

Pressure to Dissolve the UN Security Council: Putin Warns of League of Nations Revival. What Are the Implications?

It would do us well to take Putin's words with full seriousness and avoid staining human history with another world war.

By Matthew Ehret-Kump

Global Research, October 26, 2021

<u>Strategic Culture Foundation</u> 24 October 2021

Theme: <u>History</u>, <u>United Nations</u>

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the "Translate Website" drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at @crg_globalresearch.

Faced with increasing pressure to dissolve the five member UN Security Council, President Putin warned on October 21:

"If we remove the veto right of the permanent members, the UN would die the very same day – it would turn into the League of Nations. It would simply become a discussion platform".

As walls separating east and west along Manichean Cold War lines of "democratic/free" vs "authoritarian/enslaved" are quickly being erected before our eyes, it is worth pondering not only the deeper implication of the Russian president's message but also those healthier pathways out of the coming storm before it is too late.

League of Nations and the Imperial Hoax of WWI

Created in 1919 by forces centered in London and the racist Anglo-American establishment of the USA, the League of Nations was sold to a beaten-down world as the last and greatest hope for peace.

The groups then centered around Round Table leader Lord Alfred Milner (1), had taken control of the British Government in a form of <u>soft coup in 1916</u> in order to shape the terms of the post-war order.

It was a major gamble of course since there were no guarantees that those imperial plotters who kicked over the world chessboard in 1914 would necessarily come out victorious.

From 1902 onward, Lord Milner, King Edward VII and his coterie of imperial co-thinkers across the Anglo-American deep state had invested significantly into lighting the world on fire via color revolutions, a plethora of assassinations and of course a long-planned global war that turned the world inside out.

In opposition to standard theory narratives taught in sundry history departments, WWI was a war with one aim: Destroy the spread of a community of cooperating sovereign nation states which had been forming in the last decades of the 19th century. Internationally, statesmen of 1870-1900 were applying Lincoln's system of protectionism, national credit, industrial growth and win-win cooperation under the banner of "American System" champions <u>Friedrich List</u> and <u>Henry C Carey</u>. By 1890, such policies were championed by Sergei Witte of Russia, Otto von Bismarck of Germany, President Carnot of France, and many Lincoln republicans in the USA.

Despite the fact that Russia was a member of the British-led Entente Cordiale, both Germany and Russia who had historically tended to industrial cooperation along Witte-Bismarck strategic lines were the primary targets for destruction.

This was a fact better understood at the time, with *The Daily Mail* of December 14, 1909 even publishing an editorial <u>reading</u>: "the king [Edward VII] and his councillors have strained every nerve to establish Ententes with Russia and with Italy; and have formed an Entente with France, and as well with Japan. Why? To isolate Germany."

It is without a doubt that many Anglo-American grand strategists expected a cooperative United States to be drawn into "the war that was to end all wars" much earlier on. With nationalist President McKinley's 1901 murder, anglophile traitors quickly swept into power under Teddy Roosevelt who was seduced into King Edward VII's plans for an Anglo-American special relationship as the basis for a new Anglo-Saxon world order.

Woodrow Wilson's accession to the presidency from 1912-1920, and the establishment of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 only re-enforced the belief that America was sufficiently under the control of a supranational financier elite which had never quite forgiven the belligerent colony for winning independence in 1783.

When Germany found herself the last nation to be prepared for a war that had been set into motion by the architects of the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale (later joined by a bewildered Russia), America was expected to jump in immediately.

Military pacts well known to all geopoliticians of 1914 ensured Russian intervention on Serbia's side if the latter got in a fight. Similarly, Germany had guaranteed its support for Austria in any fight it found itself enmeshed in.

When an anarchist terror cell from Serbia known as 'the Black Hand' was deployed to kill Archduke Ferdinand of Austria on June 28, 1914, a chain of events was put into motion that led a sleep walking world into the slaughterhouse.

Finally realizing what had happened, Kaiser Wilhelm wrote despairingly in August 1914:

"England, Russia, and France have agreed among themselves... to take the Austro-Serbian conflict for an excuse for waging a war of extermination against us... That is the real naked situation slowly and cleverly set going by Edward VII and... finally brought to

a conclusion by George V... So the famous encirclement of Germany has finally become a fact, despite every effort of our politicians and diplomats to prevent it. The net has been suddenly thrown over our head, and England sneeringly reaps the most brilliant success of her persistently prosecuted purely anti-German world policy against which we have proved ourselves helpless, while she twists the noose of our political and economic destruction out of our fidelity to Austria, as we squirm isolated in the net. A great achievement, which arouses the admiration even of him who is to be destroyed as its result! Edward VII is stronger after his death than am I who am still alive!"

The fight inside the USA

When nationalist forces in the United States saw the fires start across the ocean, it wasn't interventionist neoconservative Pax Americana instincts that dictated a leap into the mire (as those would only be cultivated by a <u>cult of neo-Trotskyists many decades later</u>).

The USA of 1914 was still very much influenced by the non-interventionist spirit of George Washington and John Quincy Adams.

It was George Washington who warned Americans <u>never to allow themselves to be entangled</u> into European oligarchical intrigue, while Adams re-affirmed this belief in the form of his Monroe Doctrine <u>warning that</u> America must never "go about searching for monsters to destroy".

Although not attaining a victory on the federal level until the 1921 inauguration of President Warren Harding, these nationalists (sometimes dubbed "The American System Caucus") fought valiantly to keep the USA neutral. In 1915, an inside job arranged by Anglo-American (mostly Anglo) forces drove the sinking of the Lusitania carrying 1700 people (and 173 tons of explosives) from the USA to Europe. Although it took two years of relentless propaganda, this event was decisive in fueling anti-German sentiment and winning over American support to the war. With America's 1917 entry, the scales were sufficiently tipped in favor of the "allies" and the Austro-Hungarian empire was soon put down.



Photo: Library of Congress

Among other things, the Ottoman Empire- then allied to Germany was also dissolved with victor nations gobbling up her territories, while imperialists drooled over the potential carving up of the Russian empire after the destruction of the Romanov Dynasty in 1917. Lastly Sykes Picot carving up of the Middle East (also arranged years before the end of WWI) set into motion the divide-to-conquer strategy of Anglo-intrigue in Southwest Asia that has plagued the world until our present day.

The Birth of the League of Nations

Anyone going into the opening January 10, 1920 conference of the League of Nations that emerged out of the Versailles Treaty of 1919, would not have had most of this intrigue in mind.

The world was told that cause of the war was German imperial ambition and the nation state system itself that made expansionism possible. Discussing truth was not deemed

appropriate amidst this frenzy of looting as everything that Germany possessed including vital agriculture, mines, rail, industry and colonies went up for grabs. Debts were thrust upon the beaten German state as North Silesia, Ruhr, and Alsace-Loraine were confiscated along with the means of paying their reparations (2).

The acolytes managing the League of Nations demanded that the world finally learn that if nation states were permitted to exist, then such wars would plague humanity forever. The solution was the dissolution of sovereign nation states. No longer would selfish nation states be free to decide for themselves when to war and when to declare peace. Articles 10 and 16 of the League's Covenant (pre-cursor to the latter Article 5 collective security pact of NATO) would ensure this.

In Defense of Sovereignty

Fortunately, a return to sanity under the short-lived Presidency of Warren Harding (1921-23) brought the USA into a hostile relationship with the League and its Round Table affiliates within the CFR and Wall Street. Harding ensured a healthy belligerence to the League's antinational mandate and worked hard to initiate bilateral agreements with Austria, Germany, Hungary, Russia and China outside of the League's authority.

During the 1920s, many other nations shared this deep mistrust of the new supranational organization and saw it clearly as the cover for a new British Empire. With this awareness, the League was never permitted to take on the teeth which one world government fanatics so deeply desired. From 1921-1932, the increasingly impotent body fell into disarray and saw its last serious battle against nationalism die in June 1933 when American President Franklin Roosevelt torpedoed the League's London Conference on finance and trade.

This little known conference brought together 62 nations and was co-controlled by the Bank of England, the Bank of International Settlements (aka: the Central Bank of Central banks) and aimed at imposing a central bankers dictatorship onto the world. This was a process not that dissimilar from the COP26 Summit, and Great Reset Agenda in motion today.

While the success of the League's London Conference might have made WWII unnecessary (3), the goal of a Malthusian/eugenics-driven "scientifically managed" priesthood as <u>outlined</u> by the likes of John Maynard Keynes would have been just as deadly.

A Return to our Present Age

Despite the sad fact that neither Harding, nor FDR were able to fully see through their ambitious goals, the possibility of <u>reviving the spirit and intent of the United Nations charter</u> under a paradigm of win-win cooperation would not be possible without their intervention into history.

<u>FDR's early death resulted in his enemies</u> taking control of Washington and converting his dream into a Cold War nightmare. Bretton Woods institutions like the World Bank and IMF were turned into instruments for usurious re-colonialization instead of long-term productive credit generators under an <u>international New Deal</u>. Throughout the Cold War, the United Nations became increasingly an impotent servant of empire without any means of giving a voice to the majority of her 193 member nations.

The UN Security Council was among the few important institutions within the new

organization that gave an equal voice to leading members on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Over the years, especially since 2011, this veto power has been vital in blocking unilateral acts of imperialism since any official military act of intervention required unanimity of all five members.

The United Nations is NOT the League of Nations

The League of Nations was formally dissolved just as the UN was coming online.

The timing of these two events has been used to induce credulous people to believe that the UN is simply a continuity of the League. That is a provably false assertion.

Where the League of Nations demanded an abolition of national sovereignty, the United Nations made the defense of national sovereignty and non-interventionism guiding principles of its founding charter.

Unlike the technocratic/management-fixated League of Nations Covenant, the UN Charter is guided explicitly by a mandate to enhance large scale economic development, win-win cooperation and the universal needs of all humanity (4). And unlike the League, the UN featured no collective security pact which would make initiating WWIII much easier for a supranational oligarchy. The burning desire for "collective security pacts" was the driving force of NATO's creation (led as one might expect by the hand of Rhodes Scholars like Escott Reid).

Today, the UN is largely a toothless body whose 52 attempts to criticize Israel since 1973 have been blocked by the USA. But despite this, the security council's existence has unarguably saved the lives of millions by blocking the countless attempts to destroy Syria and continues to serve as a game changing wedge against the will of unipolar Dr. Strangeloves with delusions of global supremacy.

Modern representatives of the Anglo-American elite that took control of the USA over the dead bodies of Harding, FDR and JFK have clamored for a new post-nation state security doctrine. This doctrine was officially known as Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and was launched by Soros-affiliated operatives like Lord Mark Malloch Brown, Strobe Talbott and Tony Blair in 1999. Malloch Brown integrated this doctrine into the United Nations while acting as Undersecretary General of the organization and has spent the last years giving speeches calling for the dissolution of the UN Security Council in order to remove "authoritarian nations" like Russia and China from any role in global war-making decisions.

So, when Putin or Xi call for defending the UN Charter, or warn against a new League of Nations, it would do us well to take their words with full seriousness and avoid staining human history with another world war.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Matthew J.L. Ehret is a journalist, lecturer and founder of the Canadian Patriot Review. He can be reached at matthewehret.substack.com

Notes

- (1) Other prominent Roundtable-connected figures of the Milner-led soft coup included Prime Minster David Lloyd George, Leo Amery, Minister of the Admiralty Winston Churchill, Lord Balfour. Milner set up a secret group known as the 'X Committee' which largely ran most aspects of the war from 1917-1919.
- (2) After the 1918 Armistice dismantled Germany's army and navy, the once powerful nation was now forced to pay the impossible sum of 132 billion gold marks to the victors and had to give up territories representing 10% of its population (Alsace-Loraine, Ruhr, and North Silesia) which made up 15% of its arable land, 12% of its livestock, 74% of its iron ore, 63% of its zinc production, and 26% of its coal. Germany also had to give up 8000 locomotives, 225 000 railcars and all of its colonies. It was a field day of modern pillage.
- (3) As a transition to global technocratic feudalism might having arisen through more "peaceful" means
- (4) The first four sections of article one read: "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace; To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace; To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends." And just in case any imperially minded legalist wished to read the charter loosely, Article two quickly made it clear that "the Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members."

Featured image is from Wikimedia

The original source of this article is <u>Strategic Culture Foundation</u> Copyright © <u>Matthew Ehret-Kump</u>, <u>Strategic Culture Foundation</u>, 2021

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Matthew Ehret-Kump

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