

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نېاشد تن من مېباد بدين يوم وېر زنده يک تن مېباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهيم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهيم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبان های اروپایی

<http://www.strategic-culture.org/news/2015/11/15/the-current-assault-against-democracy-ii.html>

The Current Assault Against Democracy (II)

Eric ZUESSE

11/15/2015

Rex Tugwell was very active while teaching at the University of Chicago right after WW II, promoting democratic world government as being key to the establishment of peace on a more secure institutional basis. Thus, in 1946, Albert Einstein wrote an essay, «Toward a World Government», which was published in his *Out of My Later Years*, (pp. 131-33), and it opened: «A conversation I had with three students of the University of Chicago has made a strong impression on me».

He then expressed his conviction that «A person or a nation can be considered peace loving only if it is ready to cede its military force to the international authorities and to renounce every attempt or even the means, of achieving its interests abroad by the use of force». Einstein was specific: «This [world] government must be based on a clearcut constitution which is approved by the governments and the nations and which gives it the sole disposition of offensive weapons». In other words: it must represent ultimately the people who elect the leaders of the various nations of the world, not international corporations, which answer instead to the families that hold the controlling blocks of stock in them. Einstein was anti-fascist, never pro-fascist. He was 100% in the FDR mold. He was 100% a democrat, small-«d».

This immediate post-WW-II vision of an ultimate world government in the FDR democratic mold lasted unchallenged until President Dwight D. Eisenhower came into office in 1953, and (now that FDR and his power-heir Truman were gone) America's large international corporations, and their tax-exempt foundations including think-tanks, started pressing for a world

government that would be comprised instead mainly of international corporations which would help shape and would become subject to the same rules and laws and regulations in each and every 'democratic' country — that is, in each and every non-communist country. International corporations during the Cold War championed the goal of a *bi-polar, capitalist-versus-communist*, world, in which the international corporations would, themselves, ultimately *become* the world government on 'our' side, dictating not only international environmental rules, and international product-safety rules, and international labor-rules, and international rules on banking and finance, but also international rules on immigration and on the rights of refugees.

But, then, the Soviet Union and its communism ended, and yet the fascist Bilderberg group's thrust for globalized international-corporate control continued on, even after the Cold War's end, as also did what became their military extension, NATO — the international corporations' global enforcement-arm. NATO continued on, even after the Soviet Union's Warsaw Pact disappeared in 1991. NATO became, then, instead of an anti-communist alliance, an anti-Russian alliance, an alliance to conquer Russia. The imperial focus continued; but it had underlain the ideological gloss even during the early Cold War years. The 1955 summary by Prince Bernhard of the 1954 Bilderberg meeting mentioned that Article 2 of the 1949 founding document of NATO, the Atlantic Treaty, had been discussed there.

That portion of NATO's treaty said: «The Parties will... seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them». This stunning economic provision in an ostensibly military alliance was an early harbinger of the aristocracy's thrust for what finally became U.S. policy, the Trade Act of 1974. Ironically, that Act emphasized the distinction between international military agreements versus international economic agreements; and yet it embodied into American law the enabling provision for what became Investor State Dispute Resolution: the embodiment in international law of what had until then been merely the hope of the global fascist elite, «to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them».

NATO was supposed to be a military alliance, not a trade alliance nor anything of a purely economic nature. In the traditional aristocratic view, the military function is conquest, and this entails economic expansion — empire. NATO was thus, to the Bilderbergers, an extension from Article 2 of the Atlantic Treaty. Bernhard's summary also devoted an entire section to «European Unity», including passages such as:

A European speaker expressed concern about the need to achieve a common currency, and indicated that in his view this necessarily implied the creation of a central political authority. A participant, speaking as a German industrialist, said that, having fought for integration before, German industry was still determined to pursue the same purpose, but he expressed considerable doubt as to the functional approach to integration by moving from one economic sector to another. In his view, the common problems of differences in labour standards and currencies and the various elements entering into the common market must be brought nearer to parity as a condition of further progress.

A major thrust of the early Bilderberg meetings was to establish uniform economic, environmental, and labor, regulations, and a common currency, throughout Europe: this goal of transferring to an ultimate European Union a substantial portion of each European nation's sovereignty, started being realized in the 1957 Treaty of Rome, but some features of the Bilderberg plan were enacted only much later, such as the common currency, the euro, which began in 1999.

Another section of the 1955 Bilderberg summary was titled «Economic Problems», and it opened: «A United States rapporteur, defining convertibility as a state of affairs in which there is a minimum of restriction on international trade, believed that a good deal of progress had been made in that direction since the war... The increase in trade and prosperity both in Europe and the United States, however, was due in no small part to the steps which had been taken to reduce restrictions on trade». So: both the U.S. aristocracy, and the various European aristocracies, aimed to transfer at least some of their individual nations' sovereignty to supra-national treaties; but there was no discussion of how this was to be achieved — whether via democratic processes, or by dictatorial ones, or some mixture of the two.

Among the leading members of the Bilderberg group since its inception were David Rockefeller and George Ball. The latter was the first person on the Democratic side of American politics who championed as an ideal an anti-democratic, pro-aristocratic world government. Matt Stoller, on 20 February 2014, bannered, «NAFTA Origins, Part Two: The Architects of Free Trade Really Did Want a World Government of Corporations», and he reported, from his study of the *Congressional Record*, that:

After the Kennedy round [international-trade talks] ended [in 1967], liberal internationalists, including people like Chase CEO David Rockefeller and former Undersecretary of State George Ball, began pressing for reductions in non-tariff barriers, which they perceived as the next set of trade impediments to pull down. Ball was an architect of 1960s U.S. trade policy — he helped write the Trade Act of 1962, which set the stage for what eventually became the World Trade Organization.

But Ball's idea behind getting rid of these barriers wasn't about free trade, it was about reorganizing the world so that corporations could manage resources for «the benefit of mankind». It was a weird utopian vision that you can hear today in the current United States Trade Representative Michael Froman's speeches. ...

In the opening statement [by Ball to Congress in 1967], before a legion of impressive Senators and Congressmen, Ball attacks the very notion of sovereignty. He goes after the idea that «business decisions» could be «frustrated by a multiplicity of different restrictions by relatively small nation states that are based on parochial considerations», and lauds the multinational corporation as the most perfect structure devised for the benefit of mankind.

This was the basis upon which Fast Track Trade Promotion Authority was actually accepted by congressional Democrats in 1974. George Ball was the key person enabling that to happen.

After the end of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, NATO became the military arm of a

hoped-for future no-longer bipolar world — instead a monolithically uni-polar global empire, which set out to conquer the former communist nations. The ideological gloss was now gone, but the purpose of global domination by the international aristocracy didn't go away. NATO became, far more clearly, simply the military arm of the global aristocracy, whose brain is located in Washington as to politics, and in Wall Street as to finance. America's aristocracy would thus rule Europe's and Japan's.

The U.S. aristocracy, and, to a lesser extent, the European and Japanese aristocracies, within the Trilateral Commission which had been set up by the Bilderbergers (especially under Bilderberger David Rockefeller), all continue their international-corporate aim for unitary corporate global power, and for the crushing of democracy within all of the member-nations.

U.S. President Obama's proposed international treaties, the TPP, TTIP, and TISA, would replace national democratic laws and regulations regarding the environment, consumer protection, workers' rights, and investor protection, by means of ISDS, Investor State Dispute Resolution, international-corporate control of those regulations, via panels of three judges, all of whom will be selected by the international corporations that are being regulated; and, if any nation then tries to legislate stronger laws to protect the public than those panels approve under the given treaty, that nation will be fined by any corporation whose 'rights,' under these treaties (TPP, TTIP, and TISA), have been ruled by those panels to have been infringed by that violating nation. The basic idea is that the rights of the owners of the controlling blocks of stock in the international corporations take precedence over the rights of any mere nation, or of the public in any nation that participates in these vast American-dominated 'trade' deals. (The underlying ideology behind this will be discussed in my next book.)

Andrew Gavin Marshall posted an article on 16 June 2011 which provided a remarkably well-documented history of the Bilderberg group and of their plan to supplant the rule by national democracies, and to replace it with an international government by the owners of the controlling blocks of stock in the world's largest international corporations. He notes there that the large foundations and think tanks already represent the large international corporations, and that they operate as tax-exempt extensions of them. One person that he cites sums this up well:

«Foundations like Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford have a corrosive influence on a democratic society; they represent relatively unregulated and unaccountable concentrations of power and wealth which buy talent, promote causes, and, in effect, establish an agenda of what merits society's attention. They serve as «cooling-out» agencies, delaying and preventing more radical, structural change. They help maintain an economic and political order, international in scope, which benefits the ruling-class interests of philanthropists and philanthropoids – a system which... has worked against the interests of minorities, the working class, and Third World peoples».

As the great independent investigative journalist Wayne Madsen has reported, in depth, in his many articles, such as (and these are repostings of originals from Madsen's subscription-only website, in 2010) «Obama's CIA Pedigree» and "Details revealed about Obama's former CIA employer» and "The Story of Obama: All in The Company» (the latter being a September 7th reposting of Madsen's classic August 16th article, which was his best one ever), and in his 2012

book [*The Manufacturing of a President: The CIA's Insertion of Barack H. Obama, Jr. into the White House*](#). Obama's parents and grandparents were in the pay alternately of the U.S.-aristocracy-controlled CIA and Ford Foundation; and the boss of Obama's mother at the Ford Foundation was none other than Peter Geithner, who was the father of Timothy Geithner, the Wall Street operative who ran the U.S. Treasury Department in Obama's first term and who bailed out the investors in the megabanks while he refused to bail out the uneducated and poor mortgagees they had suckered with excessive loans, and the pension funds and other outside investors in the fraudulent resulting 'AAA'-rated Mortgage Backed Securities (MBSs, which the Federal Reserve is still buying up and transferring onto the backs of future U.S. taxpayers). So, Obama was deep into service to America's aristocracy, ever since he was in college; and his parents even raised him with money from the CIA and the Ford Foundation. Furthermore, Obama's first employment was with the CIA front firm, Business International Corporation, in 1983 and 1984, though he might have been recruited by the CIA even as early as around 1980.

So: Obama represents (not just in his policies, but in his background) the U.S. aristocracy, and he aspires to bring to ultimate fruition his predecessors' dream, the dream of Bill Clinton, who did the largest previous Fast-Track-approved treaty, NAFTA, and, before him, of Richard Nixon, who created Fast Track (and before everything, the Bilderberg group): the goal of a fascist world government designed in Washington and signed by the aristocracies of the world's countries that are subservient to the U.S. aristocracy — 'trade' agreements that are actually a signing-away of democratic national sovereignties to this U.S.-aristocracy-dominated global international-corporate sovereign, which is both the treaty and its implementation. A world-government in the fascist style.

Other countries don't have the U.S. Constitution's two-thirds requirement to contend with; and, so, they don't necessarily need to rape their constitutions in order to achieve this fascist conquest of their nation. Only the U.S. does; and this is the reason why, even the five international treaties that were passed via Fast Track are called, in every country that signed them, «treaty», except in the United States, where they are instead called (in accord with «Fast Track») *merely* an «international trade agreement».

Basically, FDR's post-WW-II agenda for the ultimate emergence of a future democratic world government, was hijacked by the fascists against whom FDR had led this country in order to defeat them; and, now, our Presidential candidates are needing to obtain the fascists' approvals in order for them to be able to receive the campaign-funding that's necessary in order to become 'a serious candidate.'

Consequently, any Democrat who says, like the Democratic operative Michael Wessel did headlining in Politico on May 19th, «I've Read Obama's Secret Trade Deal. Elizabeth Warren Is Right to Be Concerned», that, «secretary [and she's not 'secretary,' any more than she is 'First Lady'] Clinton ... should be commended ... for raising a note of caution» about Obama's proposed trade-deals (Wessel was implicitly recognizing there that she was trying to avoid having to say publicly that she supports Obama's 'trade' deals, just like she long had avoided saying publicly that she had supported her husband's), was merely sucking her up for a job in her campaign and/or in the White House (if she becomes President). Clinton is 100% sold already, to the highest bidders, just like every overtly Republican Presidential candidate is. Trusting her

word on what her policies would be if she were to win, would be ridiculous, because she's not nearly as skilled a liar as Obama and her husband were, and she has a much lengthier career in public life than either of them did, and that career amply displays both her incompetency and her cravenousness. As a 'servant of the people,' she'd be a bad joke, not even a skilled con-artist, such as her husband and Obama were and are.

And, the only people who support any one of the Republican candidates are the 0.01% of them who are aristocrats, and the 99.99% of them who are their aristocrats' suckers. And the only people who support the obviously fake 'Democratic' presidential candidates, the ones who haven't already made clear to the public their intense opposition to the fake 'Democrat' Obama's 'trade' deals (since they have no such intense opposition to them) — candidates such as Hillary Clinton are — are the Democratic Party's mega-donor aristocrats, and their mass of suckers on the Democratic-Party side.

But that's the way you get the money to be 'a serious Presidential candidate' in today's America.

In other words: the origin of the unConstitutional «Fast Track» is the war against the public that the aristocracy (both the Republican and the Democratic wings of it) has been waging, and increasingly winning, since 1953. And: without that change in the U.S. Constitution — the only Constitutional change that has been introduced into the American legal system without going through the obligatory Constitutional process of passing an Amendment to the Constitution — there would not be, which there now is, ISDS: Investor State Dispute Resolution, the system of international fascism that now poses a very present danger of taking over the world and of locking in fascism permanently, and fundamentally annihilating democracy and even annihilating the possibility of democracy.

And, the European Commission, which already knows all these things, is now moving forward to do the biddings of the aristocrats who control it.