

to self-determination to peoples under colonial, foreign, or alien occupation, which adversely affect their social and economic development.”

And finally, there was no agreement on the following statement in paragraph 15(b), “Reaffirming that the right to development is an inalienable human right, by virtue of which all human beings and all peoples have the right to participate and to contribute to economic, social, cultural, and political development, and that all human beings have the responsibility of development, individually and collectively, the states have the primary responsibility of creating the national and international conditions favorable for the realization of the Right to Development.”

Disregard for physical economy

As already mentioned, the world leaders are instructed to solemnly declare that they are “deeply convinced that social development and economic development are interdependent and mutually reinforcing.” Unfortunately, the draft program of action for the summit reveals this to be an absolutely empty statement.

The draft text shows no understanding of real physical economy and economic development. There are plenty of references to so-called “sustainable development” and “productive employment,” but there is no reference to any physical productive initiative that could facilitate real economic growth. As a matter of fact, there is not a single word about any infrastructure project, large-scale technology transfer, or real economic investment.

The program of action for the Copenhagen Summit maintains the illusion of the “post-industrial” society. It is plainly insane to speak about social and economic development in a post-industrial world. By what means are poverty, unemployment, and social disintegration going to be eradicated if industrialization and technological development are seen as undesirable?

In the “Notes for Speakers” mentioned above, the idea of industrial development is depicted as outright old-fashioned. The assistant secretary general quotes the U.N. Human Development Report from 1993: “The notion that manufacturing is the foundation for all other economic activity is an old illusion. The distinction between industry and services is now largely meaningless.”

As American statesman and economist Lyndon LaRouche has repeatedly pointed out, it is exactly this post-industrial insanity, combined with free-market economics, that has destroyed the world economy and left the Third World to its misery over the past 20-odd years.

EIR is currently sponsoring a series of conferences worldwide on Mr. LaRouche’s proposals for global reconstruction of the world economy based on large-scale infrastructure development. Such a conference took place in Copenhagen on Feb. 9.

Commission on Global Governance

Global empire on the U.N.’s agenda

by Torbjoern Jerlerup

In the year-end issue of the London *Economist*, “The World in 1995,” author Nico Colchester called for the creation of “government at above the level of nation-state,” in an article with the headline “The Slow Death of the Nation-State.” Colchester wrote: “The threat or promise of government at above the level of nation-state will be a strong undercurrent in the politics of the rich world in 1995. The dramatic clash between the irresistible needs for such authority and the immovable forces rejecting it is ousting the old left-right divide as the bitterest source of argument within the mature democracies. The irresistible needs flow mostly from the benevolent economic facts of life. Institutionally managed savings now slip across national frontiers like quicksilver, sapping the power of governments to finance themselves through inflation. Great companies now transcend nationality. Elites do the same. So governments are reduced to mere corporate managements, competing to attract savings, companies, and elites to their territories. This is a game that demands a degree of international refereeing.”

This piece of propaganda from the British financial elite has to be seen in the light of the ongoing global financial collapse. The international financial oligarchy wants to use the 50th anniversary of the United Nations to create the administrative organ for a global financial fascist system, under the slogan of “global governance.” In this way, they hope to wipe out what remains of the sovereign nation-state, and secure their own domination.

A proposal for financial dictatorship under the cover of “global governance” was put forward at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland in January, when world leaders met to shape the economic agenda for 1995. The official commission working on the reform of the U.N., the Commission on Global Governance, presented its final report, “Our Global Neighborhood,” on Jan. 26 to the assembled elites. Two agents of influence for the British financial elite, Shridath Ramphal, former secretary-general of the Commonwealth, and Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, were present in their capacity as chairmen of the commission, and explained that the report will be the main policy document for the U.N. Social Summit in Copenhagen in March. The



Leading lights of the U.N.'s drive for global empire, left to right: Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, co-chairman of the Commission on Global Governance; U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali; Canada's "Mr. Green" Maurice Strong, a member of the Commission on Global Governance.

proposed "reform" of the U.N. will be presented to the delegates attending the Social Summit under the heading: "A Strengthened Framework for International Cooperation for Social Development in a Spirit of Partnership."

The two chairmen explained that they believe the principle of national sovereignty should no longer be upheld as the main principle guiding international affairs. They instead endorsed the notion of "governance between people." The commission suggests that the U.N. should get more power, in fact dictatorial power, and that new decisionmaking bodies should be created under U.N. auspices, like an Economic Security Council, a strengthened International Court, and a system to give the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) more influence on the work of the U.N.

Among the members of this commission one finds former Under Secretary-General of the U.N. Brian Urquhart; former President of the World Bank Barber Conable; former Minister for Overseas Development in the U.K. Frank Judd; Senior Minister of Finance in Zimbabwe Bernhard Chidzero; and Canada's Maurice Strong, who has played a crucial role in shaping the agenda of the U.N. ever since the environmental conference in Stockholm in 1972.

Strong, who was the secretary general of the environmental conferences in Stockholm in 1972 and in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, also participated in the Davos forum, where he called for the creation of an Economic Security Council. He said that this has to be done in order to avoid a collapse of the financial system because of "instabilities" like the crisis in Mexico.

Another participant in the Commission on Global Governance's organizing drive for the Copenhagen Summit is An-

ders Wijkman from Sweden, deputy secretary general of the U.N. Development Program (UNDP). Wijkman, who sits on the international advisory council of Prince Philip's World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), has often stated that the world would be better off with only 500 million people. Wijkman, an outspoken Swedish opponent of Lyndon LaRouche, is acknowledged in the report by the Commission on Global Governance as one of their advisers.

What is 'global governance'?

The World Economic Forum in Davos opened one month after the Mexican bubble burst, and the talk there was all about the supranational government that the *Economist's* Colchester was demanding. Already on the first day, such stooges for the British financial world as Boutros Boutros-Ghali, mega-speculator George Soros, and Maurice Strong warned about the dangers of financial speculation and demanded "a new economic order." Boutros-Ghali pointed to the "instabilities" on the international currency markets and called for global cooperation against speculation on currencies.

The Ramphal/Carlsson Commission, when it presented its report at Davos, talked about the need to create an Economic Security Council to deal with the global financial mess. To understand what the commission means by this proposal, it is necessary to take a closer look at the report and the discussion behind the scenes. The intent of the U.N. reformers is to create a global U.N.-led empire to control world affairs. The U.N. will have the power to decide over all political issues like finances, trade, industry, defense, democracy, environment, and even sexual habits (through

the fight against "overpopulation").

One of the ideologies behind the work of the commission, as well as in the preparatory work for the Copenhagen Summit, Unar Kirdar from the U.N. Development Program, described the aim of the U.N. reformers in a surprisingly candid way, in a paper to the UNDP Roundtable in Stockholm last summer. He quoted an article from the *Economist* in January 1993, about a person looking back from the year 2992 at the 1990s. The article compares "global governance" to the Roman Empire:

"This was an opportunity of a magnitude the world had rarely seen before . . . the defeat of communist totalitarianism in 1989-91. . . . Perhaps not since the battle of Actium in 31 B.C., which made possible the *Pax Romana*, had there been such a chance to remake the world; and in A.D. 1991, unlike 31 B.C., the central idea on which the remaking would have been based was the victors' belief in every man's right to political and economic freedom."

The commission's "Our Global Neighborhood" report describes this concept of a new world-wide empire as follows: "By global governance we do not mean global government, as that would only reinforce the role of states and governments; global governance is about putting people at the center of world affairs. . . . By definition, global governance implies a decentralized system built on the foundations of a common set of values."

The commission's report considers the role of the British Empire, and comes to the conclusion that "some worldwide governance was partly provided by the exercise of dominion through empires, especially Britain's." While this was "politically stable," they say, it created some problems which a future "global leadership" should avoid. First, the British Empire was "ultimately unsustainable," and second, it gave rise to "economic nationalism." This must not be allowed to happen again.

'The end of geography'

The point of departure for the commission, is that the nation is losing more and more of its power because of modern weapons, the international trend of economic globalization, and the nature of international "threats" against mankind, like the so-called environmental threats. This development they call "the end of geography."

The commission writes that "the world has become too small and too crowded," and therefore "the concept of global security must be broadened . . . beyond the exclusive state interests to include the protection of people. . . . The primary goal of global security should be to prevent conflict and war and to maintain the integrity of the planet's life-support systems by eliminating the economic, social, environmental, political, and military conditions that generate threats to the security of people and the planet, and by anticipating and managing crises before they escalate into armed conflicts." As examples of such threats "to the people and the planet,"

the commission names several military and non-military "threats." Among the nonmilitary threats are the ozone hole, loss of biodiversity, nuclear power, and social breakdowns such as those in Rwanda, Somalia, and Haiti, which "were undoubtedly exacerbated by environmental deterioration accompanied by mounting population pressure."

The commission then proposes that the U.N. Security Council get increased power to deal with these "threats," by getting the power to enforce a set of "global rights and responsibilities" on humanity. The commission proposes that the Security Council get the power to solve every crisis by

Commission Chairman Ingvar Carlsson was asked by this author whether he wants to bomb nations that threaten the environment or that do not obey the accepted U.N. rules on economic policy. To this he answered, "I am not proposing that we should use bombs to force through a more sane environmental policy, but we must be able to go very far."

sanctions and by the use of force, so-called "enforcement action." They propose that a standing force of 10,000 soldiers be created as a "convincing deployment on the ground," for this enforcement to have the power to intervene in an early stage to prevent a threat against "the security of the people or of the planet." As they say, "a policeman would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the town hall and call a meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested." To this effect they propose that all military forces of the world should be controlled by the U.N., in its new capacity as global policeman. "Military force is not a legitimate political instrument except in self-defense or under U.N. auspices," they write.

Commission Chairman Ingvar Carlsson was asked by this author whether he wants to bomb nations that threaten the environment or that do not obey the accepted U.N. rules on economic policy. To this he answered, "I am not proposing that we should use bombs to force through a more sane environmental policy, but we must be able to go very far." So, the U.N. Blue Helmets would have the same function as the Pretorian Guard for the Roman Empire: to force through the dictates of the oligarchy.

This enforcement policy will not be founded on an idea of what is right or wrong, but on a fascist power-political

scheme. The model that the commission has chosen on how to use this "enforcement policy" is the Montreal Protocol of 1987, which banned the use of CFCs, without scientific evidence proving that they are destroying the ozone layer. The commission acknowledges the fraud of this protocol, when they say that "scientific opinion is far from unanimous" about the effect of the CFCs on the ozone layer; but they say that "we . . . cannot afford to wait until scientific evidence is complete."

Five proposals

To impose this fascist global empire upon all nations and all people on the planet, the commission proposes a reform of the existing institutions of the U.N. and calls for the creation of some new ones. Their proposals can be summed up in five points:

- As mentioned above, they say that the Security Council should get more power to intervene *before* an armed conflict starts in any country, or in case of "environmental degradation," lack of "democratic behavior," etc. They also propose some formal changes in the structure of the Council, whereby other countries would be invited as permanent members, *but without a veto*. The commission says that the veto should be abolished, but only after the Security Council has increased its power. This means that there is no guarantee that the Permanent Five countries, which now have a veto—the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, and France—will agree to abolish it.

- The commission proposes that an Economic Security Council be established. It is to have no enforcement capacity and its decisions are to be taken in consensus (no veto). The idea is that it should function as the control organ for the world economy, replacing the Group of Seven, and that it should coordinate the work of all branches of the U.N., not only its work in economics.

- The World Court should get more power, and "all members of the United Nations should accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. . . . Failing voluntary compliance, Security Council enforcement of World Court decisions and of other legal obligations should be pursued." Every member could then sue any other member on the charge that it is violating "the accepted global ethic," but of course the five powers with a veto can impede any decision which negatively affects their interests.

- The NGOs should receive "the right to petition." The Security Council would be able to get "early warning" about something which they believe could be a threat "to the people or the planet." All non-governmental organizations would be able to petition about anything and address their petitions to a "Council for Petitions." This council would then decide "if the situation poses or is likely to pose a threat of such proportions that it should be addressed by the Security Council." Of course, this means that if the NGOs "find" that the development of nuclear power in an African country is a

"threat" to the ecology or the economy, they could, if it is in the interest of the Permanent Five nations, get the Security Council to use force to stop the "threat."

- An international tax should be levied on airplane tickets or the use of "the global commons," like the sea or space, to finance the work of the U.N.

Financial fascism

Let us look more closely at the commission's proposal to create an Economic Security Council. This is supposed "to give political leadership and promote consensus on international economic issues where there are long-term threats to security in its widest sense, such as shared ecological crisis, economic instability, rising unemployment, the problems of transformation in the former Soviet Union, mass poverty, lack of food security. It would be concerned with the overall state of the world economy and with the promotion of sustainable development."

According to the commission, there is a need to create a global forum to replace the Group of Seven economic forum, which includes the leading industrialized nations of the West and Japan. The council is supposed to coordinate the work of the U.N. with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which they propose should also get more power. This shows that the criticism by the commission of these institutions is not meant seriously.

The Economic Security Council is supposed to make sure that actions are taken to protect the environment, with, for example, a global tax on pollution. It is also supposed to force through a new system for aid, whereby exporters of weapons could be punished, together with "undemocratic" regimes and those who "destroy the environment."

But the most important mission of the new U.N. body should, according to the report, be to impose control over the international financial markets by making sure that no country yields to "protectionism." This reveals the true fascist nature of the proposal, since without using protectionist measures, a nation can in no way defend its people against the international financial oligarchy or other expressions of global fascism.

This has to be seen in the light of the international financial collapse, something the commission describes in the following way:

"The international monetary system's dependence on private capital markets exposes it to the risk of a collapse of confidence in the system as a whole. Economic history is littered with financial crashes, and a major global banking collapse was averted in the 1980s only because developing-country debtors were coerced into maintaining interest payments, thus forestalling large-scale bank insolvencies. Growing financial interdependence increases the risk of panic spreading if the system gives way at one of its weakest points. It is not possible to predict where the lightning will strike next, but worries over the market in some of the new

Thorvald Stoltenberg, one-world propagandist

“One world, one government, one church, one army . . . one authority, one constitution, one World Bank, one currency. . . . One people, one big union with a common aim. . . .

“We hope that all tribes and people, despite border walls, can assemble and unite, that only *one* dictatorship—the message of peace from above—shall bend all wills of the world.”

—Odd Froner, from the poem “One World,” in the magazine of the Norwegian World Federalists, *En Verden*, 1983

If you want to find out how the world will look if the United Nations is allowed to implement its ideas about a world empire, look at Bosnia. In a world totally run by the U.N., planned holocausts like this will be an everyday occurrence aimed at “bending all wills of the world.” The Commission on Global Governance acknowledges this when they hold up “former Yugoslavia” as an example of a region where a stronger system of U.N. “governance” is needed, but without differentiating between aggressor and victim.

One of the persons that the commission thanks for his “help and good advice” is the U.N. “mediator” in Bosnia,

Thorvald Stoltenberg. This man has been propagandizing for a global empire for more than 30 years, as an active member of one of the leading non-governmental organizations working for the creation of a “world government,” or rather world empire, the World Association of World Federalists.

In April 1993, Stoltenberg, then minister of foreign affairs in Norway, replaced Cyrus Vance as U.N. mediator in Bosnia, working with the European Community’s Lord David Owen. Stoltenberg was chosen as a mediator because he has a close relation to the British geopolitical gamemasters who in 1991, with the help of Serbia, started the war in the Balkans. Like his predecessor as minister of foreign affairs in Norway, Knut Frydenlund, Stoltenberg is a friend of Henry Kissinger and shares Kissinger’s enthusiasm for power politics and contempt for the sovereign nation-state. This is why all Stoltenberg’s proposals for “peace” in Bosnia have been based on the idea of dividing Bosnia into ethnic zones, and this is why he often repeats the slogan that “the nation-state has too much power.”

Stoltenberg has been a member of the advisory council of the world federalist association in Norway, *En Verden*, for more than 25 years. *En Verden* openly proposes that the U.N. should be a “world government.” In reality, their proposal looks more like a world dictatorial empire, since they want the U.N. to carry out “population control” and “environmental protection,” as well “economic control.”—*Torbjoern Jerlerup*

financial instruments, such as derivatives, are a salutary warning of future storms that could threaten the system. It is also necessary to take account of some new destabilizing factors such as the role played by the large sums of drug money.”

The commission continues by stating that “the flexible rate system is not working as well as it should. There is too much volatility and serious misalignment of important exchange rates.” But this does not mean that we have to go back to a system of fixed exchange rates and a national protectionist credit policy, similar to what Venezuela did half a year ago: “In a world of globalized private capital markets, it is not possible or desirable to recreate a system of fixed exchange rates and strong public-sector control over the international monetary system. The market genie has already escaped the bottle.”

The fascist “solution” they propose is to impose a global ban on protectionism and create this Economic Security Council “to secure consistency between the policy goals of the international organizations,” and “to promote consensus-building dialogue between governments on the evolution of

the international economic system, . . . Its primary task would be to look at the main trends in the world economy and to give signals that could guide the global community.” The “recommendations” of the Economic Security Council, consisting mainly of the rich countries, could then be subject for treatment by the full Security Council, with its increased capacity to enforce its decisions upon all nations. In this way, with global economic fascism, the commission believes that it would be possible to keep the sinking *Titanic*, the immoral financial system of the IMF and the World Bank, afloat.

How close are we to actually implementing these plans? This author asked Ingvar Carlsson at Davos what the schedule looks like for carrying out the commission’s proposals, and he replied that they think they will be able to get some of them passed already this year, such as the Economic Security Council. The rest, he said, should be decided at a conference in 1998. The purpose of the Copenhagen Summit, in the commission’s view, is to build momentum for that. For republican forces around the world, it is an opportunity to stop the design for global empire dead in its tracks.