

Legitimizing Global Tyranny: Moving Towards World Government

By [Jurriaan Maessen](#)

Global Research, May 21, 2012

ExplosiveReports 21 May 2012

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [History](#)

Gideon Rachman's 2008 article titled 'And now for a world government' and, more recently, Scientific American- editor Gary Stix's piece Effective World Government Will be Needed to Stave Off Climate Catastrophe, illustrate a widespread and dangerous misconception. It also demonstrates the cunning of one world- propagandists in the crafting of their arguments. In Rachman's article we are shown typical Palaeolithic artistry: horses, warriors, deer and, portrayed on the very same rocky surface, a globe. It is almost admirable were it not so deviously cunning, to bundle within a single image the primitive with the "modern" and by doing so, considering the latter as the logical conclusion of the former. Rachman explains:

'For the first time since homo sapiens began to doodle on cave walls, there is an argument, an opportunity and a means to make serious steps towards a world government.'

This statement may be considered as the basic assumption out of which a lot of these globalists' musings emanate. Point of departure is always the human journey, that once upon a time began with cave-scribbling tribes scattered aimlessly on the planet surface, in the course of time crystallizing into sophisticated city-states, in turn evolving into even more sophisticated nation-states- and finally, approaching present-day, culminating into one world-state, eclipsing all of the above.

It sounds logical, treacherously logical. As we take a closer look at this line of reasoning however, we immediately encounter difficulties. The logic as it turns out, is not so logical after all- and besides, without long term historical precedent. History is certainly littered with tyrants and their attempts to bring about overarching supranational states. And without exception, their enterprises eventually failed, forcing freedom loving people throughout history to build firewalls against tyranny, at the same time compelling the elite to refocus their eyes on more modest ambitions.

That the implementation of a one world government is not some magical or mysterious suggestion that can only be understood by an arduous reading between the lines, as some naive debunkers have suggested, has been disproven by the fact that the aim of global government has been spelled out for us word for word by overeager transnationalists and the think tanks they tend to assemble in. Like any governmental decree, the implementation of an actual world state to replace the nation-state of old requires a theoretical legitimization. The people designated to clear the theoretical brushes, so to speak, have been picked from the marble halls of academia. In this article I will shed some light on some of these.

Professor Saul Mendlovitz, founder and co-director of an international think tank ominously called the World Order Models Project (WOMP) has since 1968 attempted to formulate an answer to the question what world government should look like. The World Policy Institute gives a description of the project by stating that “this was one of the first truly global think tanks, with partners and contributors in India, China, Africa and Europe.”

Mendlovitz, as a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, received his first funding for the project from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation. As Daniel Taylor points out in his excellent 2007 article on the World Order Models Project:

“Saul H. Mendlovitz, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, directed the project. Richard A. Falk, also a member of the CFR, contributed academic work. The goals of the WOMP, according to Mendlovitz, were to “...go beyond the nation-state system...to use a much broader range of potential actors, including world institutions, transnational actors, international organization, functional activities, regional arrangements, the nation-state, subnational movements, local communities, and individuals.”

Taylor goes on to write that “The long term goals of WOMP (2011-2013), as Mendlovitz states, is to establish “...a global tax scheme to establish and maintain a basic needs regime for global society... a complete and general disarmament with alternative security system in place...”

Richard Falk, the CFR member mentioned by Daniel Taylor, has openly written about WOMP’s endeavors throughout the last half of the 20th century, claiming world government is not one of them. In his *Global Constitutionalism and World Order* Falk writes:

“Contrary to many outside critics, the Models Project has never identified itself with the advocacy of world government or world federalism (...). And yet, more than anyone in his generation, Mendlovitz (...) has kept alive the notion that a global constitutional order is theoretically necessary and historically inevitable.”

The notion that Mendlovitz is not an advocate of world government, as Falk suggests, contrasts sharply with statements made by Mendlovitz himself at his acceptance speech at the award ceremony of the 1990 UNESCO ‘Prize for Peace Education.’ Mendlovitz, as co-Director of the World Order Models Project (WOMP) stated (page 36):

“it is my personal belief (not shared by all members of WOMP) that there is an overwhelming surge in the direction of global polity and that a world state is emerging. Indeed, some of the policy elite are beginning to discuss a single world central bank and a single currency.”

All this is not science, of course. Rather, it is an attempt to scientifically legitimize a move toward world government. It is not a new concept, the idea that the large emerges from the small, rising in the steadiest of lines upward in time. This idea accommodates our most intimate fancies about time, evolution and progression. The mind, after all, tends to construct scientific parameters around the immeasurable unpredictability of the universe hoping to encapsulate infinity. It also watches nature and then, one on one, projects it onto political systems. The problem is that once these counterfeit scientists have calculated their way towards world government, and propagate its inevitableness, the sociopaths move in to seize control.

Two years after Mendlovitz's speech, two term President of the European Commission Jacques Delors gave a speech to the Royal Institute of International Affairs titled 'The European Community and the New World Order'. Invoking the famous New World Order-speech of George Bush senior, Delors took it a step further, speaking of "world government", "transferring sovereignty" and a "worldwide single market".

In his speech, Delors advocates the destruction of sovereignty of all nation-states as a remedy. Furthermore, he states this to be necessary in order to prevent "human rights violations":

"International apathy about human rights violations will not be able to hide behind pretext of immutable, inviolable national sovereignty much longer."

As it turns out, also in this respect Jacques Delors has proven himself a prophet- as the borders are eroding worldwide while the central banks consolidate power. After he elaborates further on the fact that globalisation is often counteracted by grass roots movements, attempting to preserve national sovereignty, Delors throws up his arms in feigned indignation:

"I would add- and I will not go into detail- that economic integration, unless it is backed by a strong political will, will not in itself produce stronger international institutions or help create world government."

Here we see that all transnational institutions have global government in mind- or better: they have all been erected with the aim of establishing it.

In 2003, University of Chicago's Alexander Wendt witch-crafted a philosophical monstrosity under the header "Why a World State is Inevitable: teleology and the logic of anarchy". Carefully avoiding any moral implications clinging to his manuscript, Wendt argues the case for world government as the necessary and inevitable end result of the current merging of nation-states into ever-larger bodies of influence.

"(...) this article argues that a global monopoly on the legitimate use of violence- a world state- is inevitable."

Wendt invokes many of the major philosophers in order to add credibility and substance to the concept of the inevitability of a world state emerging out of the ruins of national sovereignty. After parading big names to invigorate his "big idea", the author finally departs from a neo-Darwinian predisposition and the self-organizing principles included in it. In the struggle of nation-states, Wendt concludes, there can be no other outcome than the formation of a world state to settle all scores. He forgets to mention that neo-Darwinism can just as easily be applied to the idea that life organizes itself into more complexity as it evolves. But Wendt pays no heed: he raises his finger in foreboding: the greatest threat on the path to world government, he states, is national sovereignty. Wendt:

"Rather than go down with the ship of national sovereignty, states should try to "get the best deal" they can in the emerging global constitution."

After identifying the main enemy to world dictatorship, he then proposes to co-opt the natural drive towards auto-determination in order to bring about his desired world state.

“Nationalist struggles for recognition are by no means over, and more new states- “more anarchy”- may yet be created. But while further fragmentation is in one sense a step back, it is also a precondition for moving forward, since it is only when difference is recognized that a larger identity can be stable. (...) Far from suppressing nationalism, a world state will only be possible if it embraces it.”

Everyone dedicated to fight the push for world dictatorship should wash their ears well with this statement. For the New World Order will pull out all the stops, including flirtations with national sovereignty, courting true libertarianism and align itself with any and every grassroots movement springing up out of the soil. The anti-venom is education, education and some more education. Anything too much centralized leaves itself wide open to infiltration.

Self-education that is. As we know, all institutionalized schooling has for many decades now been infiltrated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). At a meeting in 2009, Mr. Olabiyi Babalola Joseph Yai, Chair of UNESCO’s executive board, admitted the organization was created to “think global governance”:

“You will recall, dear colleagues, that I said, before Mr Ban Ki Moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations, that UNESCO’s role is to think global governance. That is why the Organization was founded. We come to the rescue of the system especially when the economic machine runs out of steam, as it clearly has today. It is thus a matter of urgency to set up a long-term working group on global governance. I hope that a State or group of States will seize on this worthy proposal, and that the Organization, as of this session, will give it the attention it warrants.”

At her installment as Secretary-General of UNESCO in October 2010, Irina Bokova stated:

“I am convinced of the need for global governance, founded on universal ethics, in order to take up these common challenges.”

In a 1968 publication by Louis Francois for UNESCO, the author elaborates on the need for a worldwide education-system as opposed to the old, discarded one which still recognized sovereignty of the nation-state (page 18):

“We are witnessing the establishment of a new world order based upon the system of the United Nations”, Francois explains.

He links a growing world population as one of the main obstacles to be overcome in the quest for a global educational system (page 25):

“(...) not only is the population of the world increasing; it is also growing younger (...). So the first obstacle to be overcome by education is that of quantity. The first problem to be solved by a ministry of education is that of accommodating and teaching these rapidly increasing multitudes of young people.”

On page 32 the author arrives at the logical destination of his train of thought:

“Educational expansion is hard put to it to keep up with the huge growth of population.”

In order to effectively guide the population toward slavery, the number of people should be reduced lest its effectiveness wear off.

“Wherever we look”, says Francois on page 36, “education is striving to forestall the demographic explosion.”

All these statements do not fall out of the clear blue sky. UNESCO’s founder, Vice President of the Eugenics Society and foremost transhumanist Julian Huxley explained why global governance is crucial in his UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy:

“Even though it is quite true that any radical eugenic policy will be for many years politically and psychologically impossible, it will be important for UNESCO to see that the eugenic problem is examined with the greatest care, and that the public mind is informed of the issues at stake so that much that now is unthinkable may at least become thinkable.”

Another “founding father” of the scientific dictatorship, Sir Bertrand Russell once explained:

“Every government that has been in control of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen ...”

With a sharp sense of foresight when it comes to media matters, Francois describes the future of education and what its ground principles are on which this future should be founded (page 80):

“Promoting the recognition of the fact that, if the countries of the world are still divided by their interests and their political convictions, they are, day by day, growing more closely interdependent in matters of economics, science, technology and culture. Promoting awareness of the fact that nations must cooperate, that is to say work together for their common good within international organizations.”

“To sum up”, the author concludes on page 98, “UNESCO serves as a catalyst for dynamic ideas. Well placed to hear of what is happening in the world, sensitive to the nation’s needs, UNESCO is aware of the very first stirring of ideas, follows their development and can, at the proper time, co-ordinate, harmonize and finally impose them in their full force.”

It would almost be amusing, this notion that UNESCO is merely picking up on ideas, if it were not so horribly cynical in the end. The calculated and synchronized move toward a brave new world is not a bottom-up thing, somehow evolving naturally from the grass roots; it is a top-down system, posing as grass roots, crafted to brainwash as large an audience as it can through the use of mass media, schooling systems and other available instruments of propaganda.

In 1974, the Director-General of UNESCO, Rene Maheu, stressed the importance of gathering all media, irrespective of its medium, under the great wing of UNESCO and the globalists. At a banquet of the International Coordinating Council of the Man and the Biosphere Programme in Williamsburg, USA, Maheu starts out by giving some insight in UNESCO's long-term vision for mankind (page 2):

"The rationale behind the MAB (Man and the Biosphere) programme is to ensure that the physical, biological and other environmental requirements of man are placed in the hands of each of us (present) and remain under our overall control."

Explaining to his listening audience that the earth will disintegrate if not for "a collective effort planned, organized and executed by the international community acting in concert", the Director-General goes on to state:

"I believe that we have now reached the point in world affairs where we must have a systematic reorganization of international relations on all levels."

He of course favors the UN as the proper body to do the reorganizing, gives it its proper name (page 4):

"I wish to reiterate my firm conviction- together with my hope- that a new world order- political, monetary, economic and social- should now be established."

Precisely ten years after Louis Francois outlined the plans for a new world order, a meeting of "consultants" was organized at UNESCO Headquarters discussing "the free and balanced flow of information in a new communication order."

The participants were carefully selected (page 1):

"Fifteen consultants and observers from university and professional circles and representatives of international journalists' organizations attended this meeting. The main purpose of the meeting was to review briefly the origins of the concept of a free and balanced flow of information, to analyze the current state of discussions and the components of a new world order, together with its legal, technological and socio-economic implications, and to make suggestions and recommendations for future action by UNESCO and other international organizations."

One of the aims described in the document, was (page 2): "Preparing and carrying out "pilot programmes" of education incorporating these principles." Regarding the before mentioned "legal implications", one of the proposals was to "draw up regulations relating to international mass communications (page 3)."

There is nothing like a strong choke hold to force your subjects into submission. When the status of the journalist in this new world order was discussed, the participants agreed that they would first have to "assess the feasibility of establishing an international code of ethics which would be adopted by journalists possessing a "universal" sense of mission, that is to say transcending their national origin in the defense of peace and fraternity (page 3)." After we strip off the Orwellian euphemisms, this code of ethics clearly equals a strangling oath of

obedience.

Among the many disturbing recommendations made by the panel, such as setting up “an international fund for the purpose of renting news transmission channels”, the need was expressed “to set up a “World Press Council” to help ensure the truthfulness and objectivity of information, in the event of it proving impossible to devise and adapt an “international code of ethics (page 6)””.

A transnational body, in other words, that will decide whether a news item is truthful or not. While the going was good, the participants also called for (page 4) “seminars for professionals in order to make them understand the need to broaden the concerns of those who, in the mass communication process, have the responsibility for selecting information, in other words, those who act as information filters (Gate-Keepers).”

At a 1983 UNESCO conference, there seemed to be an even greater consensus on the strategies that should be implemented in order to reach a new world order- and it appears that those in attendance had a swell time debating semantics (page 16):

“The participants regarded the new world order as a recognized concept, developing but irreversible, which would be established stage by stage.(...) The establishment of a new world communication order appeared to one participant as a participation, a world response to the communications revolution, whereas another emphasized the importance of the word “new” in describing the concept.”

Bordering on the ridiculous, this exchange between globalists is nevertheless significant for it occurred long before papa Bush delivered his famous ‘new world order’ speech before the US congress in 1991. It became part of the nomenclature long before that within the seclusion of key globalist meetings. On page 10 some participants of the conference declared that “the effort to establish a new world information and communication order in stages could not be separated from the effort to promote a new international economic order.”

Or, if I may add, a scientific world order. Just recently I covered statements made by professor of physics at California State University and American representative to the UN, Roger Dittmann, who in 2004 wrote that all policies related to Agenda 21 should be pursued with the aim of worldwide population reduction and population control: “The Big Die Off”, as the professor calls it.

In his presentation Sustainable Development, the New International Scientific Order, and UN Reform Dittmann outright calls for a new “International Scientific Order” to make sure the entire scientific community will be made ready to implement worldwide population reduction objectives. Dittmann:

“Not only do people require organization about their (multiple) identities (including professional, scholarly, and scientific), they need international, even supranational affiliation, facing a common adversary.”

This common adversary-remark neatly ties in with the Club of Rome’s 1993 The First Global Revolution in which the authors state:

“In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill....All these

dangers are caused by human intervention, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then, is humanity itself.”

As the theoreticians pancake hypothesis upon hypothesis to prove their position, namely that a world state is inevitable, a closer inspection of their work reveals it is a false understanding, manufactured by a biased predisposition: both time and space have stunningly little regard for our fancies, phasing- as they do- in and out of our grasp as quickly as you can say ‘fallacy’. History, it seems, does not support their arguments.

After the Roman Empire had collapsed, other, smaller kingdoms emerged out of its ruins. This applies to the Greeks, the Babylonians, and almost every other system with imperial designs. The Egyptian kingdom, once a vast and powerful culture, grew to be just a shadow of its former self at the beginning of our calendar. Charlemagne established the great Frankish empire only to unwittingly lay the groundwork for the establishing of sovereign states in the centuries to come, like Germany and France. We have only to study history in order to counter the mythology of a gradual evolution towards a one world system. There is no evidence supporting an historic, chronological pattern of progression from the small to the great. More often than not it is the other way around, for excessive power always provokes resistance.

The original source of this article is ExplosiveReports
Copyright © [Jurriaan Maessen](#), ExplosiveReports, 2012

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Jurriaan Maessen](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca