hand, Mike is happily riding his determinist globalising waves while, on the other, labouring under the illusion that he can control some of them in spite of his own premises, or at least steer some in the direction that he wants to go. But really what happens is that Mike constantly tries to embrace a contradiction or simply redefine it the way he likes to think about it. In this sense he is a master clown of illusion who regularly fools himself.

The Social Darwinist march of progress and age of empire suddenly becomes the age of cooperative "enlightened internationalism" (p.44). At the same time, human success depends on the "selfish gene" and "genetic nepotism" (p.39) - along with potty history we get potty biology! - and this is all merged by Mike with the theories of Adam Smith into an unintelligible mish-mash of supposed explanation and pious homilies, e.g. "An open market without a conscience or compassion is like a truck without a driver. It can accelerate the trend for the rich to become even richer and the poor to become ever more desperate" (pp.60,61).

Of course, the fact that a deepening divide between rich and poor is precisely what is happening, both worldwide and within Aotearoa/NZ, does not faze Mike at all - he simply denies fact (see e.g. p.59). Statistics NZ has recently released figures reinforcing the already existing documentation of this deepening gap, and also the emerging erosion of the middle-class. However,

Moore's whole approach to regulating the free market is a clip-on method: to somehow add "social insurance, environmental rules and measures to promote the disadvantaged" (p.60). He badly misunderstands the logic of capitalism which is not surprising.

There *are* enormous forces of globalisation, especially in communications and transport, that are impacting on us, and will impact on us. But given that all this is "man-made" we can yet assert the values of social justice, freedom, democracy, human rights and other vital values over these forces. If we do not then most assuredly we are resigning ourselves to a grim fate indeed. And in the end, according to the current conception of what globalisation is, and should be, only a small minority of humankind are really set to prosper, hence all the anguish from them when you work to expose this - especially their accusations of conspiracy theory if the clearly undemocratic consequences are spelt out.

This is deliciously ironic when various New Right ideologues like "Withering of the State" Upton; Luxton in various statements, interviews; Douglas/Prebble and ACT; Professors Enderwick and Haworth; the Business Roundtable; etc. have all made clear that the grand design is a country where pretty well the only remaining function for government is the openly coercive function, i.e. the operation of the police and army to keep the masses in line. Indeed, it is democracy which the New Right wishes to destroy above all else. Mike's big problem is that he is allied with such ideologues on free trade/investment as progress but wants to try and redefine the predictable outcomes to accommodate his own contradictory illusions about the survival of the nation State, democracy and citizenship.

### **Paradoxical Pirouettes**

Despite any denial of wanting to dismantle the democratic State, Moore cannot elude the coils with which he has caught himself. Time and time again he pulls the rope ever tighter. He refers at one stage to Karl Marx's "Withering of the State" (p.22) - is he confused here with Upton's book?! But at this point he firmly rejects that the State is in decline and will suicide. Instead, he agrees with one of his gurus, TNC pundit Peter Drucker, who is quoted as saying that probably "the nation state will survive the globalisation of the economy and the information revolution that accompanies it. But, it will be a greatly changed nation state, especially in domestic fiscal and monetary policies, foreign economic policies, control of international business, and perhaps in its conduct of war" (p.22). Incredibly enough then, Mike cites this particular quote in support of his own contention that in fact the State "will ultimately be strengthened by that (sic) changes that await us" (p.22).

Perhaps the best thing to do here is to cite another quote from Drucker, just to signal corporate continuity in action. Back in the early '70s Drucker's slogan was ". . . we need to defang the nationalist monster" and replace it with TNC rule ("Global Reach: The Power of the Multinational Corporations", Richard Barnet & Ronald Muller, p.55). Mike got the term the "global shopping centre" from Drucker ("Global Reach", p.14).

In the course of his book, Moore does come up with a few memorable lines. For instance, he wants to "try democracy"; to "see the bigger picture" (he should read GATT Watchdog's quarterly publication, *The Big Picture*); and to abjure "sweet dreams and fairytales" which "are easier to sell to anxious voters" [hark to the GATT propagandist!] (pp.10,11). There are plenty of "Mooreisms", e.g. "We all treasure ancient and new literature. Shakespeare and Mickey Mouse . . ." (p.38).

Struggling in his coils, Mike continually falls into some big holes - again of his own making. Probably the deepest one is his praise for the Internet as the expression of a vibrant new form of democracy. "The new information age means that electronic-based grassroots pressure groups and the media have more power than most politicians" (pp.12, 13). He is certainly truthful to some extent about the possible power of the Internet although the threatened powerful "vested interests" to which he refers in this particular context are now seeking ways to try and control this democratic medium too. The biggest irony is that it was the unprecedented international mobilisation of NGO resistance on the Internet that blew apart the OECD-orchestrated campaign to foist Mike's beloved MAI on to the globe. My, my, Mike, real internationalism at work! "God bless the Internet", says Mike (p.82). Amen!

An article in *The Independent on Sunday* (UK, 10/1/99) was aptly titled, "How the Web Saved the World", and explained how "the world's most clandestine treaty has been exposed" on the Internet; and how this "most secret treaty turned out to be a political Dracula which simply could not survive the light of day . . ." So this was a vehicle of globalisation that was derailed by concerted democratic action - at least for the moment. A great triumph of people power.

For Moore, however, MAI is the fulfilment of all his dreams. Fact, as usual, is certainly not allowed to get in the way. He gives the same old, worn clichés about the benefits of foreign investment that were exposed in the September 1998 edition (no. 88) of *Watchdog* (along with all our other publication issues as well), e.g. only 10% of profits are remitted offshore (see p.50 of his book). Similarly, he touts the MAI as completely harmless and asserts that it would not change any domestic legislation here in Aotearoa/NZ. Both the Overseas Investment Commission(OIC) and the Treaty of Waitangi would serve as protections anyway. Given the TNC threat to Maori values and CAFCA's ongoing exposure of the farcical OIC, Moore's words are as empty as ever.

To return to the *Independent on Sunday* article, worldwide protest was directed against the MAI on account of provisions which - among other things - would have:(1) enabled TNCs to sue governments for damages before an international tribunal over any legislation that increased their costs such as higher wages, or social and environmental standards; (2) allow the MAI to override earlier international agreements such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child; (3) permit challenges to anti-smoking programmes, and all sorts of laws/regulations as "investment-distorting"; and, (4) allow TNCs to even demand equal access to government funding in competition with non-profit health and social services agencies. In fact, the Harvard Lawyers' Society said that MAI violated the United Nations Declaration on the Right to Development. Meantime, Mike lamented the "lack of intelligent debate" on the MAI (p.51).

It is still very important to monitor what happens to the MAI proposals and keep a close watch on the activities of politicians like Moore. Ominously enough, in December 1998 the life of the WTO's trade and investment working party was extended indefinitely, enabling it to incorporate some of the MAI provisions in a new round of negotiations. It was the Clinton Administration, "whose civil servants dreamt up" the MAI, with lots of inducements and help from the TNC brigade, and the US will be determined to achieve its goals wherever the opportunity arises (*Independent on Sunday*, 10/1/99).

It is highly humorous that at one stage, in his typically muddled fashion, Moore even claims that the new factor of the Internet will cause the collapse of "extraterritorial regulatory power" and lead to the devolution of jurisdictions (p.22). Indeed:"The powers of governments over traditional areas of the economy will be transformed by the new logic of the Internet" (p.22) Right on Mike! It is not quite how you are envisaging it but things do not always turn out the way you plan. Now that the electronic-based, grassroots pressure groups have blasted away the MAI for the moment, the opportunity is there to start rolling back the WTO, APEC, etc. and other TNC-driven regimes in order to replace them with much improved international bodies and regulatory systems. Ironically, too, Mike in his revamped self-image as the great democrat welcomes international NGO participation (pp.82,83).

Moore maintains he looks forward to a participatory networking democracy rather than an electoral representative type (pp. 21, 26,82,83). Obviously his version of it could be very dangerous, given all his other baggage. As well, his assertion here conflicts with his view as to how "the dynamic of globalisation will continue to wear down any of the rough spots contained in (these) regional trading agreements" (p.16). So much for local control! Once more we see how Mike likes to have things both ways if he can, to have his cake and eat it too. This basic contradiction runs through so many of his arguments. He asserts that his "book advances the doctrine of independence through interdependence" (p.16). Likewise:"The true nationalist and patriot is also an internationalist. This is not a contradiction" (p.38). In this regard, his favourite sleight of hand trick is to simply identify "internationalism" in practice with what he understands as "globalisation"(or "globalism"). Naturally, neither of these terms are defined by Moore.

He goes on to contend that:"Far from weakening the integrity of a nation's State and allowing the great multinationals to ravage the world, I believe the GATT and the WTO do the opposite"

(p.72). As again is so often the case Mike merely states his fond belief without any real supporting evidence. His strongest point is the alleged success in a couple of cases by small countries against larger countries in the WTO disputes system (p.73). But there are many other factors - from overall context to particular trade-offs - involved in these trade/investment relations about which Moore is silent.

In *Focus on Trade*(no. 33, Jan. 1999), Aileen Kwa of the Focus on the Global South emphasises that "the WTO's brand of free trade has expanded the freedom and powers of TNCs but has severely curtailed the interests of developing countries". This is due to a set of causes with deep roots in colonial/imperial history. So far as the disputes institution is concerned:"Developing countries have discovered that finding recourse in the dispute settlement system is costly and requires a level of legal expertise which they may not have". Moreover, the principles informing the system - "whether a country is violating free trade rules" - are not oriented to their development needs. The odd relative success counts for little. Nelson Mandela has pointed out that in the GATT Uruguay Round: "The developing countries were not able to ensure that the rules accommodated their realities . . . it was mainly the pre-occupations and problems of the advanced industrial economies that shaped the agreement" (*Focus on Trade*, no. 33, Jan. 1999). Does Nelson then wear his underpants tucked into his shirt?!

Yet sometimes Mike can accidentally give an insight into the operations of global control. For example, in the course of an argument as to the benefits of free trade, he describes how the IMF rescue package for Mexico helped maintain jobs in the US by propping up the demand for American exports (p.54). Indeed, says Mike, "all the money the US has given to the IMF since the fund's inception has been paid back not only in full but with interest" (p.58). This US/IMF intervention is seen as part of the free trade system. Compounding problems temporarily plastered over do not really worry Moore if they benefit the rich and powerful. The global contortions/contradictions of free trade may multiply but Mike soldiers on, his faith unshaken.

### **Weird and Wacky**

On the very exceptional occasion, Mike can yet make an oddly profound observation like the rather sudden declaration at the end of his chapter on "Future-proofing New Zealand" - "*We are in deep trouble*" (p.109). Whereas he welcomes international competition as the creator of jobs (p.54), he still ironically elsewhere acknowledges that:"Productivity has become uncoupled from employment . . . New technologies and the international competitive drive mean downsizing to seize and maintain a competitive cost advantage" (p.104). Gosh, is there a momentary inkling there of the competitive race to the bottom and the erosion of standards, protections and safeguards? What of his beloved MAI?!

But Moore dismisses the lowering of standards through the constant, predatory search by TNCs for cheap labour as an economic "fallacy" which particularly ignores the question of "labour productivity" (p.53). Again, he dutifully cites Madeleine Albright who has claimed:"The evidence is clear that globalisation is not lowering standards around the world, it is raising them" (p.52). Yet again later, Mike ponders the vexed issue of wage rates in developing countries:"Wealthy companies often appear keen to take advantage of lower environmental and labour standards in developing countries in order to increase profits which could be seen as exploitative" (p.74). He even draws attention to the fact that:"Part-time jobs have burgeoned in all Western countries . . . Working conditions are eroded" (p.104) - gee, Mike! Then he next calls for "new forms of public works" even though his free market policies would eventually either disallow or undermine these (p.105).

Mike gets very confused about leadership. The potty history is often hilarious. "Reactionaries" like the reviewer resist the inspiration of leading politicians like Moore riding the "great waves of changes in world history" (p.13). According to the great helmsman, all these great historical waves have been accompanied by violent resistance, unemployment and great distrust and hatred of leaders. Sometimes he unashamedly sings a paen to imperialism as the manifestation of the forces of the open society reaching outwards. A very bizarre example is the conquering Ghengis Khan who was once poised to take Europe but (unfortunately?! ) failed, according to Mike, because of a cultural/political requirement that he be buried in his homeland (p.32).

He has an interesting assortment of minor heroes of globalisation for NZ. For instance, there is the "old Marxist", Ken Douglas, who recently joined the honours list. Ken can certainly now "see beyond the battle cry of the last class war" as Mike so delicately puts it (p.102). Then, too, one of his favourite "New Zealanders" is: "A brewer who has opened plants in Australia and China . . . and is bold enough to form a global brewing power and merge with a Japanese producer" (p.108). Mike sure knows how to grease up to the rich and powerful! This brewer, Douglas Myers, a leading light of the Business Roundtable, gained handsomely on the deal. Yet Myers is also one of those agents of globalisation about which Mike has expressed concern - at least indirectly with regard to the lowering of standards. After all, Mike was earlier critical of the attacks of the Roundtable on "workers' conditions" (p. 100). Globalisation is sure confusing, ain't it, Mike?!

Moore even gives examples of colonisation by the spread of European diseases in the Americas and also Aotearoa as arguments against self-reliance. In his view, this all goes to show that the "self-sufficient" State is doomed to fail (p.33). Accept our exports - and accept our diseases too! He says that the "march of civilisation has been a story of vibrant, often violent, internationalism . . ." (p.30). Mike, of course, is a strong supporter of the US war on Iraq and securing the Western supply of oil and other strategic resources. However, for him the "argument that the rich are consuming too much of the world's resources" is wrong (p.180). Why? Basically because Mike says so. We all can get rich and consume as much as we want - it is called "sustainable development", or rather the sustainable free market (p.166). Somehow the market and consumption can grow and yet not grow with increased affluence all round (see pp.161 & 166). And despite the well documented decimation of NZ's fisheries he points to them as a "world first", a model of "sustainable fishing".

Moore constantly draws attention to problems of globalisation to which on his own premises he can offer no solutions. For example, he quotes Drucker about the remarkable mobility of money in the "financial cybermarketplace" - of "virtual money" which serves "no economic function": in other words, the unprecedented potential for the sort of financial speculation that has rocked the world of late and threatens even greater instability in the future (pp.22,23). But Mike has no solution to this problem. Indeed, he goes on to quote Drucker to the effect that since business will live in a borderless world the "tax base will shrink dramatically" (p.23). So much for the survival of good government. Meanwhile, the New Right keeps up its attack on taxes to run down, indeed eliminate, the welfare State and thus increase inequality - something that Mike buys into as well (p.93).

He is gung-ho about the new biotechnology, attacking the "luddites" who want to try and control it. While he recognises on the one hand that it might be outstripping "our capacity to deal with the ethical issues involved", we will just have to learn somehow to cope with it (p.27). Of the very real question as to whether democracy can survive biotechnology Mike is silent yet once more. Despite the mounting corporate charge against environmental legislation, both on the domestic level here and on the international scene, he can pose as a defender of environmental protection through greater commercialisation . . . (p.171). As a typical rightist, Moore blames the bulk of environmental damage on population growth and poor people (p.162). On the other hand, he does recognise that the wealthiest nations "consume the most resources, release the most pollution, and have the greatest capacity to make the necessary changes" (p.166). Mike is positively brimming with inconsistent platitudes.

The book is composed then of the rambling thoughts of Chairman Mike on this and that, liberally interspersed with plenty of quotations from his favourite writers, and riddled with repeated moralistic exhortations to trust him, and his corporate mates, and everything will turn out okay. There is a loose organisation into chapters, covering topics like the Information Age, International Structures, "Luddites and Leadership", Sovereignty, and the Green Movement. But the text can be difficult to read, especially in the early part which gives the guts of what Mike is on about, because of the famed discursive nature of his writing. His mind can skip from point to unrelated point like a grasshopper which in turn reflects his magpie-like, ill-digested gathering of information. Disorganisation rules!

As indicated above, he repeatedly points to certain trends while demonstrating his inane incompetence to comprehend obvious meanings and implications. One very significant trend that he

warns about is the likelihood of increased violence; and he says that in response to threats like terrorism "security will soon be the fastest-growing industry outside technology and entertainment" (p. 28). Oh dear, Mike, it looks suspiciously like the Marxist theory of class warfare on a massive scale. At the same time, of course, the radical changes that Moore is pushing are supposedly about inevitable progress and the dawn of a marvellous new Millennium of competition/cooperation. Indeed, all capitalist and technological change is ultimately good for Mad Mike even though he can point to unfortunate consequences like increased violence (compare pp. 28 & 176).

Almost needless to add, these changes are ideally geared to turn a commercial profit somehow, to make a commodity out of everything possible - ironically, even growing class conflict as witness the burgeoning security industry. The old McPhail/Gadsby joke of Mike peddling we-taburgers comes to mind. Moore remains the enthusiastic Western moderniser/futurist, resolutely unfazed by any apparently negative trend and kicking shins to get conformity.

### **Finale**

We should not "idealise international trade" says Mike, but it "can provide the security and economic growth necessary for enduring solutions to be reached" (pp.10). There lies his main misunderstanding in that trade/investment and its agents are today forcing on us their own solutions; and, whereas Moore as a committed part of this process, might feel that things are going well, a growing number of people - as he himself recognises - do not accept his plans for the future.

Yet more ironies are implicit in this very recognition. Moore argues that the clashes of the future will be less ideological than "cultural and economic" although his book itself is so much an ideological tirade against his opponents (p.15). Moreover, it seems that he cannot mean class conflict by the term "economic" since he considers Marxism totally discredited and irrelevant. So what he does mean here is unclear although it may mean increasing economic competition (despite the benign regulations of the WTO, etc.) and/or the competition for world resources - competition which again suggests class conflicts on a world scale. Nevertheless, the "virtues" of free trade competition will ensure food, human rights and housing (*Press*, 29/1/99).

GATT Watchdog and CAFCA have keenly backed Moore's bid to be the director-general of the WTO. We feel that the Government has unwittingly launched a potentially erratic and very beneficial cruise missile against free trade on to the world scene. The big players are looking for "the ideal choice to tread the delicate diplomatic line between the two powerhouse camps of Europe and the US" (*Press*, 8/12/98). With a thinker like Mike now at the top job, we are sure that the TNC-agenda will labour hard for progress. At the end of his book, Mike appeals for "trust and faith" to be learned by the masses (p.184). It is "the greatest challenge for today's leaders". Sorry, Mike, you flunk the test.

(PS. This has been a full-out assault on Mike Moore's policies. But at the Parliamentary committee hearing on submissions on the SIS Amendment Bill one attendee thought that Mike came across as the only *human* member of the committee. Another got a very different impression but there may be some hope left yet, Mike!)