

If you wanted to conquer the world, how would you do it?

Since the Creation there have been innumerable attempts by men to rule their fellow men by conquest. It is an ageless dream that a One World Government would be both achievable and desirable. Traditionally, conquerors like Alexander the Great and Genghis Khan simply marched in with an army and took what they wanted. But to keep and consolidate a conquest is, in the end, more difficult than the conquest itself. How would you take it all, once and for all? It has always been the way of tyrants to use semantics to offer the people one thing and give them another. For example, the three major Socialist dictators of Europe of the generation of our fathers (Nazis, Fascists and Communists) developed this art of doublespeak to a fine art. Politicians and bureaucrats today continue in their tradition, in virtually every country on earth. Any politician who wants to take the freedom of a people knows that he must convince them that there is a greater risk than that particular freedom is worth, or he must do it in the name of something higher - pretending that the legislation or regulation or war is, "to make the world safe for democracy," or, "the war to end all wars," or "to free the slaves," or "for the children," or some other such demagoguery. They never seem to weary of this game, and the more gullible or complacent the people, the more effective it is. This technique is less effective when used on a people who are vigilant in the protection of their freedom. For that reason, it has proven extremely effective since the end of World War II, which brought unprecedented wealth and complacency. It has been even more effective since the so-called collapse of Communism. Apathy is at an all-time high, and new "threats" to our way of life have to be virtually manufactured in order to cause us to give even more power to the State. "There's a hole in the ozone layer!" "Auto emissions are killing us!" "The sky is falling!" "Hate crimes are worse than ordinary crimes!" "Crimes against humanity!" "It's a vast right-wing conspiracy!" "Global Cooling!" "Global Warming!" Etc. Real threats to our peace and prosperity also exist, of course, and when anticipated - such as Y2K - offer unprecedented opportunities by the Statists to increase their control through legislation or by Executive Order. You would develop an infrastructure for a One World Government. Your one-world government will include all the ingredients of a government, to wit: You need a head of state. You need a legislative body. You need a judicial system. You need a body of law. You need a system of taxation. And most of all, you need an army. Within the structure of the United Nations you have a head of state - the Secretary-General. His claimed domain is the planet. The individual in this seat, and all his minions as officers, are both contracted and sworn to obey the wishes of no country on earth, working only for the good of the United Nations. You have a legislative body - the General Assembly. Nations of a few thousand people have the same vote as those of the largest countries, but none are elected, and none may be replaced by the people they claim to represent. You have a body of law - the UN Charter. Combine that with thousands of multi-lateral agreements and treaties, and other international bodies of control, each adding its own layer of international regulations on commerce and finance, and you have a bureaucrat's dream come true. You already have a judicial system, not only in the World Court of the Hague, but in the now developing International Criminal Court - a system which they tell us can be imposed upon all nations whether they voted for it or not - a system of judicial authority which purports to reach into every country with the authority to prosecute "crimes against humanity," whatever that is, and "hate crimes". "The proposed International Criminal Court will be a permanent Court that will investigate and bring to justice individuals, not countries, who commit the most serious crimes of concern to the international community.... The ICC will be a global judicial institution, an international jurisdiction complementing national legal systems." Taken from the ICC web-site on 28 October, 1998. http://www.igc.apc.org/icc/html/the_court.htm You would make your proposals as attractive and as broad and as appealing as possible, in order to gain the largest public support, and having established the precedent and the acknowledgement of your authority, you could then narrow and redefine your terms any way you like, depending upon the worldview of those who write the regulations and define the codes. Now, in order to finance your one-world government, it would not be acceptable that you survive on the crumbs voluntarily tossed to you by the "member states." It would be imperative that you develop your own sources of financing independent from the voluntary contribution system. You must have a system of enforceable taxation. The plans are now in place, and the proposals have been drawn up by both American and United Nations bureaucrats to place a simple fee (we don't use the word, "tax") of only one dollar on every barrel of oil coming from the floor of the ocean outside territorial waters; to assess a mere 1% on every international financial transaction; to levy a mere 1% on each international flight; etc., etc, ad nauseum. You may also look in the near future for an international application of that ingenious tax on stupidity, the lottery, to be expanded into a World Lottery, an attractive system of "saving the rain forests," or "saving the whales" whereby both the gullible and the greedy may line up to voluntarily finance the demise of their nation's sovereignty. World taxes are coming. "The power to tax is the power to destroy." - Benjamin Franklin But you can't collect delinquent taxes, nor can you enforce the edicts of a world court,

unless you have an army, or a police force. The United States has been working toward this end openly since President Kennedy's infamous State Department Document 7277, which set forth as official American policy a program to reduce American and Soviet military might to a domestic defense force, while at the same time increasing the military prowess of the United Nations to such a size that no nation on earth can resist it, "thus making wars of aggression impossible. "In short, the U.S. program calls for total elimination of national capacity to make international war. It is presented in dead earnest." - Adlai Stevenson, 15 November 1961, before the U.N. General Assembly, ACDA publication #5, p. 623. The United States Disarmament Agency has been working steadily toward that goal for three decades, even as the commitment to it rises and falls with each administration. In the meantime, you are not without allies around the world. Every nation has its utopians, every nation has its dreamers. It doesn't matter that they don't agree on the details of how the world should be run. What matters is that they come to the table and join the debate of how they're going to give away the sovereignty of their country. "Cooperative security will only reach the United Nations when states on a global level adopt policies to this end, limiting their arsenals, adopting non-offensive defence, renouncing the use of force as a political instrument... "

Vicenc Fisas, *Blue Geopolitics, the United Nations Reform and the Future of the Blue Helmets*, Pluto Press, London, 1995, pp. 133-134. (Foreword by Federico Zaragoza, Director-General, UNESCO) Fisas goes on to make a list of proposals which are endorsed by UNESCO and UN leadership. They include three phases Phase I Create United Nations Peace Enforcement Forces of some 50,000 effectives, taken from Member countries' military units, made permanently available to the Security Council. Link these forces to the process of reformation and democratization of the United Nations system. Sign agreements with Member States to make the necessary military forces available to the Security Council (Article 43) Open a treaty for signing by states, rigorously defining the circumstances under which the Peace Safeguarding Units (PSU) could intervene without the consent of the parties involved. Make available to the Security Council the bases and installations necessary for the smooth running of the PSU. Put into action the United Nations Military Staff Committee and enlarge it with representatives from those countries with most experience in peace-keeping operations. (Article 47) Set up a Peace Enforcement planning and training centre within the United Nations. Phase II Transfer full control of the national units made available to the Peace Enforcement Forces to the United Nations. Transfer ownership and control of the bases and installations provided in the first Phase. Increase the rate of reduction of national military apparatuses. Existing military apparatuses will have a purely defensive nature, not provocative. Phase III National armies disappear. You would control the press Now you shouldn't be so naïve as to think you'll control every word printed or spoken, but you do want to cultivate a climate whereby, over the years, those who share your point of view rise to positions of decision-making both in what is reported and what is ignored. You cannot tolerate the people getting and dispensing information without the "spin" or control of your professional spin-masters on the critical stories. For that reason, the Internet has become a major threat to the State, and all of a sudden there are politicians who have never given a tinker's dam for the pornography in the local grocery store who are all up in arms to "protect the children" from pornography on the Internet. If you think they are concerned about pornography, you are a guppy. They are concerned because powerful forces have suggested that their chances for re-election will be improved if are concerned. They are concerned about a medium of information which has developed so rapidly that the State has not been able to keep up with its regulations and restrictions on free speech. Pornography is a problem to any society. Free speech is a problem to tyrants. It would be ideal, were you attempting to remold society so that the people would peacefully accept a radical transformation of the way they are governed, to have them either become totally complacent or have them redefine words so that they no longer mean the same thing. There is no more perfect form of slavery than those who think they are free. You would find it advantageous to do their thinking for them by giving them capsules of information every day, starting with the newspaper, then the radio on the way to work, then You would disarm the People It would be imperative, of course, that you disarm your enemies, (governmental entities and individuals), lest they wake up, rise up, and throw off the yoke of bondage. For this reason, the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States must either be changed or ignored. The Second Amendment was placed in the Bill of Rights to prevent Tyranny, not to protect the right of the people to hunt squirrels. In most countries, disarming the government will suffice, since most countries don't trust their citizens to be armed. America was, and is different. "Little more can reasonably be aimed at with respect to the people at large than to have them properly armed and equipped.... This will not only lessen the call for military establishments; but if circumstances should at any time oblige the government to form an army of any magnitude, that army can never be formidable to the liberties of the people, while there is a large body of citizens, little, if at all, inferior to them in discipline and the use of arms, who stand ready to defend their rights and those of their fellow citizens." - Alexander Hamilton You would nullify existing Constitutional safeguards of each nation, increasing their international commitments incrementally.

Every nation will have those annoying constitutions, some worse than others. You would move boldly where possible to bribe national leaders to either change them or to sign treaties and agreements which abrogate them. "We cannot leap into world government in one quick step. (It) requires a process of gradually expanding the range of democratic cooperation." - Globalist spokesman Zbigniew Brzezinski, former Columbia University professor and National Security advisor to five U.S. presidents, speaking at the first State of the World Forum in 1995. Perhaps the best analysis on this was written by one of the movers and shakers of American policy over the past generation, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., writing about the League of Nations, and why it failed: "The commitment of troops to combat became the perennial obstacle to American acceptance of the Wilsonian dream. It is a political obstacle: how to explain to the American people why their husbands, fathers, brothers or sons should die in conflicts in remote lands where the local outcome makes no direct difference to the United States? And is it a constitutional obstacle: how to reconcile the provision in the constitution giving Congress exclusive power to declare war with the dispatch of American troops into hostilities at the behest of a collective security organization." - Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "Back to the Womb?" in *Foreign Affairs*, July-August 1995, p. 3. (Emphasis his.)

You would blur the lines of national governmental functions Through "regional arrangements" and the hybridization of institutions you would create new organizations, with full authority which transcends national authority in the name of more efficient: Regional trade and economic zones, always centralizing more and more power into organizations in which the People have no voice. Regional military arrangements, whereby the soldiers would have no particular loyalty to anything but their commanding officer. You would blur the concept of national loyalty. Regional and international courts whereby judges of one nation would judge citizens of other nations, reducing the supreme court of every nation to an inferior court. Once in, you would not allow nations to withdraw Nearly two hundred years ago this nation fought a terrible and tragic war over the right of some States, who considered themselves sovereign, to withdraw in the interest of self-determination. The Union was preserved, at great cost. Rightly or wrongly, the right of individual states within the United States of America to secede is no longer considered legal. You would impose a similar restraint upon Member States in your New World Government. There is no provision in the UN Charter for Member States to secede, and the world may some day see that any Member which attempts to do so will incur a fate not unlike that of the Confederate States of America - brutal subjugation and occupation, with a plan of Reconstruction that will make an example for all time. You would discredit all those who promote nationalism as Enemies of Peace The principle of sovereignty should be redefined by those who shape public opinion. No nation should be so selfish as to think it is sovereign today in the way that our forefathers thought. That is counter-revolutionary thinking. "In the United States, neo-isolationism promises to prevent the most powerful nation on the planet from playing any role in enforcing the peace system. If we refuse a role, we cannot expect smaller, weaker, and poorer nations to ensure world order for us. We are not going to achieve a new world order without paying for it in blood as well as in words and money." - Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., *Foreign Affairs*, July-August 1995, p. 8, (emphasis mine). "For all these reasons, the principle of sovereignty and the norms that derive from it must be further adapted to recognize changing realities. States continue to perform important functions, and must have the powers to fulfil these functions effectively. But these must rest on the continuing consent and democratic representation of the people. They are also limited by the fundamental interests of humanity, which in certain severe circumstances must prevail over the ordinary rights of particular states." - *Our Global Neighborhood, The Report of the Commission on Global Governance*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1995, p. 71. "It is to those sacred principles enshrined in the UN Charter to which we must henceforth pledge our allegiance." -- President Geo. Bush

You would discredit all those who suggest conspiracy as fanatics. Should you meet someone who says there is a conspiracy to establish a one world government, you would laugh and suggest that they are nuts, that they are gullible, that they are part of the dreaded "radical right wing conspiracy," or some other such gibberish. You would do all you could to keep them away from United Nations literature, and particularly from websites such as the Global Millennium Project. (millenniumproject.org/constitution.html) You would do all you could to prevent individuals and organizations from working together. You would encourage dissidence between organizations which have similar goals, emphasizing the minor differences, exacerbating the personality clashes, and encouraging each to protect their "turf," their economic base. Cooperation among your enemies would be your death knell. Above all, you would keep secret the knowledge that a coalition to protect American sovereignty already exists. You would bury all references to Army Specialist Michael New Action Fund (www.mikenew.com) and to the many well-documented websites and publications that prove beyond any doubt that the United Nations was conceived in conspiracy to assist in the conversion of a sovereign United States to a servile "member nation" of a one-world government. For those who wish to make history, or to understand it, I offer this little treatise. Daniel D. New © 1998, Daniel D. New