

U.N. 'perm five' dictate the new world order

by Webster G. Tarpley

Proceedings at this year's 45th session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York have reflected the central role of this supernational, one-world institution in dictating neo-colonialist punitive measures against Iraq. Speaker after speaker in the general debate has stressed the newfound unity of action of the five permanent members of the Security Council (U.S., U.K., U.S.S.R., France, and People's Republic of China) after more than four decades of Cold War logjam and vetoes. In the view of Baker, Bush, Shevardnadze, Mitterrand, Hurd, and others supporting the neo-imperialist consensus of the moment, the Security Council will now be capable of functioning according to the original 1945 intentions of the framers of the U.N. Charter, that is to say as a syndicate of "five policemen" capable of imposing a collective will by force on the rest of the world. Speaker after speaker has announced a "new world order" based on the rebirth of "multilateralism" and a "renaissance" of the U.N.

Some critics have recalled that the last time there was so much talk of a "new order" was around the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis of 1940. The atmosphere around the U.N. in recent weeks has been redolent of a new Congress of Vienna. But this is an illusion. In retrospect, the Security Council decisions and much of the General Assembly debate are likely to read like the minutes of a discussion of urban zoning in the city council of Pompeii shortly before the eruption of Vesuvius. In effect, the "perm five" and their retainers are dancing on a volcano. For the world outside of the U.N.'s East River enclave is lacerated by the worst economic depression of all time, and presents half a dozen crisis spots that are ready to explode into regional war, as the speech of the

Pakistani foreign minister, among others, recalls. This world can be usefully compared to that of August 1914 and of 1938-39. This is the ominous reality which the U.N. seems determined to make worse.

The far-seeing wisdom of the framers of the Charter has been much celebrated at the U.N. in these weeks; it is useful to recall that the framers were such unabashed imperialists as Stalin, Molotov, Churchill, Eden, and the U.S. State Department. Although the five permanent members of the Security Council would like to arrogate to themselves some mysterious mantle of mastership over human destiny, even the composition of the "perm five" is arbitrary and anachronistic. Why, for example, should a bankrupt, discredited, and collapsed imperialism like Great Britain retain membership, while such larger and more important nations as Germany, Japan, India, Brazil, and others are excluded? The answer could not be provided by changing the powers entitled to seats as permanent members. The very idea of five permanent members excluding all others from real power is repugnant and unworkable, and this entire supernational system ought to be junked. The U.N. can be useful as a talk shop and as a venue for negotiations, but it cannot be allowed to violate the sovereignty of nation states.

Among Arab states, Islamic states, and among the developing sector and non-aligned countries in general there exists a great deal of suspicion and resentment in the face of such neo-colonialist land grabs dressed up in hypocritical phrases. Mitterrand, Shevardnadze, Hurd, and others have felt themselves obliged to refute these objections in their own remarks. But at the U.N., criticism from the Third World and the non-

aligned has been muted, largely because of the atmosphere of gangster-style intimidation and coercion being fostered by the great powers, and above all by the United States.

At the center of the New World Order sits the Security Council with its 15 members. But of these, the 10 non-permanent members are merely hand-raisers, merely filler. Those who really count are the five permanent members, those who possess veto power. On all substantive matters, Security Council action requires an affirmative vote of nine members, including the affirmative vote of each of the five permanent members. This means that the "perm five," plus any four of their rotating stooges, are in a position to dictate Security Council resolutions, which the U.N. considers international law and binding on all countries.

The functioning of the "perm five" is a mixture of Star Chamber and floating crap game in midtown Manhattan. On the one hand, "perm five" deliberations are kept rigorously secret, carried out behind closed doors, with all reporters and the public barred. These are not open covenants openly arrived at; this is secret haggling in the tradition of Yalta and Potsdam, of which the Security Council is in fact an extension. The "perm five" often meet, not in the U.N. complex at Kips Bay by the East River (an extraterritorial plot contributed by the Rockefeller family), but in the mission of one or the other of the powers.

A sinister military dimension

Adding a new and sinister dimension to the Security Council is the revival of its Military Staff Committee. This organism, it is worth recalling, was theoretically established under Chapter VII, Article 47 of the Charter, where we read: "There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the Permanent Members of the Security Council or their representatives."

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has been most vocal in proposing that this institution be reactivated and made into the military command structure for the armed intervention into the Gulf; the Soviets have indicated that they regard this as part of the possible price for playing a role in a military attack on Iraq. The Anglo-Americans appear hesitant to accept the Soviet plan regarding the Military Staff Committee, since this would make the Kremlin a partner in the Anglo-American seizure of the oil resources of the Gulf. Shevardnadze (with the support of Norway and others) argued in his speech that the Military Staff Committee ought to possess a permanent rapid deployment force, always on alert to conduct raids into various parts of the world, especially the developing sector.

The Red Chinese foreign minister, in his speech to the Security Council, expressed some verbal objection to an armed intervention by the powers against Iraq. This is but the faintest echo of the old militant Third-Worldism of the Beijing regime. As for the French position, it is useful to compare the speech of French President François Mitterrand to General de Gaulle's speeches in Phnom Penh in 1966, when de Gaulle was President of France, or to his remarks in the wake of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. Such a comparison makes clear that Mitterrand has abandoned the pro-Arab foreign policy of de Gaulle, conserving merely a certain veneer of rhetoric to differentiate himself. In practice, there is not much difference among Mitterrand, Hurd, Baker, and Bush. The operative French policy appears as that of Suez in 1956, when France joined England and Israel in attacking Nasser's Egypt when the latter had assumed control of the Suez canal with a view to using the canal tolls to help build the Aswan dam. The main difference is that this time the French insist on an independent command. De Gaulle scorned the United Nations as "le machin" ("that thing"); Mitterrand appears eager to take his place at the table of the "perm five."

Basic features of the New World Order that emerge from the U.N. include the following:

- Genocide, especially against non-white and neo-colonial populations. This is the immediate content of Security Council resolutions 660-670, mandating naval and air blockade and embargo of Iraq and Kuwait, including Jordan and affecting millions of Asian migrant workers in these countries. This is not the first time that the U.N. has served as a vehicle for genocide, and we should recall that the International Monetary Fund and World Bank are both parts of the U.N.-centered supernational bureaucracy. Seen in this light, the hypocritical posturing and cynical demagoguery surrounding the much-touted U.N. "Children's Summit" can be properly appreciated.

- Malthusianism and zero-growth environmentalism. These are part of the litany of almost every speaker, with Britain's Foreign Secretary Hurd inveighing against the ozone layer and global warming, Jan Syse of Norway talking of the "green agenda" in the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe's Bergen Declaration of May 1990, and Hans van den Broek of the Netherlands calling for "green peace." Many look forward to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, set for 1992.

- Usury and global impoverishment. As far as the "perm five" are concerned, the New World Economic Order, debt moratoria, and North-South technology transfer are all a dead letter. The U.S. State Department regards any mention of the New World Economic Order as a hostile act against the United States, to be punished by retaliatory measures. Mitterrand talks at some length about the debt issue and the plight of the poorest, yet what he proposes to do for the least developed countries is not much different from Hurd, and does not differ qualitatively from the "Toronto Terms" of 1988, which Hurd

claims stemmed from a British initiative in the first place.

The view from the U.N. is that history, ideology, and politics have ended in a neo-Hegelian mélange of Francis Fukiyama and Daniel Bell. In the words of Canada's Joe Clark: "In the years between the two world wars and in the depths of the Cold War, there were debates about whether a state's interests were best pursued through unilateral action or through cooperation and compromise. That debate is now over. It is over because the world has changed. The choice today is not between realism or idealism, unilateralism or cooperation; it is between success and failure. Cooperation is now the new realism and pragmatism is the only path to progress." Even Krzysztof Skubiszewski of Poland, whose country is part of the "multinational effort" in the Gulf, approvingly joins assembly President Guido de Franco of Malta in quoting the London *Times* to the effect that "previously, political ideologies wrecked the functioning of the Organization," and goes on to say that "we are now, I hope, entering an era in which ideologies will be less and less vocal in international politics and the role of the ideological factor in relations among states will be greatly reduced and will disappear. We welcome this development."

Implicit in all this is the vision of a Pax Angloamericana, of a world empire imposed by the Anglo-Saxon superpower that enshrines the false idols of "democracy," "pragmatism," and "the free market" in its imperial pantheon. This is what the age of St. Augustine knew as *senectus mundi*, the moral senility and bankruptcy of the principal institutions of the world. It is ironic that there should be so much talk of new order when the world is in chaos, so much reliance on a Pax Angloamericana when we are on the eve of war.

Documentation

The following are excerpts from speeches delivered in New York City to the 45th U.N. General Assembly and the U.N. Security Council. All emphasis has been added.

Shevardnadze's 'emerging new world order'

From the speech of Eduard A. Shevardnadze, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., to the U.N. General Assembly, Sept. 25, 1990:

. . . But now our field of vision has been obscured by the dark cloud of aggression against Kuwait. On that Black Thursday, Iraq flagrantly violated the United Nations Char-

ter, the principles of international law, the universally recognized norms of morality, and the standards of civilized behavior. Iraq has committed an unprovoked aggression, annexed a neighboring sovereign state, seized thousands of hostages, and resorted to unprecedented blackmail, threatening to use weapons of mass destruction. . . . An act of terrorism has been perpetrated against the emerging new world order. This is a major affront to mankind. Unless we find a way to respond to it and cope with the situation, our civilization will be thrown back by half a century. . . .

Today is no time for rejoicing, but one cannot help being satisfied at the unprecedented unity of the Security Council and the clear attitude of the international public opinion in the face of Iraq's behavior. This gives us confidence in the ability of the United Nations to deal with this grave international crisis. The positions taken by members of this Organization give the Security Council the mandate to go as far as the interests of world peace will require. . . .

International relations are being freed from the vestiges of the cold war which for many years had a negative effect on the international legal order. We are again becoming the *united nations* and are returning to our own *global constitution*—the *Charter* of the United Nations, to those of its provisions that were forgotten for a while, but have been proven to be indispensable for the most important of our tasks—the maintenance of international peace and security. . . .

In the context of recent events, we should remind those who regard aggression as an acceptable form of behavior that *the United Nations has the power to "suppress acts of aggression."* There is ample evidence that this right can be exercised. It will be, if the illegal occupation of Kuwait continues. There is enough unity in this regard in the Security Council, and there is also the will and a high degree of consensus in the world community. . . .

Of course, before—and I reiterate—before this, all political, peaceful, non-military forms of pressure must be applied to the aggressor, obviously in combination with economic and other enforcement measures.

In a way, the Gulf crisis is not just a tragedy and an extremely dangerous threat to peace; it is also a serious challenge for all of us to review the ways and means of maintaining security, the methods of protecting law and order on our planet, *the mechanisms for controlling the processes which affect the state of human civilization in the broadest meaning of this term, and the role of the United Nations in this.*

As any other democratically operating organization, the United Nations can function effectively if it has a mandate from its members, if states agree on a voluntary and temporary basis to delegate to it a portion of their sovereign rights and to entrust it with performing certain tasks in the interests of the majority. . . .

The world is consolidating on the basis of universal human values. *Partnership is replacing rivalry.* It is becoming

the basis for relations between many countries that used to regard each other as adversaries.

Partnership is not just a fashionable term. It came in evidence during the latest crisis and underlay the close and constructive interaction among the permanent members of the Security Council. But the decline of East-West rivalry as a real or perceived factor in international relations may bring to the arena of world politics new figures and new phenomena. One such phenomenon we will probably have to deal with is claims to *regional hegemony*.

Among the *issues assuming a critical importance for the future of mankind are the non-proliferation of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological, and missile technologies*, and, more generally, the disproportionate growth of the military sector in some economies and societies. . . .

We need to define the criteria of defense sufficiency. The Iraqi aggression would seem to make it difficult even to discuss this. After all, what can be sufficient in the face of the irrational? On the other hand, the aggression has once again underscored the validity of the argument that no nation should have the exclusive prerogative or absolute freedom to determine its own level of armament. Any other approach would result in an unbridled arms race and all-out militarization. We must look toward different principles, toward an accommodation of reciprocal concerns and a balance of armaments at the lowest possible levels. . . .

In the longer term, the world community will need to monitor the military power of states, arms supplies, and transfers of military technology. Such an approach will be in everyone's interests and will strengthen stability and trust. Otherwise, we will continue to be confronted with armed conflicts and attempts to intimidate and blackmail. Above all, it will be necessary to keep a close watch on those countries that make determined efforts to build up the offensive capabilities of their armed forces. Moreover, to have them explain why this is being done.

We might consider the idea of introducing on a global and regional level *the international registration of certain types of armaments that are produced or acquired*. There is a need for transparency in this area. . . .

Two years ago, the Soviet delegation raised the issue of *reactivating the work of the Security Council's Military Staff Committee*. Recent developments have convinced us of the need to return to the original idea conceived by the founders of this Organization and of its Charter. We know why the Military Staff Committee has never become a functioning body. During the cold war, the Committee could not and did not have a role to play. Now, however, we see that without substantive recommendations from this body, the Security Council is unable to carry out its functions under the Charter.

The architects of our Organization proceeded from the harsh realities of the Second World War, and were right in assuming that for the Organization to be effective in keeping peace and preventing war, it must have the means to enforce

its decisions and, if necessary, to suppress aggression, and have a mechanism for preparing and coordinating such actions.

The Soviet delegation believes that the Security Council must take the necessary organizational steps to *be able to act in strict conformity with the provisions of the Charter*.

It should begin by initiating steps to reactivate the work of the Military Staff Committee and study the practical aspects of assigning national military contingents to serve under the authority of the Council.

The Soviet Union is prepared to conclude an appropriate agreement with the Security Council. We are sure that the other permanent members of the Council and states that might be approached by it will do the same.

If the Military Staff Committee worked properly, if appropriate agreements had been concluded between the Council and its permanent members, and if other organizational aspects of countering threats to peace had been worked out, there would be no need now for individual states to act unilaterally. . . .

There is no reason to object to steps taken by legitimate international "law-enforcement bodies"—the Security Council and its Military Staff Committee.

We should not underestimate even the psychological effect of the Security Council acquiring structures and forces to counter aggression. . . .

The latest crisis has dramatically illustrated the importance of *preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction*. . . .

The world community should also consider the *possibility of various "unconventional situations" arising from the mass taking of hostages and cases of blackmail involving particularly dangerous and destructive weapons*. These problems will have to be addressed at two levels—technical and legal. We could start out by setting up a group of experts for contingency planning under the Security Council.

Recommendations regarding the management of "unconventional situations" should be made known to a limited number of people. The Security Council may find it necessary, upon recommendation of the Military Staff Committee, to establish a rapid response force to be formed on a contract basis from units specially designated by different countries, including the five permanent members of the Security Council. This idea also deserves discussion.

But technical methods alone are not enough to deal with such things. In our view, there is an urgent need to institute *a new norm in international law* which would declare the threat by any individual for purposes of blackmail of using weapons of mass destruction, hostage-taking or mass terror to be a crime against humanity. . . .

The principle of suppressing aggression and threats to peace should, in our view, be complemented with the principle of individual responsibility and commensurate punishment.

This is a difficult question from the legal standpoint. An advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice should be sought on this subject. Incidentally, we would be in favor of enhancing the role of that body and would welcome a more up-to-date interpretation of its competence.

The Gulf crisis is causing a major dislocation in the entire system of world economy. Its true magnitude is even difficult to assess now. It is clear that the consequences will be severe for the economies of the developing countries, particularly the poorest of them, those burdened by large foreign debt. Merely stating this is not enough. Action must be taken without delay. *It is necessary to establish as soon as possible an international machinery, maybe a temporary one for the time being, for example under the auspices of the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank, to mitigate the negative consequences of this crisis for countries which are in a particularly vulnerable position.* . . .

The Soviet Union, as a major oil-producing and energy-exporting country, will be prepared to cooperate in implementing measures under the auspices of the United Nations or of any other international body, aimed at stabilizing the economic situation in the world. This should not be a matter of individual steps of a mostly charitable nature to assist individual countries. What is needed is a global policy of stabilization and compensation.

History, particularly modern history, teaches all kinds of lessons. They should not be ignored or underestimated. One of them is that security can hardly be lasting unless it is supported by economic growth combined with spiritual health and traditional cultural values combined with new technologies and a concern for the environment. . . .

Much has been said lately on *environmental issues*. We even run the risk of "talking away" our future, for until now very little has been done at the global level, while the destruction of the environment is outstripping our preparations to deal with the threat. . . .

In our view, one of the priority measures would be to establish a *United Nations Center for Emergency Environmental Assistance*.

As we see it, the way to go is to reduce military expenditures and to promote conversion in the defense production sector. There is no alternative. The figures are well known: \$800 billion must be spent before the end of this century to avert environmental degradation. That sum is almost equal to what the world spends on the military each year.

Baker: U.N. can and will use force

From remarks by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker at the U.N. Security Council, Sept. 25, 1990:

. . . Rarely has the United Nations been confronted by so blatant an act of aggression as the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Rarely has the international community been so united and determined that aggression should not succeed. . . .

Eduard Shevardnadze spoke for all of us when he said earlier today: "This is a major affront to mankind. In the context of recent events, we should remind those who regard aggression as an acceptable form of behavior that the United Nations has the power to suppress acts of aggression. There is ample evidence that this right can be exercised. It will be, if the illegal occupation of Kuwait continues."

Van den Broek: for a 'green peace'

From the address to the U.N. General Assembly by Hans van den Broek, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, on Sept. 26:

. . . The improved climate between East and West will also positively influence multilateral cooperation, as is proven by the United Nations' handling of the present crisis in the Gulf. . . . The very core of the U.N. Charter is at stake: the maintenance of peace and the prevention of aggression. . . . The sad story of the League of Nations has taught the world that we must stand firm and united in the face of aggression.

Just as in Europe, we would prefer to see regional solutions to the regional problems in the Middle East. In principle, we therefore understand the call for an Arab solution to this conflict. We are dealing here, however, with the aggression of an Arab state against another Arab state. And it is at the request of Arab states, which feel threatened by Iraq, that countries from outside the region have come to their aid. Moreover, international aggression and violent conquest transcend the confines of the region, because they strike at the heart of the U.N. Charter. Finally, legitimate interest in the stability of this part of the world is certainly not limited to the region itself. It should therefore be clear that an Arab solution cannot be a substitute for Security Council resolutions, but could only take shape subject to Iraq's full compliance with them. . . .

Just as it is difficult to imagine safeguarding *international peace* without at the same time striving to promote *social peace*, it is equally difficult to imagine that either can survive in the long run without an ecological balance—in short, *green peace*. Life on Earth for future generations could very well be endangered if man does not make peace with nature. And if not peace, then at least a ceasefire.

The threats are real enough: warming of the ozone layer, acid rain, expanding deserts, and reckless deforestation—to pick just a few from a growing list. It is indeed most urgent that we act, if only to stop further deterioration. We simply cannot afford the luxury of waiting for irrefutable scientific proof as to what precisely causes the different problems confronting us. We should not give ourselves the benefit of the doubt. It is crucial now to move toward the early conclusion of a world climate convention which should put an effective stop to such related phenomena as the warming of the atmosphere, the depletion of the ozone layer, and deforestation.