

Gorbachov stumps for one-world government

by Leif Johnson

Mikhail Gorbachov, who less than a year ago was the world's most absolute ruler, with dominion over one-sixth of the earth's surface, came to Fulton, Missouri on May 6 to end the Cold War. Forty-six years ago, Winston Churchill announced to the world from the same Westminster College that an "iron curtain had descended over Europe," thus commencing the Cold War.

The stubby Gorbachov stood beneath the hulking statue of Winston Churchill and declared that he shared the goal of Churchill, but instead of mere Anglo-Saxon unity, which embraced only half the world, now the world was ready for "global government." The "decisive role" would be played by the U.N., which would subordinate each nation's armed forces to the U.N. command, and the secretary general would use preemptive force to stamp out conflict anywhere in the world.

The main barrier to this "new world order" were nations which remained "morbidly jealous of their sovereignty" and impede the principle of "extraterritoriality." But, Gorbachov intoned, "humanity is at a turning point" where the old paradigm of civilization of regional or autonomous relations between countries has shifted to "integration and internationalism."

Therefore a new global, international security system must be created to reduce military spending and solve the problems of ecology, demography (population control), food production, and the quality of life.

Gorbachov also wants to expand the U.N. Permanent Security Council, in the hopes of winning a wider acceptance of the U.N. one-world government. He proposed that India, a country otherwise concerned with sovereignty, be added to the U.N. Security Council, and also suggested that Italy, Indonesia, Canada, Poland, Brazil, Mexico, and Egypt be made members of the Security Council. His reason: "Under certain circumstances, it will be desirable to put certain national

armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council, making them subordinate to the United Nations military command."

Reports indicate that Gorbachov's idea of expanding the Permanent Security Council is being viewed with favor among many countries, including Japan. Despite these nations' suspicions of the United Nations, the view is that Gorbachov offers an alternative to a unilateral new world order, as demanded by U.S. President George Bush.

Endorsement of eco-fascism

The world's problems, declared Gorbachov, are well understood by the "authoritative Club of Rome," the 20-year-old group of European oligarchs who declared that industrialization and population growth must be halted lest the world run out of raw materials and energy sources.

Gorbachov asserted that global communications and information had spread confrontation, with its hopelessness and despair, trade wars, rebirth of protectionism, and, worst of all, ecological dangers such as the ozone hole, the greenhouse warming, and the destruction of forests.

To take "collective action," the U.N. needed new "principles, new mechanisms authorized by the world community." They included compulsory control of nuclear and chemical weapons, a consortium to dismantle those weapons, overseen by a strengthened U.N. International Atomic Energy Agency, a weapons export ban by the year 2000, and an enlarged U.N. Security Council with a special body to impose economic sanctions and deploy military force to prevent local conflicts.

Gorbachov also called for a sequel to the Earth Summit on world ecology scheduled for June in Rio de Janeiro, to set up an "international mechanism with extraterritorial rights and powers" to deal with world problems, including "overpopulation."

Rights of minorities

There were lighter moments, though unintended. Gorbachov approved the use of global government force to compel nations to safeguard "democracy," and, departing from his text, he added, "and the rights of minorities." Surely some listeners remembered that Gorbachov rose from the ranks of KBG and Communist Party General Secretary Yuri Andropov's "kindergarten." How many political dissidents and minorities were incarcerated, tortured, and murdered by this Soviet leadership?

Gorbachov's other amusing statement was that he had "criticized the foreign policy of the Stalinist leadership of that period," referring to the early Cold War era. To whom would this aspiring *apparatchik* have dared make such criticism? It would have wrecked his ascent into the *nomenklatura*, the bureaucracy; he had no policy or program as he clawed his way to the top.

Unhappily, once on top, he still had no policy or program. For six years he sat at the top of the heap and watched the livelihoods of his 280 million subjects disintegrate. Perhaps Gorbachov will be awarded the Nobel Prize in economics.

The incredible misery of Gorbachov's own country, the collapse of industry, transportation, and farming, and the famine and wretchedness of the ordinary citizen of the former Soviet empire were never mentioned. Nor did he notice the impoverishment of the populations of the Third World, the spread of epidemics of AIDS, cholera, and drug resistant tuberculosis. Would Gorbachov's global government address the issue of how to build the world's industry, water systems, transportation, and agriculture, or would it be the world's oppressor, as the Russian Army was in Europe between 1815 to 1863 and then again after 1945?

Who wrote the speech?

One wondered who really wrote this speech; it didn't sound Russian. It contained all the Anglo-American buzzwords such as "condominium," "global government," "ecology," "new world order," "extraterritoriality," "democracy," "rights of the minorities," and "rebirth of protectionism." But for the Russian voice, could the speaker have been eco-freak Sen. Al Gore (D-Tenn.), or Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.), or Jimmy Carter? Or perhaps the Club of Rome's Alexander King, Prince Charles, or the Trilateral Commission's David Rockefeller, or world food cartel kingpin Dwayne Andreas? Or even James Baker III, or George Bush?

Gorbachov sounded like a man who had worked his way to the top of a big city mob only to discover that Dope, Inc. was a global government and he had to scratch his way up a longer ladder. The press commented that perhaps Gorbachov was seeking to become U.N. secretary general. The *New York Times* ran a front-page picture showing Gorbachov dwarfed by the towering statue of Churchill.

Press stories included that of Gorbachov autographing a vodka bottle, Gorbachov being flown in on the Forbes family

private jet "Capitalist Tool," Gorbachov being offered a \$100 million plant by grain cartel kingpin Dwayne Andreas to make soybean "harvestburgers" to replace \$700 million worth of Russian pork sausages, and Gorbachov and Andreas trading boyhood farm stories.

Gorbachov's stated mission in his high-profile, 16-day tour is to raise money for his Moscow-based Gorbachov Foundation. He is reported to have raised \$100,000 from the Council on Foreign Relations, and was reported to be considering buying an abandoned U.S. naval base as his American headquarters.

Documentation

The following are excerpts of a speech by former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri on May 6.

. . . I would like to commence my remarks by noting that the U.S.S.R. and the United States missed . . . the chance to establish their relationship on a new basis of principle, and thereby to initiate a world order different from that which existed before the [Second World] War. I think it is clear that I'm not suggesting that they should have established a sort of condominium over the rest of the world. The opportunity was on a different plane altogether. . . .

I have more than once criticized the foreign policy of the Stalinist leadership in those years. Not only was it incapable of reevaluating the historical logic of the interwar period, taking into account the experience and results of the war and following a course which corresponded to the changed realities, it committed a major error in equating the victory of democracy over fascism with the victory of socialism and aiming to spread socialism throughout the world.

But the West and the United States in particular also committed an error. Its conclusion about the probability of open and probable Soviet military aggression was unrealistic and dangerous. This could never have happened, not only because Stalin, as in 1939 to 1941, was afraid of war, did not want war, and never would have engaged in a major war, but primarily because the country was exhausted and destroyed. It had lost tens of millions of people, and the people hated war. Having won a victory, the Army and the soldiers thought only of getting home and back to a normal life. By including the nuclear component in world politics, and on this basis, unleashing a monstrous arms race—and here the initiator was the United States and the West—defense sufficiency was exceeded, as the lawyers like to put it. This was a fateful error.

So, I would be so bold as to affirm that the governing circles of the victorious powers lacked an adequate strategic vision of the possibilities for world development as they emerged after the war, and consequently a true understanding of their own country's national interests. . . . The conflict was presented as the inevitable opposition between good and evil. . . .

What are the characteristics of the world situation today? In thinking over the processes which we ourselves have witnessed, we are forced to conclude that humanity is today at a major turning point. . . .

First and foremost, it signifies the possibility of creating a global international security system, thus preventing large-scale military conflicts like the world wars of the 20th century and facilitating a radical reduction in levels of armaments and reducing the burden of military expenditures. This signifies that the intention and the resources of the world community can be focused on solving problems in non-military areas such as demography, ecology, food production, energy sources and the like. . . .

Turning now to the world economy, the increasingly close links between national economies and markets has been accompanied by intensified international competition, leading to de facto trade wars and a threatened rebirth of protectionism. One of the worst of the new dangers is ecological. . . . Today the global climatic shifts, the greenhouse effect, the ozone hole, acid rain, contamination of the atmosphere, soil, and water by industrial and household waste, the destruction of the forests, etc., all threaten the stability of the planet. . . .

'Collective action by the world community'

One consequence of the increasing world integration is the democratization of international relations. It would seem that now all are agreed that the bipolar system has exhausted its potential. Some say that it will be replaced by a monocentric one. But most people feel that the world will be multipolar. . . . An awareness of the need for some kind of global government is gaining ground. . . .

- Nuclear and chemical weapons. Rigid controls must be instituted to prevent their dissemination, including measures of compulsion in cases of violation. An agreement must be concluded among all presently nuclear states on procedures for cutting back on such weapons and liquidating them. Finally, a world convention on chemical weapons should be signed.

- The peaceful use of nuclear energy. The powers of the International Atomic Energy Agency must be strengthened, and it is imperative that all countries working in this area be included in this agency system. The procedures of this agency should be tightened up and the work performed in a more open and aboveboard manner. Under United Nations auspices, a powerful consortium should be created to finance the modernization or liquidation of extremely risky nuclear

power stations and also to store waste fuel. A set of world standards for nuclear power plants must be established. Work on nuclear fusion must be expanded and intensified.

- The export of conventional weapons. Governmental exports of such weapons should be ended by the year 2000, and in regions of armed conflict, it should be curtailed at once. The illegal trade in such arms must be equated with international terrorism and the drug trade. With respect to these questions, the intelligence services of the states which are permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations should be coordinated, and the Security Council itself must be slightly expanded.

- Regional conflicts. Considering how much experience has been obtained in the Middle East in Africa, in Southeast Asia, Korea, Yugoslavia, the Caucasus, in Afghanistan, a special body should be set up under the United Nations Security Council with the right to employ political, diplomatic, economic, and military means to settle and prevent such conflicts.

- Human rights. The European process had officially recognized the universality of this common human value: that is, the acceptability of international interference wherever human rights are violated. . . . I believe that the new world order will not be fully realized unless the United Nations and its Security Council create structures, taking into consideration existing United Nations and regional structures, which are authorized to impose sanctions and make use of other measures of compulsion, especially when rights of minority groups are being particularly violated.

- Ecology. In Rio de Janeiro there's going to be the first worldwide conference on ecology. I would like to hope that matters will not limit themselves merely to discussion and to the settlement of disputes, but rather that an international mechanism will be created with extraterritorial rights and powers.

- Food, demography, economic assistance. It is no accident that these problems should be dealt with in this connection. Upon their solution depends the biological viability of the Earth's population and the minimal social stability needed for civilized existence of states and peoples. Major scientific, financial, political and public organizations, among them the authoritative Club of Rome, have long been occupied with these problems. However, the newly emerging type of international interaction will make possible a breakthrough in our practical approach to them.

I would propose that next year a world conference be held on this subject. One similar to the forthcoming ecological conference. . . .

The United Nations, which emerged from the results and the lessons of the Second World War, is still marked by the period of its creation. . . . Nothing, for instance, other than the division into victors and vanquished explains why such countries as Germany and Japan do not figure among the Permanent Members of the Security Council. . . .