

Global Governance: Why? How? When?

Henry Lamb © 1996: Published by the *Murchison Chair of Free Enterprise College of Engineering*

The Rise of Global Governance

The desire to rule the world has been a part of the human experience throughout recorded history. Alexander the Great led Greece to dominance of the known world, only to become the victim of Rome's quest for world dominance. The Roman Empire, built on bloody battlefields across the land, was swallowed up by the Holy Roman Empire, built on the fear and hopes of helpless people. History is a record of the competition for global dominance. In every age, there has always been a force somewhere, conniving to conquer the world with ideas clothed in promises imposed by military might. The 20th century is no different from any other: Marx, Lenin, and Hitler reflect some of the ideas which competed for world dominance in the 1900s. The competition is still underway. The key players change from time to time, as do the words that describe the various battlefields, but the competing ideas remain the same.

One of the competitors is the idea that people are born free, "totally free and sovereign," and choose to surrender specified freedoms to a limited government to achieve mutual benefits. The other competitor is the idea that government must be sovereign in order to distribute benefits equitably and to manage the activities of people to protect them from one another. The first idea, the idea of free people, is the idea that compelled the pilgrims to migrate to America. The U.S. Constitution represents humanity's best effort to organize and codify the idea of free people sovereign over limited government. It is a relatively new idea in the historic competition for world dominance.

The other idea, the idea of sovereign government, is not new. Historically, the conqueror was the government. The Emperor, the King, the conqueror by whatever name, established his government by appointment and established laws by decree. Variations of this idea emerged over time to give the perception that the people had some say in the development of law. The Soviet Union, for example, held elections to choose its leaders; but the system assured the outcome of the elections as well as the ultimate sovereignty of the government. During the 1700s, the first idea was ascendant as evidenced by the creation of America. During the 1900s, the second idea has again become ascendant as evidenced by the emergence of global governance. This report identifies and traces some of the major forces, events, and personalities that are responsible for the rise of global governance in the 20th century.

The League of Nations (1900-1924)

Competition for world dominance was fierce in the first quarter of the 20th century. New, dynamic ideas emerged to fill the vacuum created by the crumbling British Empire and the end of the colonial era. At the turn of the century, America, though hardly a world leader, was expanding rapidly. Economic and technological advances attracted worldwide interest. Halfway around the world, another idea was taking hold. The oppression of Nicholas II in Russia, combined with the influence of Karl Marx, gave rise to the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Bolsheviks) which became the Socialist Revolutionary Party. Under the leadership of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the party platform called for the "establishment of nurseries for infants and children in all shops, factories, and other enterprises that employ women"¹ and for the "nationalization and re- distribution of land."² What began as a rebellion against the oppression of government sovereignty as imposed by Czar Nicholas was hijacked by Lenin who, with his colleagues Stalin and Trotsky, promptly replaced the Czar's oppression with their own. Within weeks after Nicholas' assassination, Lenin nationalized all private, ecclesiastical and czarist land without compensation. He introduced press censorship, nationalized big industry, outlawed strikes, nationalized the banks, built up a police force and ordered the requisition of grain from the peasants to feed the Red Army.³ By the time Lenin died in 1924, Stalin had consolidated his power and organized his government to become the world's most dominant example of the idea of government sovereignty.

Americans were far too busy earning a living to pay much attention to the tumult in Russia. While Lenin's party was forging the Principles of Communism in 1903, Orville Wright made his historic flight. The first automobile trip

across the United States was completed, and the U.S. government ratified the Panama Canal Treaty. Congress created the Federal Reserve System in 1913, and Ford Motor Company shocked the industrialized world by raising wages from \$2.40 for a nine-hour day to \$5 for an eight-hour day in 1914. Americans were divided about entering the First World War, but did in 1917, and had a million troops in Europe when the war ended in 1918 when the warring parties accepted Woodrow Wilson's "Fourteen Points" which became the basis for the League of Nations.

Edward Mandell House was Wilson's chief advisor. He persuaded Wilson to sign the Federal Reserve Act and he was the real architect of the League of Nations.⁴ House was no ordinary advisor. He was Wilson's "alter ego," and he was an "unabashed and unapologetic" socialist.⁵ House published a novel in 1912 entitled Philip Dru: Administrator. The story is a recitation of socialist thinking enacted by Dru, whose purpose was "to pursue Socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx," and who, in the story, replaced Constitutional government with "omnicompetent" government in which "the property and lives of all were now in the keeping of one man."⁶ In the story, Dru created a "League of Nations" much like the League of Nations he fashioned for Woodrow Wilson.

More importantly, House came to his position with Woodrow Wilson from an elite circle of friends known as the "Inquiry": Paul Warburg, J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, John W. Davis, among others, all of whom had direct interest in the Federal Reserve System and great interest in the League of Nations. House was well on his way to transforming Woodrow Wilson into his fictional Philip Dru -- until the Senate refused to ratify the League of Nations in 1920. Embarrassed and defeated, Wilson died four years later, ironically, the same year Lenin died.

The dream of world domination, however, did not die. House and his friends realized that public opinion in America had to be changed before any form of world government could succeed. While shuttling to Europe on post-war peace negotiations, House arranged an assembly of dignitaries from which was created the Institute of International Affairs which had two branches. In London, it was called the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA); in New York, it was called the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), formed officially July 29, 1921.

The founding President of the CFR was John W. Davis, personal attorney to J. P. Morgan. Paul Cravath and Russell Leffingwell, both Morgan associates, were also among the founding officers.⁷ Money for the new organizations was provided by J. P. Morgan, Bernard Baruch, Otto Kahn, Jacob Schiff, Paul Warburg, and John D. Rockefeller, the same people involved in the forming of the Federal Reserve.⁸ The purpose of the CFR was to create a stream of scholarly literature to promote the benefits of world government, and attract a membership of rich intellectuals who could influence the direction of foreign policy in America. The CFR, supported by the world's wealthiest foundations and individuals, has been extremely successful. Its flagship publication, Foreign Affairs, is the port-of-entry for many ideas that become public policy. The U.S. delegation to the founding conference of the United Nations included 47 members of the CFR. The Secretary-General of the conference, Alger Hiss, was a member of the CFR. Hiss was later convicted of perjury for lying about having provided government documents to a Communist espionage ring.⁹

The first quarter of the 20th century forced America into a world war where the strength of its economy and effectiveness of its technology were displayed to the world. On the other side of the Atlantic, Russia gave birth to Stalin's version of Communism. At the time, both nations were primarily concerned about domestic issues with little thought of dominating the world. The Soviet Union exemplified the idea of government sovereignty; America exemplified the idea of free people sovereign over its government. Sooner or later, the two ideas had to collide. Other competitors were also at work. The CFR began to rebuild its plans for a world government, and a new competitor arose on Russia's eastern border.

The United Nations (1925 - 1950)

While Stalin reigned over "The Great Terror," in which an estimated 20 million Russians were executed, and instituted the first of a series of "five-year plans,"¹⁰ America struggled through some of its hardest years. Prohibition brought organized crime, Federal Reserve policies brought a stock market crash, drought brought a dust bowl to the bread basket, and a nation-wide depression brought crushing poverty to most Americans. Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to the White House in 1932. The CFR was to Roosevelt what Edward House was to Woodrow Wilson. "The organization [CFR] essentially ran FDR's State Department."¹¹ Henry Wallace, a committed Marxist, was FDR's Secretary of Agriculture.¹² The "New Deal" delivered by Roosevelt resembled the performance of Philip Dru in Edward House's novel.

By 1941, Hitler had invaded Russia and Japan had bombed Pearl Harbor. For the next five years the world tried to commit suicide. Those not caught up in the war, the CFR, realized that the war provided an excellent reason for the nations of the world to try once again to create a global institution that could prevent war. Two weeks after Pearl Harbor, Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, recommended the creation of a Presidential Advisory Committee on Post War Foreign Policy. The committee was the planning commission for the United Nations. Ten of the committee's 14 members were members of the CFR.¹³

The process of creating the United Nations lasted throughout the war. The first public step was the Atlantic Charter (August 14, 1941), signed by Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, which committed the two nations to a "permanent system of general security." Because Stalin was under attack by Germany, Russia was forced to join the allies in the Moscow Declaration (October 30, 1943) which declared the necessity of establishing an international organization to maintain peace and security. The Dumbarton Oaks Conversations (August, 1944) which produced the World Bank, also settled political and legal issues that were drafted into the UN Charter. The Yalta Summit (February, 1945) produced a compromise which gave the Soviets three votes (USSR, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine) in exchange for voting procedures demanded by the U.S.¹⁴ Edward Stettinius made another extremely significant concession. He agreed that the UN official in charge of military affairs would be designated by the Russians. Fourteen individuals have held the position since the UN was created; all were Russians.¹⁵ The committee designed and FDR sold the United Nations to the 50 nations that came to the San Francisco conference in 1945. Among the 47 CFR members in the official U.S. delegation were: Edward Stettinius, the new Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, Adlai Stevenson, Nelson Rockefeller, and Alger Hiss. To ensure that the new organization would be located in America, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., donated the land for the UN headquarters.¹⁶

In his 1962 book, *WHY NOT VICTORY*, former Senator Barry Goldwater recalls that the UN was approved by the Senate largely because of the representations of the State Department which assured the Senate that:

" . . . it [UN] in no sense constituted a form of World Government and that neither the Senate nor the American people need be concerned that the United Nations or any of its agencies would interfere with the sovereignty of the United States or with the domestic affairs of the American People."¹⁷

Five years later, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, CFR member James Warburg said: "We shall have world government whether or not you like it --by conquest or consent."¹⁸

The ink on the UN Charter had not yet dried when the Charter for UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) was presented in London, November, 1945. UNESCO swallowed and expanded the Paris-based International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation which was a holdover from the League of Nations. Julian Huxley was the prime mover of UNESCO and served as its first Director-General. Huxley had served on Britain's Population Investigation Commission before World War II and was vice president of the Eugenics Society from 1937 to 1944. In a 1947 document entitled *UNESCO: ITS PURPOSE AND ITS PHILOSOPHY*, Huxley wrote:

"Thus 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."¹⁹

UNESCO's primary function is set forth in its Charter:

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

UNESCO was created to construct a world-wide education program to prepare the world for global governance. UNESCO advisor, Bertrand Russell, writing for the UNESCO Journal, *The Impact of Science on Society*, said:

"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"²⁰

The National Education Association was a major advocate for UNESCO. In a 1942 article in the NEA Journal, written by Joy Elmer Morgan, the NEA called for " . . . certain world agencies of administration such as: a police force; a board of education"

A year later in London, the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education called for a United Nations Bureau of Education. UNESCO became the Board of Education for the world.

Huxley believed the world needed a single, global government. He saw UNESCO as an instrument to “help in the speedy and satisfactory realization of the process.” He described UNESCO’s philosophy as global, scientific humanism. He said: “Political unification in some sort of world government will be required for the definitive attainment” of the next stage of social development.²¹ From the beginning, UNESCO has designed programs to capture children at the earliest possible age to begin the educational process.

William Benton, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State, told a UNESCO meeting in 1946:

“As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism . . . We shall presently recognize in nationalism the major obstacle to development of world-mindedness. We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty. UNESCO must be the pioneer.”²²

The UN and UNESCO were created in the wake of the worst war carnage the world had ever witnessed. Conditioned by a constant stream of propaganda produced by the CFR in America, and by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in Europe, the move toward global governance was accepted and allowed to go forward. Julian Huxley realized, however, that to be successful over the long haul, a world-wide constituency would have to be developed. In 1948, Huxley and his long-time friend and colleague, Max Nicholson, both of whom were involved with the Royal Institute of International Affairs, created the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

The IUCN drew heavily from the 50-year-old British Fauna and Flora Preservation Society (FFPS) for its leadership, funding and its members. Sir Peter Scott, FFPS Chairman, drafted the IUCN Charter and headed one of its important Commissions. This important non-governmental organization (NGO) was instrumental in the formation of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) in 1961 and the World Resources Institute (WRI) in 1982. These three NGOs are to the United Nations System what the CFR was to Franklin Roosevelt, or what Edward House was to Woodrow Wilson. These three NGOs have become the driving force behind the rise of global governance.

The Cold War (1950-1970)

The dream of world dominance is not, nor has it ever been, the pursuit by an exclusive cadre of conspirators. The dream has been held by many different factions -- often simultaneously -- always in competition with one another. By 1950, at least three major forces -- all competing for world dominance -- were clearly identified. Each of the three major forces worked overtly and covertly to achieve their objectives.

The Soviet Union had clearly defined its Marx/Lenin/Stalin version of Communism. Its systematic program of expansionism -- including an active organization in the United States -- fully intended to bring all the world under its control. So confident were the Soviets of their eventual success that, on his 1959 tour of the U.S., Nikita Khrushchev pounded his shoe on a podium before the television cameras and declared to America: “We will bury you!”

America would have no part of a world under Communist rule. Senator Joseph McCarthy led a crusade against Communists in America. His campaign tarnished many non-communists but was successful in rooting out Alger Hiss, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, and Morton Sobell, all convicted of espionage-related crimes. (Because of the statute of limitations, Hiss could not be tried for espionage but was convicted of perjury for lying about his espionage activities.)²³

More importantly, the televised McCarthy hearings awakened America to the “Communist threat,” and when U.S. troops entered Korea to fight the communists, support for the Communist Party USA diminished steadily from a high of more than 100,000 members to its current low of about 1000 members.²⁴ American leaders did not pound their shoes, nor proclaim a program of world dominance. American foreign and economic policy, however, left no doubt that at the very least, America intended to prevent the Soviets from achieving world dominance.

The third force competing for world dominance was not the United Nations, but the people whose dreams of a world government were frustrated by what the United Nations turned out to be. The annihilation of the League of Nations by the U.S. Senate left the advocates of world government with a large dose of reality. They realized that the UN could exist only by the grace of the U.S. and the Soviets, and that the UN itself could have no authority or power over the major powers. But it was a real start toward global governance which provided an official, if impotent, mechanism for the incremental implementation of their global aspirations.

During the 1950s and 1960s, the UN was little more than a debating society that occasionally attempted to referee disputes among the major world powers. Public attention was riveted on domestic issues and the deepening cold war. Russia's Sputnik launch was a catalyst for the launch of the U.S. space program. Fidel Castro's embrace of Communism in Cuba stiffened America's policy of "containment" -- first articulated in the CFR Journal, Foreign Affairs.²⁵

The 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision pushed McCarthy, Communism, and the UN completely off the domestic radar screen. Rosa Park's refusal to give up her seat on a Birmingham bus to a white man was the fuse that ignited an explosion of racial riots. Federal troops confronted Alabama National Guardsmen over Governor Orville Faubus' refusal to let nine black children enter Little Rock Central High School. Dr. Martin Luther King delivered his "I have a dream" speech to a quarter-million people on the Mall in Washington, and tanks rolled on the streets of Chicago and Detroit.

Domestic events also obscured American awareness of the creation of the World Wildlife Fund. The same Julian Huxley who founded UNESCO and the IUCN, along with his friend, Max Nicholson, formed the organization primarily as a way to fund the work of the IUCN. Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, served as President. An auxiliary organization called the "1001 Club" charged an initiation fee of \$10,000 which went into a trust fund to provide ongoing revenues to WWF. The WWF and the IUCN share an office building in Gland, Switzerland. (In 1987, the name was changed to the World Wide Fund for Nature, but the acronym remained the same).²⁶

Behind the scenes, America developed and launched the Nautilus, the first of a new generation of atomic powered submarines. Both Russia and America tested nuclear devices with ever increasing payloads. Bomb shelters were the mainstay of civil defense, and school children were taught to "duck-and-cover." The official defense policy was MAD -- Mutually Assured Destruction.

Much, much further behind the scenes, plans were being developed to defuse the MAD policy. The UN had no authority or power in its own right to do anything about the spiraling arms race between the world's two super-powers. It became the stage, however, on which the advocates of global governance performed their strategic play, using the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the starring roles. In 1961, newly elected President John F. Kennedy presented a disarmament plan: Freedom From War: The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World, also known as the Department of State Publication 7277. The plan called for three phases which would ultimately result in the gradual transfer of U.S. military power to the United Nations. The plan called for all nations to follow the U.S. lead and disarm themselves to "a point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened UN Peace Force."²⁷ A new and improved version of the same idea was presented in May, 1962, called: Blueprint for the Peace Race: Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World released by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (Publication 4, General Series 3, May 3, 1962) headed by John McCloy. It is neither fair, nor accurate, to say that these documents were the product of the CFR. It is accurate, and instructive, to realize that these documents were developed by men who were members of the CFR. John McCloy and Robert Lovett were described as "distinguished individuals" in an article by John F. Kennedy which appeared in Foreign Affairs in 1957. Lovett was offered his choice of cabinet positions in the Kennedy administration but declined, choosing instead to make recommendations all of which were accepted by Kennedy. Lovett recommended Dean Rusk as Secretary of State. Rusk had been a member of the CFR since 1952 and had published an article in Foreign Affairs in 1960 on how the new President should conduct foreign policy. The New York Times reported that of the first 82 names submitted to Kennedy for State Department positions, 63 were members of the CFR.²⁸ Like FDR and every President since, JFK filled his State Department and surrounded himself with individuals who were, perhaps coincidentally, members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Lovett, John McCloy, Dean Rusk, McGeorge Bundy, and Adlai Stevenson (JFK's Ambassador to the UN), all members of the CFR, guided Kennedy through the disastrous "Bay of Pigs" operation and the Cuban missile crisis.

That members of the CFR have exercised extraordinary influence on foreign policy cannot be denied. Whether that influence is the result of organizational strategies, or the result of individuals who simply happen to be members of the same organization, is an endlessly debated question. Richard Harwood, of the Washington Post, observes that members of the Council on Foreign Relations

“... are the closest thing we have to a ruling Establishment in the United States. The President is a member. So is his Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of State, all five of the Undersecretaries, several of the Assistant Secretaries and the department's legal adviser. The President's National Security Adviser and his Deputy are members. The Director of Central Intelligence (like all previous directors) and the Chairman of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board are members. The Secretary of Defense, three Undersecretaries and at least four Assistant Secretaries are members. The Secretaries of the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Health and Human Services and the Chief White House Public Relations man . . . along with the Speaker of the House [are members] . . . This is not a retinue of people who 'look like America,' as the President once put it, but they very definitely look like the people who, for more than half a century, have managed our international affairs and our military-industrial complex.”²⁹

Article 11 of the UN Charter gives the General Assembly authority to “consider” and “recommend” principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, but virtually no authority to enforce disarmament. Kennedy's proposal was a bold first step toward giving the UN the power which early, necessary compromises had stripped from the original vision of a world government.

The Kennedy plan has never been revoked. Though modified and delayed by political necessity, the essential principle of relinquishing arms, as well as control of the production and distribution of arms, to the UN has guided the disarmament policy of every American President since JFK. Prior to the Kennedy Disarmament Plan, the UN sponsored a Truce Supervision Operation in 1948, and a Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan in 1949. Since the Kennedy Disarmament Plan, the number of UN Peace-keeping operations has steadily increased.³⁰

Still further behind the scenes, the fledgling United Nations was beginning to take shape. UNICEF (United Nations International Emergency Children's Fund) was created in 1946 to provide emergency relief to the child victims of WWII. It was reauthorized in 1950 to shift its emphasis to programs of long-term benefit to children in underdeveloped countries. It became a permanent UN entity in 1953. UNESCO's purpose was to “educate” the world. UNICEF was created to provide the mechanism through which that education could be delivered to children.

UN Article 55 provides for the UN to “promote higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development.” To fulfill this charge, the UN Expanded Program of Technical Assistance (UNEPTA) was created in 1949, and expanded with a Special Fund in 1957. By 1959, the program had been transformed into the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) (now headed by James Gustave Speth, former President of the World Resources Institute) which spends more than \$1 trillion annually, mostly in developing countries.

The UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) was created in 1949. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was created in 1951. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) brought together existing international food programs in 1946 and began its World Food Program in 1963. The UN's International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was created in 1953. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) was created in 1947. The International Labor Organization (ILO) created in 1919 as an instrument of the failed League of Nations was reconstituted and folded into the United Nations in 1948. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) was authorized in 1947. Founded in 1863, the Universal Postal Union (UPU) became an entity of the UN in 1948. The World Health Organization (WHO) was created in 1948. The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) which had existed since 1865 was folded into the UN system in 1949. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) was created in 1966. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) was established in 1967. These are only a few of the 130 UN agencies and organizations that proliferated during and since the Cold War.

While the UN organization was expanding exponentially, out of the media spotlight which was focused on race riots and the arms race, UNESCO plodded forward with its mission to educate the world. Robert Muller, long-time Secretary-General of the UN's Economic and Social Council under which the UNESCO operates, delivered

a speech at the University of Denver in 1995. His musings and recollections provide valuable insights into the kind of education UNESCO was preparing for the world. From Muller's comments:

“I had written an essay which was circulated by UNESCO, and which earned me the title of 'Father of Global Education.' I was educated badly in France. I've come to the conclusion that the only correct education that I have received in my life was from the United Nations. We should replace the word politics by planetics. We need planetary management, planetary caretakers. We need global sciences. We need a science of a global psychology, a global sociology, a global anthropology. Then I made my proposal for a World Core Curriculum.”³¹

The first goal of Muller's World Core Curriculum, is:

“Assisting the child in becoming an integrated individual who can deal with personal experience while seeing himself as a part of 'the greater whole.' In other words, promote growth of the group idea, so that group good, group understanding, group interrelations and group goodwill replace all limited, self-centered objectives, leading to group consciousness.”³²

The World Core Curriculum Manual says:

“The underlying philosophy upon which the Robert Muller School is based will be found in the teachings set forth in the books of Alice A. Bailey, by the Tibetan teacher, Djwhal Khul (published by Lucis Publishing Company, 113 University Place, 11th floor, New York, NY 10083) and the teachings of M. Morya as given in the Agni Yoga Series books (published by Agni Yoga Society, Inc., 319 West 107th Street, New York, NY 10025).”³³

Alice Bailey established the Lucifer Publishing Company, which was renamed Lucis Press in 1924, expressly to publish and distribute her own writings and those of Djwhal Khul, which consisted of some 20 books written by Bailey as the “channeling” agent for the disembodied Tibetan she called Djwhal Khu.³⁴ Until recently, the Lucis Trust, parent organization of the Lucis Press, was headquartered at the United Nations Plaza in New York.³⁵ Bailey assumed the leadership of the Theosophical Society upon the death of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky. The Society's 6,000 members include Robert McNamara, Donald Regan, Henry Kissinger, David Rockefeller, Paul Volker, George Shultz, and the names that also appear on the membership roster of the CFR.³⁶

Hindsight reveals that -- while the United States was performing on the UN stage, sparring with the Soviet Union, keeping score with nuclear warheads -- the forces which heavily influenced the official policies of both the United States and the United Nations were actually outside both governments: non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Three distinct NGO influences were clear by the end of the 1960s: the CFR and its assortment of affiliated spin-off organizations; the mystic, occult, or “new-age” spiritual movement; and the growing number of organizations affiliated with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). In 1968, the IUCN led a lobbying effort with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (headed by Robert Muller) to adopt Resolution 1296 which grants “consultative” status to certain NGOs. This resolution paved the highway for global governance. The Lucis Trust was one of the first NGOs to be granted “consultative” status with the UN.

The Environmental Movement (1970s)

Not a single vote was cast against the Wilderness Act of 1964 when it finally reached the Senate. Congress thought it was setting aside nine million acres of wilderness so posterity could see a sample of what their forefathers had to conquer in order to create America. The new law was the crowning achievement of the Wilderness Society, to which its Director, Howard Zahniser had devoted five years of constant lobbying. Though unnoticed at the time, the new law signaled an end to the traditional “conservation” movement and the beginning of a new environmental “preservation” movement. The conservation movement might be characterized by the idea that private land owners should voluntarily conserve natural resources; the environmental preservation movement is characterized by the notion that the government should enforce conservation measures through extensive regulations. By this distinction, the Wilderness Society brought the environmental movement to Congress. Robert Marshall, Benton MacKaye, and Aldo Leopold — all avowed socialists — organized the Society in the early 1930s and proclaimed their socialist ideas loudly. Marshall's 1933 book, *THE PEOPLE'S FORESTS*, says:

“Public ownership is the only basis on which we can hope to protect the incalculable values of the forests for wood resources, for soil and water conservation, and for recreation Regardless of whether it might be desirable, it is impossible under our existing form of government to confiscate the private forests into public ownership. We cannot afford to delay their nationalization until the form of government changes.”³⁷

This significant event failed to register a blip on the radar screen of public awareness. Instead, public attention focused on the racial strife, the 1968 Democratic convention in Chicago, and the Viet Nam War which tore apart the convention, the party, and the nation. The First "Earth Day" in 1970, which perhaps coincidentally was celebrated on Lenin's birthday, April 22, was viewed as little more than a festival for flower children. The anti-war fervor, again, brought a quarter-million protesters to the Mall, and Watergate brought down the Nixon Presidency. The Clean Water Act of 1972 and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 served as beacons to attract the energies and idealism of a generation of young people who had successfully forced the world's most powerful government to abandon a war they saw to be unjust. The 1970s witnessed an unprecedented explosion in the number of environmental organizations and in the number of people who joined and supported these organizations.

Among the more important but lesser known organizations formed during this period are the Club of Rome (COR — 1968) and the Trilateral Commission (TC — 1973). The COR is a small group of international industrialists educators, economists, national and international civil servants. Among them were various Rockefellers and approximately 25 CFR members. Maurice Strong was one of the "international" civil servants.³⁸ Their first book, *THE LIMITS TO GROWTH*, published in 1972 unabashedly describes the world as they believe it should be:

“We believe in fact that the need will quickly become evident for social innovation to match technical change, for radical reform of the institutions and political processes at all levels, including the highest, that of world polity. And since intellectual enlightenment is without effect if it is not also political, The Club of Rome also will encourage the creation of a world forum where statesmen, policy-makers, and scientists can discuss the dangers and hopes for the future global system without the constraints of formal intergovernmental negotiation.”³⁹

That "world forum" was authorized in 1972 by UN Resolution 2997 (XXVII) as the UN Conference on the Human Environment. Maurice Strong was designated Secretary-General of the Conference which, among other things, recommended the creation of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), which came into being January 1, 1973, with Maurice Strong as its first Executive Director.⁴⁰ The Conference held in Stockholm produced 26 principles and 109 specific recommendations which parroted much of the language in the COR publications. The difference is, of course, that the Conference Report carries the weight of the United Nations and has profound policy implications for the entire world.⁴¹

Another COR publication, *MANKIND AT THE TURNING POINT*, provides further insight into the thinking that underlies global governance:

“The solution of these crises can be developed only in a global context with full and explicit recognition of the emerging world system and on a long-term basis. This would necessitate, among other changes, a new world economic order and a global resources allocation system A 'world consciousness' must be developed through which every individual realizes his role as a member of the world community It must become part of the consciousness of every individual that the basic unit of human cooperation and hence survival is moving from the national to the global level.”⁴²

A companion work by the same authors, Mihajlo Mesarovic and Eduard Pestel, entitled *REGIONALIZED AND ADAPTIVE MODEL OF THE GLOBAL WORLD SYSTEM*, introduced and described a system of regionalization which divided the globe into 10 regions, each with its own hierarchical system of sub-regions.⁴³

The Trilateral Commission published a book entitled *BEYOND INTERDEPENDENCE: THE MESHING OF THE WORLD'S ECONOMY AND THE EARTH'S ECOLOGY*, by Jim MacNeil. David Rockefeller wrote the foreword; Maurice Strong wrote the introduction. Strong said:

“This interlocking . . . is the new reality of the century, with profound implications for the shape of our institutions of governance, national and international. By the year 2012, these changes must be fully integrated into our economic and political life.”⁴⁴

In retrospect, it is clear that the early work of the United Nations was an effort to achieve global consensus on the philosophy upon which its programmatic work would be built. It is also clear that, despite the disproportionate share of the cost borne by capitalist nations, the prevailing philosophy at the UN is essentially socialist. The fundamental idea upon which America was founded — that men are born totally free and choose to give up specified freedoms to a limited government — is not the prevailing philosophy at the UN, nor at the CFR, the COR, the TC, or the IUCN. Instead, the prevailing philosophy held by these organizations and institutions is that government is sovereign and may dispense or withhold freedoms and privileges, or impose restrictions and penalties, in order to manage its citizens to achieve peace and prosperity for all. In his book, *FREEDOM AT THE ALTAR*, William Grigg says it this way:

“Under the American concept of rights, the individual possesses God-given rights which the state must protect. However, the UN embraces a collectivist worldview in which 'rights' are highly conditional concessions made by an all-powerful government.”⁴⁵

Another description of the difference between the two ideas is offered by Philip Bom, in *THE COMING CENTURY OF COMMONISM*:

“In the western Constitutional concept, limited government is established to protect the fundamental natural human rights of the free individuals in a free society. In a radical socialist concept of the state, the citizen has a duty to the state to help the state promote the socialization or communization of the man.”⁴⁶

These fundamentally different, conflicting ideas have been described differently by different people at different times. In 1842, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels preached their gospel through an organization known as the "Federation of the Just." In 1845 it was the International Democratic Association of Brussels that promoted their ideas. By 1903 the organization that championed Marxism was the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party before Lenin transformed it into the Communist Party. The names used to describe the prevailing philosophy at the UN are confusing to Americans. Regardless of the name attached, the underlying philosophy has several common characteristics that readily identify it as different from the philosophy upon which America was founded. Chief among those characteristics is the abhorrence of private property. As Philip Bom points out:

“In the *COMMUNIST MANIFESTO*, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels identified communism with democracy. 'The communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations . . . to win the battle of democracy'. They also pointed out that, 'The abolition of existing property relations is not at all a distinctive feature of communism The distinctive feature of communism is . . . abolition of private property.’”⁴⁷

Another tell-tale characteristic of socialist/communist philosophy is the assumption of omnipotent government. Philip Bom addresses the semantics problems as well as the omnipotent government issue this way:

“The war of words and world views of democracy continues but with greater confusion of priorities. President Reagan professed that '*freedom and democracy are the best guarantors for peace.*' President Gorbachev confessed that peace and maximum democracy are the guarantors of freedom. '*Our aim is to grant maximum freedom to people, to the individual, to society.*'”⁴⁸

In the Gorbachev statement, it is assumed that 'freedom' is the government's to give. The U.S. Constitution clearly views 'freedom' to be the natural condition of man and assigns the protection of freedom as government's first responsibility. International equality, equity, social justice, security of the people, democratic society all are terms used in UN documents that have a completely different meaning in a socialist context from the meaning understood in America.

These differences become exceedingly important in the context of official UN documents. Consider the language in the UN's Covenant on Human Rights, a document that bears approximately the same relationship to the UN Charter that the Bill of Rights bears to the U.S. Constitution.

Article 13 says:

“Freedom to manifest one’s religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law”

By contrast, the Bill of Rights says:

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof”

Article 14 of the Covenant says:

“The right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions, but these shall be only such, as are provided by law.”

The Bill of Rights says:

“Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press” Period.

The philosophy of omnipotent government permeates virtually all of the documents that have flowed from the UN since its inception. Consider the preamble to the report of the first World Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat I) held in 1976 under the auspices of Maurice Strong's newly formed United Nations Environmental Programme: *"Private land ownership is a principal instrument of accumulating wealth and therefore contributes to social injustice. Public control of land use is therefore indispensable."* Their recommendation: *"Public ownership of land is justified in favor of the common good, rather than to protect the interest of the already privileged."*⁴⁹ Morris Udall and others tried unsuccessfully to implement the Federal Land Use Planning Act in the early 1970s influenced by those seeking to impose global governance.

In the early 1970s the UN created a Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. As if singing in the same choir, the U.S. created a Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. On May Day, 1974, a proposal was submitted to the UN General Assembly calling for a New International Economic Order (NIEO); it was adopted as a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States on December 12, 1974. It called for the redistribution of wealth and political power, and the promotion of international justice based on the 'duties' of developed countries and the 'rights' of developing countries.

Throughout the 1970s, college students and others joined environmental organizations in droves. They protested, carried placards, picked up litter, preached recycling and organic gardening, mostly unaware that their leaders were attending conferences and promoting agendas based on the same philosophy that America had opposed in Viet Nam, Cuba, and the Soviet Union. Carefully crafted documents, magnified by a cooperative media, elevated the environment to a most noble cause. The object of near-worship for an army of energetic activists, “the environment” as an international issue was ripe for the picking by the advocates of global governance.

The Environmental Movement (1980s)

"Bait-and-switch" is a time-tested technique used by unscrupulous merchants to offer one thing and then provide another. The environmental movement of the 1970s was the unwitting victim of its leadership which offered a cleaner environment but, in the 1980s, delivered instead a massive program to achieve global governance. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) had already launched a Regional Seas Program (1973); conducted a UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD 1974); developed a Global Frame-work for Environmental Education (1975); established the International Environmental Education Program (IEEP); set up a Global Environmental Monitoring System (GEMS); set up a World Conservation Monitoring Center at Cambridge, England (1975 as a joint project with the IUCN and the WWF); implemented the Human Exposure Assessment Location Program (HEAL — 1976); conducted a UN Conference on Desertification (1977); organized the Designated Officials for Environmental Matters (DOEM); and in 1980, published World Conservation Strategy jointly with the IUCN and the WWF. The DOEM is an organizational structure that requires every UN agency and organization to designate an official to UNEP in order to coordinate all UN activity with the UNEP agenda. UNEP was well positioned to interject the environment into the argument for global governance.⁵⁰ Recognizing that communications was the key to global education, UNESCO adopted in 1978 a "Declaration on Fundamental Principles Concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthen Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Countering Racism, Apartheid and

Incitement of War.” To figure out what the declaration meant, UNESCO Director General, Dr. A. M. McBow, appointed Sean MacBride to chair the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems. Their report was released in 1980 entitled [*MANY VOICES, ONE WORLD: TOWARDS A NEW MORE JUST AND MORE EFFICIENT WORLD INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION ORDER*](#). The head of TASS, the official news agency of the Soviet Union, was one of fifteen chosen to serve on the Commission.

Not surprisingly, the report said that the *“media should contribute to promoting the just cause of peoples struggling for freedom and independence and their right to live in peace and equality without foreign interference.”* It expressed concern about independent news monopolies, such as the Associated Press and Reuters, but was not at all concerned about state controlled news monopolies such as TASS. It recommended a transnational political communication superstructure “within the framework of UNESCO,” an International Centre for the Study and Planning of Information and Communication.⁵¹ The Commission believed that a “new World Information Order” was prerequisite to a new world economic order. The report reflected the same “sovereign government” philosophy demonstrated in Article 14 of the Covenant on Human Rights: government, UNESCO in particular, should have the authority to regulate the flow of information to “promote” its agenda, and minimize public awareness of conflicting ideas. A proposal to require international journalists to be licensed brought swift and dramatic negative re-action which pushed this proposal to the back burner. The idea of controlling the media continues to simmer, even though an alternative plan was developed through NGOs.

The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) allocated funding to establish computer network services for NGOs and academics in Latin America. The Association for Progressive Communications (APC) linked together networks in Brazil, Russia, Canada, Australia, Sweden, England, Nicaragua, Ecuador, South Africa, Ukraine, Mexico, Slovenia, and then entered into a partnership with the Institute for Global Communications (IGC). Known simply as [igc.apc.org](#), this gigantic computer network now boasts 17,000 users in 94 countries. It has exclusive contracts with several UN agencies to coordinate, facilitate, and disseminate information about and from UN conferences. This NGO has arrangements with at least the following UN agencies: UN Association International Service (UNAIS); UN Centre for Human Rights; UNICEF; UNDP; UN Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW); UNESCO; UNEP; UN Information Centre (UNIC); UN International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD); UN International Emergency Network (UNIENET); UN Non-Government Liaison Service (NGLS); UN Population Fund (UNFPA); UN Secretariat for the Fourth World Conference on Women (UNWCW); UN University (UNU); and UN Volunteers (UNV).⁵²

West German Chancellor, Willy Brandt, was tapped to chair another International Commission in 1980: the Independent Commission on International Development. The Commission report, entitled [*NORTH-SOUTH: A PROGRAM FOR SURVIVAL*](#), stated:

“World development is not merely an economic process, [it] involves a profound transformation of the entire economic and social structure . . . not only the idea of economic betterment, but also of greater human dignity, security, justice and equity The Commission realizes that mankind has to develop a concept of a 'single community' to develop a global order.”

The report says that the choice is either development or destruction; either “a just and humane society” or a move towards [the world's] own destruction.”⁵³

For 50 years, Sweden was a socialist country. In 1976, the socialists were dumped and conservatives took over — until 1982. Olof Palme restored socialism to Sweden and was promptly rewarded with the chairmanship of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security (ICDST). In their report, entitled [*A COMMON SECURITY: BLUEPRINT FOR SURVIVAL*](#), the Commission built on Kennedy's 1962 *BLUEPRINT FOR THE PEACE RACE*, and on the 1974 Charter for a New International Economic Order, which linked disarmament with development.

The Charter's Article 13 says:

“All States have the duty to promote the achievement of general and complete disarmament *under effective international control* and to utilize the resources released by effective disarmament measures for the economic and social development of countries, allocating a substantial portion of such resources as additional means for the development needs of developing countries.” (Emphasis added).

The Brandt Commission report had concluded that security meant not only the military defense of a nation, but also required solving the non-military problems — such as poverty — to improve the basic conditions necessary

for peaceful relations among nations. Their conclusion was bolstered by the report of a UN advisor, Inga Thorsson, a Swedish Under-Secretary of State, who wrote:

“It is important that we do not content ourselves only with the actual disarmament efforts. World disarmament is needed for world development — but equally, world development is a prerequisite for world disarmament. Not until we have arrived at a situation of reasonable equity and economic balance in the world, will it be possible to develop conditions for a lasting disarmament.”⁵⁴

The United States and the Soviet Union had hammered out a policy generally known as "peaceful coexistence," to avoid MAD — Mutually Assured Destruction. The Palme Commission proposed a strategic shift from *collective security*, insured by the superpowers for the constellation of affiliated nations, to the concept of *common security* through the United Nations. The concept also linked the transfer of money saved by the disarming superpowers to the development of underdeveloped nations, transferred through and redistributed by the United Nations.⁵⁵

A work that began in 1973 was completed in 1981 — the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. The U.S. and the USSR wanted the Convention limited to navigational questions. But a group of 77 developing nations, known as G-77, hijacked the conference and the subsequent negotiations and wrote into the treaty the principles of the New International Economic Order (NIEO) — a UN taxing authority. The treaty created the International Seabed Authority (ISA) which would have jurisdiction over all non-territorial waters and the seabed. No seabed activity, mining, salvaging, and so forth, can occur without a permit from the ISA.

Application fees begin at \$250,000 and a schedule of royalties is set forth in the Convention. The Convention is the first to give direct taxing authority to the UN. It is a legal mechanism for the redistribution of wealth from developed nations to developing nations. The U.S. had avoided the Convention until 1994 when President Clinton signed the Treaty. Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, has announced that ratification of the treaty will be a priority for the Clinton Administration in 1997.⁵⁶

The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) had grown dramatically by 1982, with organizations in several countries, including the United States. Russell Train, the President of WWF-usA, secured more than \$25 million in grants from MacArthur Foundation, Andrew K. Mellon Foundation, and from “US and Foreign governments, international agencies, and individual gifts,” to launch a new NGO — the World Resources Institute (WRI) headquartered in Washington, D.C. James Gustave Speth was chosen as President. Speth, a Rhodes Scholar, turned to the environment after the Viet Nam war and co-founded the Natural Resources Defense Council. He became a Rockefeller protégé and is described as “one of the most effective environmentalists alive today.” He served as President of WRI for 11 years, then as a member of President Clinton’s transition team, then moved to the UNDP as its head.⁵⁷ The WRI joined the WWF and the IUCN to become the three-cornered NGO foundation for the global environmental agenda.

A World Charter for Nature was the chief product of a 1982 World Conference on Environment and Development, at which Maurice Strong said:

“I believe we are seeing the convergence of the physical and social worlds with the moral and spiritual. The concepts of loving, caring and sharing . . . for a saner, more cooperative world . . . are the indispensable foundations on which the future security system for a small planet must now be based.”⁵⁸

In 1984, there was a World Conference on environmental management. But a Conference in Vienna, Austria, in 1985 established UNEP as a major player in world affairs when it produced the Vienna Convention on Ozone Depleting Substances. The ascendancy of Mikhail Gorbachev to the Soviet throne received far more media attention than did the Ozone Treaty. Most Americans did not hear about the Treaty until the Montreal Protocol in 1987 which banned certain refrigerants and fire-fighting materials.

Another World Conference on Environment and Development was held in 1987. Gro Harlem Brundtland, Vice President of the World Socialist Party, was named as Chair. The Brundtland Commission Report, entitled OUR COMMON FUTURE, embraced most of the ideas contained in the UNEP/IUCN/WWF publication *WORLD CONSERVATION STRATEGY*, including the concept of “sustainable development.” It is the Brundtland Commission that links the environment to development and development to poverty. The Report says:

“Poverty is a major cause and effect of global environmental problems. It is therefore futile to attempt to deal with environmental problems without a broader perspective that encompasses the factors underlying world poverty and international inequality.”⁵⁹

Brundtland was a member of the Brandt Commission. Maurice Strong (who chaired the first world Conference on Environment and Development in 1972) was a member of the Brundtland Commission. Shirdath Ramphal was a member of the Brandt, Palme, and Brundtland Commissions, and later co-chaired the UN-funded Commission of Global Governance. Ramphal is a past President of the IUCN. The Brundtland Commission succeeded in two break-through accomplishments: (1) it linked poverty, equity, and security to environmental issues and (2) it recognized that the environment was a popular issue around which individuals, NGOs, and governments could rally. The environment was firmly established as the battle-cry to mobilize the world to create the New Economic World Order.

While UNEP was convening the first Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in 1988, the UNDP was funding a Global Forum of Spiritual and Parliamentary Leaders for Human Survival, sponsored jointly by the UNDP's Global Committee of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (created in 1982) and the Temple of Understanding. The Temple of Understanding is an NGO accredited to the UN, and one of several projects of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York City. The featured speaker at the Forum was James Lovelock, author of *THE AGES OF GAIA*. Lovelock said: "On Earth, she [gaia] is the source of life, everlasting and is alive now, she gave birth to humankind and we are a part of her."⁶⁰ The Gaia Institute is also housed at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, as is the Lindisfarne Association which published *G-A-I-A, A WAY OF KNOWING: POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW BIOLOGY*. Maurice Strong is a member of Lindisfarne and often speaks at the Cathedral, as do Robert Muller and Vice President Al Gore.⁶¹

The Forum produced what was called the "Joint Appeal" which grew into the National Religious Partnership for the Environment (NRPE). The project is endorsed by eleven major environmental organizations, has received grants of more than \$5 million, and is currently engaged in mailing "education and action kits" to 53,000 congregations. Amy Fox, Associate Director of the NRPE, says:

“We are required by our religious principles to look for the links between equity and ecology. The fundamental emphasis is on issues of environmental justice, including air pollution and global warming; water, food and agriculture; population and consumption; hunger, trade and industrial policy; community economic development; toxic pollution and hazardous waste; and corporate responsibility.”⁶²

The decade had begun with an eruption of Mt. St. Helens, and perhaps a more spectacular political eruption: arch-conservative Ronald Reagan captured the White House from arch-liberal, Jimmy Carter. Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), more popularly known as "star wars," is cited as a major factor in the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union. The USSR, which Reagan dubbed "the evil empire," did assume a new attitude about arms reduction and disarmament. Gorbachev announced "*glasnost*," a new policy of openness, and "*perestroika*" a restructuring program which featured measured "free market" opportunities. Gorbachev, who was infinitely closer to the socialist dominated inner-circle of the UN-global-governance cabal than was the Reagan Administration, may well have been preparing to shift the seat of socialist leadership from the Soviet Union to the United Nations. The newly formulated strategy of *common security*, rather than *collective security* could not accommodate the notion of a single state, even the Soviet Union, as the seat of global authority. And it is now clear that, even though it appeared to the west that Gorbachev was moving his country toward capitalism, he never had any such intention.

Gorbachev told his Politburo in November, 1987:

“Gentlemen, comrades, do not be concerned about all you hear about Glasnost and Perestroika and democracy in the coming years. They are primarily for outward consumption. There will be no significant internal changes in the Soviet Union, other than for cosmetic purposes. Our purpose is to disarm the Americans and let them fall asleep.”

He later wrote:

“Those who hope that we shall move away from the socialist path will be greatly disappointed. Every part of our program of perestroika — and the program as a whole, for that matter — is fully based on the principle of

more socialism and more democracy We will proceed toward better socialism rather than away from it. We are saying this honestly, without trying to fool our own people or the world. Any hopes that we will begin to build a different, non-socialist society and go over to the other camp are unrealistic and futile. We, the Soviet people, are for socialism. We want more socialism and therefore more democracy.”⁶³

By November 9, 1989, when the Berlin Wall collapsed, it became clear to the world that events had out-run Gorbachev's intentions. The Soviet Union, along with 70 years of utopian-communist dreams, collapsed as thoroughly as did the wall. The vacuum thus created in the global political balance was seen as an invitation to usher in a new, permanent balancing force — global governance.

The role and capacity of NGOs was greatly enhanced in the mid 1980s when Donald Ross of the Rockefeller Family Fund — the same Rockefeller money pot that launched the Council on Foreign Relations — invited the leaders of five other Foundations to meet informally in Washington. From that meeting grew the Environmental Grantmakers Association, a nearly invisible group of more than 100 major Foundations and corporations. They meet annually to discuss projects and grant proposals and decide which NGOs will be funded.⁶⁴ Having gained a measure of national prominence in his failed bid for the White House in 1988, then Senator Al Gore, as chair of the Senate Science and Technology Committee, assumed the responsibility of advancing the global environmental agenda in America. It was Gore, and then-Senator Timothy Wirth, who arranged special "prayer breakfasts" with selected congressmen for James Parks Morton, Dean of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, to promote the National Religious Partnership for the Environment.⁶⁵ It was Gore who led the Senate to approve the Montreal Protocol which banned refrigerants. It was Gore who brought James E. Hansen, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, to the Senate chambers to testify that he was "99% certain that greenhouse warming had begun."⁶⁶

The decade of the 1980s was a pivotal period for the advocates of global governance. The MacBride Commission had established the principle of information management as a legitimate responsibility of the United Nations, though only partially implemented through participating NGOs: IGC/APC. The Brandt Commission had linked development with peace, and the Palme Commission had linked development with peace and disarmament as a way to shift military power to the UN and money to the third world. The Brundtland Commission linked development to the environment and introduced the concept of "sustainability." The NGOs, coordinated by the IUCN/WWF/WRI triumvirate, and funded by the Rockefeller-coordinated Environmental Grantmakers Association, launched a world-wide campaign to convince the world that the planet stood at the brink of environmental disaster. It could be averted only by a massive transformation of human societies which would require all people to accept their spiritual and moral responsibility to embrace their common global heritage and conform to a system of international law that integrates environmental, economic, and equity issues under the watchful, regulatory authority of a new system of global governance.

Global Governance: The Final March (1990s)

A decade of world conferences and international commissions in the 1980s proved to be only practice sessions for the world conferences and UN commissions of the 1990s, beginning with the World Summit for Children in New York City in 1990. The Convention on the Rights of Child was adopted by the UN General Assembly on November 20, 1989, and the Summit was designed to promote the Convention for acceptance by the world. The Convention's preamble says: "Recalling that in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations has proclaimed that childhood is entitled to special care and assistance," and the Convention designates the UN to guarantee that "special care" and deter-mine what "assistance" is needed. The Convention grants to children the right to express their own views freely in all matters (Article 12.1); the right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds (Article 13.1); the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 14.1); the right to freedom of association and peaceful assembly (Article 15.1); and the right to privacy in the family, home, or correspondence (Article 16.1).⁶⁷

Many Americans believe that children have no such rights until they have been earned through the painful process of growing up, and then it is the parent's rightful privilege to grant those rights to the child. Ratification of the Convention would be tantamount to the U.S. government giving the UN the authority to grant those rights to children, and the authority to guarantee and enforce those rights, even when parents disagree. In fact, the Convention would establish the authority, if not the mechanism, for the UN to establish the criteria for childrearing, including education, sex education, religion, and even leisure-time activities. There is nothing in the

Convention to preclude the UN from requiring all children to attend state-run schools from nursery school to high school, and taking children completely away from the influence of the family.

From New York to Rio (1992)

A heat wave and an extended period of drought the last few years of the decade gave credence to a coordinated media campaign of global environmental disaster. The Union of Concerned Scientists published a "Warning to Humanity" which said: "A great change in our stewardship of the earth and the life on it is required if vast human misery is to be avoided and our global home on this planet is not to be irretrievably mutilated."⁶⁸ The annual "State of the Planet" report, issued by the WorldWatch Institute, predicted progressively worsening environmental disasters. And the mainstream media joined the campaign to convince the world that the planet was on the brink of collapse:

- Charles Alexander, Time magazine: "As the science editor at Time, I would freely admit that on this issue [the environment] we have crossed the boundary from news reporting to advocacy;"
- Barbara Pyle, CNN environmental director: "I do have an ax to grind . . . I want to be the little subversive person in television;"
- Dianne Dumanoski, Boston Globe environmental reporter: "There is no such thing as objective reporting . . . I've become even more crafty about finding the voices to say the things I think are true. That is my subversive mission;"
- Bernard Goldberg, CBS 48 Hours: "We in the press like to say we're honest brokers of information, and it's just not true. The press does have an agenda."⁶⁹

To this mix of extravagant propaganda, then-Senator Al Gore added his best-selling book, *EARTH IN THE BALANCE: ECOLOGY AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT*. Like Rachel Carson's *SILENT SPRING* thirty years earlier, what Gore's book lacked in scientific accuracy was more than compensated for by an abundance of emotion. He called for a tax on fossil fuels. He called for a "global program to accomplish the strategic goal of completely eliminating the internal combustion engine over say, a twenty-five year period."⁷⁰ And he called for the reorganization of society:

"I have come to believe that we must take bold and unequivocal action: we must make the rescue of the environment the central organizing principle for civilization . . . Adopting a central organizing principle — one agreed to voluntarily — means embarking on an all out effort to use every policy and program, every law and institution, every treaty and alliance, every tactic and strategy, every plan and course of action — to use. In short every means to halt the destruction of the environment and to preserve and nurture our ecological system."⁷¹

Despite significant, legitimate objections from the scientific community, which were ignored by the media and ridiculed by environmental organizations, the public perception of impending environmental disaster was successfully blamed on exploding human population; human-caused global warming; and human-caused loss of biological diversity. The stage was set for the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) scheduled to be held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. No previous UN conference had ever received such planning and promotion. Maurice Strong was named to head the conference, which was dubbed "Earth Summit II." He had chaired the first "Earth Summit" in 1972 and had participated in every environmental commission and conference since. (Strong became Chairman of the Board of WRI in 1994). To guide the agenda for the conference, UNEP and its NGO partners published two major documents: *CARING FOR THE EARTH*, (1991 via UNEP/IUCN/WWF), and *GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY*, (1992 via UNEP/IUCN/WWF/WRI). These documents contained the material from which the revolutionary UNCED documents would be produced.

The NGO community, coordinated through the IUCN and the WRI publication *Networking*, used the igc.apc.org computer networks extensively to funnel information to and from the UNCED agenda planners, and to plan the NGO Forum. UNCED provided an opportunity for the NGOs to perfect the lobbying process. With the blessings of and assistance from the UNEP, the NGOs scheduled a "Forum" the week immediately preceding the official conference. Nearly 8,000 NGOs were officially certified to participate in the UNCED Forum, and another 4,000 NGOs were observers, swelling the total attendance at UNCED to more than 40,000 people — the largest environmental gathering the world has ever known. UNCED may be recorded in history as the most significant event the world has ever known; it was the watershed event that began the final march to global governance.

Agenda 21, the underlying conference document, was a distillation of the UNEP/IUCN/WWF/WRI documents. It consisted of 294 pages and 115 specific program recommendations. *Agenda 21* was further distilled into

another document called *The Rio Declaration* which was a succinct statement of 27 principles on which the recommendations were based, and which would guide the global environmental agenda. Two major international treaties had also been prepared for presentation at UNCED: the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

In the summer of 1992, President George Bush faced a difficult reelection campaign. He expressed little interest in the Rio conference and was savagely ridiculed by then-Senator Al Gore and his own EPA Administrator, William Reilly, who publicly urged Bush to attend. Bush relented and was one of more than 100 heads of state that adopted the UNCED documents. Bush, however, did not sign the Convention on Biological Diversity due to ambiguities relating to the transfer of technology. He told the conference audience:

“Our efforts to protect biodiversity itself will exceed the requirements of the treaty. But that proposed agreement threatens to retard biotechnology and undermine the protection of ideas, . . . it is never easy to stand alone on principle, but sometimes leadership requires that you do. And now is such a time.”⁷²

Agenda 21 and the Rio Declaration are not binding documents. They are "soft law" documents which are the foundation for future binding documents such as the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity. These two treaties contained important new features that are not present in the hundreds of other international treaties that the U.S. has ratified. These treaties do not allow any reservations or exceptions. Other treaties provide for parties to specify particular reservations or exceptions to which they are not bound. The UNCED treaties require all-or-nothing participation. The UNCED treaties created a "Conference of the Parties" (COP) which is a permanent body of delegates which has the authority to adopt "protocols," or regulations, through which to implement and administer the treaty. The UNCED treaties were non-specific. The treaties were actually a list of goals and objectives; the COP was created to develop the protocols necessary to achieve the objectives — after the treaties had been ratified.

The Framework Convention on Climate Change, for example, binds participating nations to the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000; the COP develops the protocols necessary to achieve that goal, and the member nations are legally obligated to comply. The Convention on Biological Diversity requires the creation of "a system of protected areas." The COP will adopt protocols to define what is an acceptable system of protected areas long after the treaty has been ratified. The binding treaties are written in language that appears to pursue environmental objectives: however, the principles upon which the treaties are based (The Rio Declaration) are in fact a refined re-statement of the principles for social change developed by the various socialist-dominated commission of the 1980s.

For example,

Principle 1:

"Human beings are at the center of concerns for sustainable development . . . ;"

Principle 2:

"National sovereignty is subject to international law"

Principle 3:

"The right to development must be fulfilled so as to equitably meet developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations;"

Social change is clearly the first objective of the Declaration.⁷³ Dr. Dixy Lee Ray, who attended the conference, reported:

“The objective, clearly enunciated by the leaders of UNCED, is to bring about a change in the present system of independent nations. The future is to be World Government with central planning by the United Nations. Fear of environmental crises — whether real or not — is expected to lead to compliance.”⁷⁴

To assure that the COPs of the respective treaties were properly guided in their discussions of the protocols necessary for implementation, the UNEP/IUCN/WWF/WRI partnership launched a *Global Biodiversity Assessment* (GBA). Robert T. Watson, NASA chemist and co-chair of UNEP's Ozone Panel, was chosen to chair the project. IUCN's Jeffrey McNeely was selected to produce the important section on "Human Influences on Biodiversity," and WRI's Kenton Miller coordinated the critical section on "Measures for the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable use of Its Components." The work was begun before the treaty had been ratified by a single nation, and involved more than 2000 scientists and activists from around the world.⁷⁵ UNCED adjourned and the thousands of NGO representatives went home to begin the campaign to ratify the treaties and implement *Agenda 21* and the principles of the Rio Declaration.

A *Chicago Tribune* article by Jon Margolis, September 30, 1994, said that the Global Biodiversity Assessment was a process that had just begun, that no document existed. A participant in the GBA process had secretly photocopied several hundred pages of the peer-review draft of the document. Summaries of the draft documents were prepared and provided to every member of the U.S. Senate. The shocking details of the bizarre plan to transform societies was sufficient to block a ratification vote in the closing days of the 103rd Congress, despite the fact that the treaty had been approved by the Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 16 to 3.

Agenda 21 called for each nation to create a plan for sustainable development consistent with the principles of the Rio Declaration. The UN created a new Commission on Sustainable Development, and Maurice Strong created a new NGO called Earth Council, based in Costa Rica, to coordinate NGO activity to implement the Rio Declaration principles through national Sustainable Development Programs. Earth Council has produced a directory listing more than 100 nations that have formal sustainable development plans under development. The UN created another program to "empower children" to help implement the sustainable development program: "Rescue Mission: Planet Earth." In a Rescue Mission newsletter *Action Update*, their work is described as getting governments together "who try to make the others feel guilty for not having done what they promised on Agenda 21."⁷⁶

To implement *Agenda 21* and the principles of the Rio Declaration in America, President Bill Clinton issued Executive Order No. 12852, June 29, 1993, which created the Presidents Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD). Jonathan Lash, President of the World Resources Institute (WRI) was named as co-chair. Jay D. Hair, President of the IUCN, and former President of the National Wildlife Federation was one of eight NGO leaders appointed to the Council. Eleven government officials, along with the eight NGO leaders, easily dominated the discussions and produced a predictable report from the 28-member Council. Not surprisingly, the final report, [*SUSTAINABLE AMERICA: A NEW CONSENSUS*](#), presents 154 action items to achieve 38 specific recommendations that are precisely the recommendations called for in *Agenda 21*.

The most casual reading of the PCSD's 16 "We Believe" statements, compared with the 27 principles of the Rio Declaration, reveals that the PCSD has simply Americanized the Rio language to form the foundation for implementing the UN agenda in America. PCSD Belief No. 10, for example: "Economic growth, environmental protection, and social equity are linked. We need to develop integrated policies to achieve these national goals" sounds very much like Rio Principle No. 3 "The right to development must be fulfilled so as to equitably meet developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations."⁷⁷ The PCSD is *Agenda 21* at work in America.

The PCSD also provides a glimpse of the global governance process to come. Public policy is initiated by non-elected officials, massaged into specific proposals by an NGO-dominated "stake-holders council," written into regulations administratively by willing bureaucrats (who themselves, are frequently former NGO officials), or presented to Congress for approval — along with the threat of retaliation at the ballot box from the millions of NGO members represented by the stakeholders council.

The UNCED and *Agenda 21* covered an extremely wide range of issues that affect virtually every person on the planet. The purpose for the array of policy recommendations put forth for public consumption is, ostensibly, to protect the planet from inevitable destruction at the hands of greedy, uncaring, or unaware humans. At the core, however, the policies recommended are socialist policies, built on the assumption that government is sovereign and must manage the affairs of its citizens. Nothing in *Agenda 21*, the Rio Declaration, or the PCSD recommendations even acknowledges the idea that humans are born free, and are sovereign over the governments they create. Nothing acknowledges the idea that government's first responsibility is to protect the inherent freedom of its citizens, particularly, the freedom to own and use property. To the contrary, everything about the UNCED documents aims to limit human freedom and to restrict the use of private property until it can be placed in the public domain. As sweeping as the UNCED documents are, they are but the first step in the final march to global governance.

The IUCN held its triennial session in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1993. Dr. Jay D. Hair assumed Presidency of the organization, as Shirdath Ramphal stepped down to devote more time to his position as co-chair of the UN-funded Commission on Global Governance. His parting message is illuminating:

"Rio, for all its disappointments, set the seal on a new agenda for the world: the agenda of sustainable development. It was not, of course, new for IUCN, which had blazed a trail for sustainable development since

1980 with the World Conservation Strategy. In the final analysis, it is a matter of equity. There are also other aspects to the claims of equity. If there are limits to the use of some resources, they must be fairly shared. Early users, who have prospered, must not pre-empt them but must begin to use less so that others may also progress. The rich must moderate their demands on resources so that the poor may raise theirs to levels that allow them a decent standard of living. Equity calls for no less. We need . . . to persuade others that, for the Earth's sake consumption, must be better balanced between rich and poor."⁷⁸

Equity, or wealth redistribution, is clearly the underlying purpose for "sustainable development," in the IUCN agenda. Its influence over UNEP activities and upon the global agenda cannot be overstated. Its membership includes 68 sovereign nations, 103 government agencies, and more than 640 NGOs. Among the government agencies listed as contributors in the 1993 Annual report are: the U.S. Department of State; U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID); and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The U.S. State Department contributes more than \$1 million per year to the IUCN.⁷⁹

The IUCN evaluates every proposed World Heritage site and recommends to UNESCO whether or not it should be listed, or listed "in danger."⁸⁰ George Frampton, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, asked UNESCO specifically to send a representative from IUCN to evaluate Yellowstone Park as a site "in danger" in 1995.⁸¹ On January 18, 1996, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12986, which says:

"I hereby extend to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources the privileges and immunities that provide or pertain to immunity from suit."⁸²

The IUCN is the driving force behind UNEP and the global environmental agenda. The Convention on Biological Diversity was developed and proposed by the IUCN in 1981 to the World Commission on Environment and Development.⁸³ The IUCN is the architect and engineer designing the road to global governance.

From Rio to Vienna (1993)

The UN Conference on Human Rights was held in Vienna, June 1993. The primary objective of this conference was to promote the pending Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Few Americans have ever heard of such a treaty and would probably not object on the basis of the title alone. However, as is always the case, the devil is in the details. The treaty would "guarantee" the right to housing for women, the right to "choice," or abortion (Article 16e). Cecilia Acevedo Royals, President of the National Institute of Womanhood, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"This Convention is deeply flawed. It will, in fact, harm women, men and children by establishing an international policy instrument that can be used as a weapon against the family, the institution of marriage, and cultural and religious values, and that can be turned into a tool for the societal control of women."⁸⁴

While the Convention aims at guaranteeing certain "rights" to women, it would, in fact, give to the UN the power to enforce those rights. Instead of empowering women, it would, in fact, empower the state, the global state, the United Nations. The Convention has been ratified by 130 nations, though not by the United States. The Clinton Administration prodded State Department officials to urge Senate ratification.⁸⁵

From Vienna to Uruguay (1994)

On April 15, *The New York Times* carried a full-page ad that hailed the World Trade Organization as "the third pillar of the new world order."⁸⁶ The World Trade Organization (WTO) sailed through the Senate in the closing days of the 103rd Congress, handing over to the UN system the authority and the mechanism to impose and enforce its agenda on America. The WTO Charter requires "the optimal use of the world resources" in accordance with the objective of sustainable development (Preamble). It requires the WTO to "make appropriate arrangement for effective cooperation" with NGOs and intergovernmental organizations (Article V). It requires member nations to change their laws to conform to the WTO: "each member shall ensure the conformity of its laws, regulations and administrative procedures with its obligations as provided in the annexed Agreements" (Article XVI). Although the U.S. must pay a disproportionate share of the WTO cost, it has only one vote and no veto (Article IX).

The WTO may impose trade sanctions on a nation that it determines is not in compliance with any international treaty. It may impose sanctions, fines, and penalties on a nation, or on an industry. Members are bound by the dispute resolutions dictated by the WTO (Section 2, Annex 2). Bilateral trade deals must meet the approval of the WTO. Bilateral or multilateral trade agreements can be changed by a vote of the members of the WTO (Article X (4)). Article XVI says: "No reservations may be made in respect to any provision of the Agreement."⁸⁷

The WTO could not have survived without the U.S. The UN could not have controlled world trade without the WTO. But now the facility is in place and the bureaucracy is gearing up to become the first-line enforcement mechanism of global governance.

From Uruguay to Cairo (1994)

Population control has long been a high priority for the United Nations, though promoted for different reasons, by different names, at different times. Currently, the population explosion is cited as the underlying cause of the human impact on biodiversity and on climate change. Population control entered the UN agenda as a eugenics issue by virtue of Julian Huxley's involvement with British Population Investigation Commission and the Eugenics Society. In 1954, the Rome conference promoted the concept of fertility as an economic factor. By 1974, the Bucharest conference integrated population and development issues with the developed nations insisting that population reduction was essential to economic development. When the issue emerged at the Mexico City Conference, it appeared as a matter of "women's rights" and freedom of choice. In Cairo at the September International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), population control was seen by some to be a matter of "women's empowerment by the state"⁸⁸ while others saw population control as an essential requirement of sustainable development initiatives.⁸⁹ The Cairo "Programme of Action" said:

“. . . unsustainable consumption and production patterns are contributing to the unsustainable use of natural resources and environmental degradation as well as to...social inequities and poverty” (Chapter 3.1); and "Governments should establish the requisite internal institutional mechanisms . . . to ensure that population factors are appropriately addressed within the decision-making and administrative processes” (Chapter 3.7).⁹⁰

The conference agenda focused on gender equality; the eradication of poverty; family in its various forms; children's rights; education; as well as population policies, human rights, and sustainable development. Population control is critical to the overall global environmental agenda. The Global Biodiversity Assessment concludes that:

“A reasonable estimate for an industrialized world society at the present North American material standard of living would be 1 billion. At the more frugal European standard of living, 1 to 3 billion would be possible. An 'agricultural world,' in which most human beings are peasants, should be able to support 5 to 7 billion people”⁹¹

The cost of the various UN population programs discussed at the conference was estimated to be between \$17 and \$75 billion. The World Resources Institute (WRI) reported in the *NGO Networker* that Zero Population Growth was the NGO coordinating lobbying activities for the Cairo conference.⁹²

From Cairo to Copenhagen (1995)

In Copenhagen, the UN's World Summit on Social Development was the occasion for advancing the road to global governance. The central theme of the conference was the "eradication of poverty." The agenda also included population policies, the reduction of consumption, and elevating NGO participation. More than anything else, the conference was about money, getting it to the UN, and increasing the power of the UN to collect it and spend it.

The conference proposed an international "20/20 Compact" which would require developing countries and aid donors to allocate 20 percent Official Development Assistance (ODA) to "human development priorities." Commitment 8 in the Draft Conference Document calls on nations to target .07 percent of Gross Domestic Product to Official Development Assistance.⁹³

The conference was used by the UN-funded Commission on Global Governance to float a trial balloon: global taxation. Buried in the UNDP's 1994 *Human Development Report* was an idea advanced by James Tobin calling for a "uniform international tax on international currency transactions." When the UNDP report was presented to the conference, it was heralded as the way to provide "substantial reliable funds for sustainable human development." Conference documents describe the proceeds from the tax as "immense, over \$1.5 trillion per year (150 times the current total UN budget) to be devoted to international and humanitarian purposes and to be placed at the disposal of international institutions."⁹⁴

Other global taxes were also proposed: international travel; telecommunications; and taxes on resource use — especially energy resources.

Paragraph 75 of the conference document calls for the "strengthening of...non-government organizations . . . enabling them to participate actively in policy-making . . . involving these organizations in the design, implementation and evaluation of social development strategies and specific programmes." It was clear to Rita Joseph, who attended the conference for Population Research Institute, that

“The thrust currently behind the latest declarations is to set up not only monitoring bodies, but enforcement agencies, to which individual and group petitions concerning perceived grievances may be mounted. There is a push on to expand international government so that it reaches right down to communities and homes, there to dabble in values reorientation.”⁹⁵

NGO lobbying activities for this conference were coordinated by the Overseas Development Council in Washington, DC., according to WRI's *NGO Networker*. (The editor of the *NGO Networker*, Sarah Burns, went to work for the UNDP in Washington as NGO Liaison in 1994).

From Copenhagen to New York (1995)

The UN Commission on Sustainable Development held its third meeting in New York, April 1995. This was a Commission meeting rather than a World Conference. The pomp was not as pompous, but the circumstance was as significant as any UN meeting. The agenda focused on land degradation, desertification, forests and biodiversity; patterns of consumption, financial resources, and technology transfer. The Commission is said to be developing a new international Convention on Sustainable Development, but a new strategy is being used. Other Conventions have been developed through a long series of Commission meetings until they are complete. Then they are presented to the world at a World Conference, as was the case with the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Maurice Strong's strategy is to get individual nations to develop their own sustainable development plan, all of which are developed within the framework of *Agenda 21*, so that when the Convention on Sustainable Development is finally completed, most of the nations will already be doing what the Convention calls for. Until the Convention is complete and ratified, the sustainable development programs within individual nations will be authorized by national law. When the Convention is ratified, the programs will come under the authority — and under the regulatory and enforcement procedures — of the United Nations.

From New York to Beijing (1995)

All the pomp that was missing in New York was present in Beijing for the fourth World Women's Congress in September 1995, preceded by a week-long NGO Forum. The event was expected to produce a Platform for Action to guide national and international policy on women's issues into the 21st century. The event was the culmination of a “180-Day Local-to-Global-to-Local Women's Empowerment Campaign” organized by the NGO WEDO (Women for Environment and Development Organization).

WEDO's parent organization, Women U.S.A. Fund, Inc, is headed by Bella Abzug, Congresswomen Patsy Mink and Maxine Waters, and Gloria Steinem. Funding for the NGO comes from the Ford Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation and the Turner Foundation. The campaign featured the coordinated release of press kits to the media, boycotts, “take over the legislature for a day” rallies, forums, lunchtime workshops with fellow workers, and a “myriad of actions” all over the world. The purpose of the campaign was to focus public attention on the Beijing Conference, and more particularly, on WEDO's conference agenda.

WEDO called for the tracking of all national and international economic and development programs by social and gender impact studies; restrictions on economic growth in industrialized countries; the transfer of common property (water, forests, grazing lands and fishing waters) to international control; prohibiting ownership of such common property to national or international corporations; national and international strategies to alleviate women's poverty; remuneration for women's unpaid work (housekeeping, child rearing, etc.); taxes shifted from income to consumption; universal guaranteed income and payment for childcare and other socially productive activities; and a universal 50/50 program that would require all business and government entities to have a 50/50 men/women work force.⁹⁶

The conference produced more hype, hoopla, and hyperbole than anything else. First there was a flap about having a World Conference on Women's issues in a nation which so severely oppressed women. Then there

was a flap about the facilities. Then there was a flap about the extreme security measures. Then there was Hillary Clinton, who put in a personal appearance. Of significance is the reappearance of the "Tobin Tax" as a recommended way to fund the extravagant programs demanded by the delegates. There reappeared new calls to elevate the status and authority of NGO's in decision-making and in program administration. And there was a new idea advanced — the FDR (not Franklin D. Roosevelt).

The FDR means "Family Dependency Ratio." The idea calls for extensive monitoring of the activities, consumption, and production of every member of every family to determine whether a family is a net "consumer" or "producer." This idea grew out of WEDO's demand to "value and remunerate" women for their unpaid work.⁹⁷

Throughout the Conference, debate on the serious issues as well as the frivolous issues proceeded with virtually no challenge to the appropriateness of UN jurisdiction over a range of issues that should be at least national, if not extremely personal. Taxation, employment policies, and land use policies were all offered up to the UN. Delegates and the NGO lobbyists passed the stage of questioning the appropriateness of global governance; it is now a question of how much and how soon. There is no longer any discussion of freedom, property rights, or national sovereignty. The discussion centers around how best to get the wealth from developed countries into the UN for redistribution to the undeveloped countries. The documents coming from each of the successive World Conferences continue to reflect the assumption that government — the United Nations Government — should be sovereign, and that nation states are secondary, and individuals are cannon-fodder.

From Beijing to San Francisco (1995)

The Beijing Conference had hardly adjourned when Gorbachev's State of the World Forum convened in San Francisco, September 27, 1995. Though not an official UN function, the Forum was designed to advance global governance. Forum President and founder of the Christic Institute, Jim Garrison, told the *San Francisco Weekly*, "We are going to end up with world government . . . we have to govern and regulate human interaction."⁹⁸ Gorbachev told the hand-picked audience of celebrities and dignitaries that "we are giving birth to the first Global Civilization." Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's National Security Advisor, told the audience that "regionalism" must precede world government. New-age guru, Sam Keen received enthusiastic applause for his pronouncement:

"If we cut the world's population by 90%, there won't be enough people left to do ecological damage."

The Forum's agenda called for the transfer of all armaments to the UN, the initiation of global taxation, stricter population control programs, and the elimination of nationalism and national borders. The highlight of the event was a joint presentation by Gorbachev, former President George Bush, and former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Gorbachev is the founding President of Green Cross and the Gorbachev Foundation. He along with Maurice Strong were regarded as candidates to replace Boutros Boutros-Ghali as Secretary-General of the United Nations at the expiration of Ghali's term December 31, 1996.⁹⁹ However since UN rules have required that an African hold the position of Secretary-General for another term, Kofi Annan has assumed this position. Maurice Strong has been designated his "Senior Advisor" for restructuring the United Nations. On 16 July 1997, Kofi Annan released a report on UN "reform" plans. They coincide with the blueprint drawn in [OUR GLOBAL NEIGHBORHOOD: REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON GLOBAL GOVERNANCE](#). It is noteworthy that its lead author is Maurice Strong.

From San Francisco to Istanbul (1996)

Habitat II, the UN Conference on Human Settlements, convened in Istanbul in June 1996. Despite the fact that Habitat I called for the elimination of private property in 1976, the U.S. has contributed more than \$32 million ¹⁰⁰ to its operations and sent an enthusiastic delegation to Istanbul to assure the Conference that America is supporting its objectives. The entire agenda was bathed in the ambiguous language of sustainable development. Two of the major issues to emerge through the noise of 4000 delegates and 25,000 NGO representatives, were: (1) the right to housing, and (2) good governance. Although at least three previous UN documents declare the right to housing, two of them have not been ratified by the U.S. Consequently, the universal right to housing is in question. Article 5 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination declares a right to housing. The U.S. has ratified that Convention. The International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Human Rights, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, both of which declare the right to housing, have not been ratified by the U.S. As the leader of

one NGO, called the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions, says: "The right to housing is a powerful, mobilizing tool for women's groups, street children and so on. Denying this right would be a great step backwards." ¹⁰¹ If housing is declared to be a universal right, then the UN would have the responsibility of guaranteeing and enforcing that right. And to have meaning, the UN would have to have the authority to collect the money necessary to provide universal housing.

Of more direct importance is the issue of "good governance." Throughout all the conferences of the 1990s, emphasis has been placed on expanding the role and functions of NGOs in the decision-making process and the management and administration of government programs at every level. Habitat II Director-General, Wally N'Dow, said:

"The road to Istanbul has been marked by many innovations. One of seminal importance has been a pioneering change in the rules of procedure — a change that was initiated during the preparatory process and subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly [Rule 61] in recognition of the important role of local authorities and NGOs. As a result, all the organizations and institutions of civil society will receive unparalleled recognition at a UN conference, nominating their representatives to participate in a formal session They speak for countless millions of men and women in the cities and towns across the planet, the true constituents of Habitat II."¹⁰²

This rule change officially elevates NGOs to participatory status in the policy-making process of the United Nations. Policy making by individuals who have no direct or indirect accountability to the electorate is a foreign concept in America. It is common — in fact expected — in socialist countries. In America, if voters do not like the way America is being represented in the UN, voters can remove the President who appoints UN delegates and elect someone else who more accurately reflects American values. American voters cannot unelect representatives from the Sierra Club, or the president of a gay feminist NGO, or any other NGO who may be selected by their peers to make global policies which affect Americans.

Moreover, Rule 61 invites participation by local officials. Heretofore, the UN has served its member nations as represented by official delegates. This rule is the first step toward bypassing the official national government to extend UN influence, programs, and eventually money, regulations, and enforcement — directly to the people within the nation. This is the essence of governance by civil society, orchestrated by the United Nations. This is the first wave of the reality of global governance.

From Istanbul to Geneva (1996)

The second meeting of The Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change (COPII-FCCC), convened in Geneva, Switzerland July 8-19, 1996. The treaty was presented in 1992 at the Rio "Earth Summit," and has now been ratified by 159 nations, including the U.S. The treaty requires participating Annex I (developed) nations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000.

At COP I, however, meeting in Berlin in 1995, the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) proposed that developed nations reduce emissions to a level 20%, less than 1990 levels. The COP did not adopt the proposal, but did adopt the "Berlin Mandate" which was an agreement to develop a legally binding Protocol by 1997. COP II was designed to negotiate The terms of the Protocol for adoption at COP III in Kyoto, Japan in 1997.

To influence the proceedings, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) released its Second Assessment Report (SAR). For the first time, the official UN body claimed that ". . . the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate." Although 100 scientists — some of whom were participants in the IPCC process — publicly objected to the report's findings in a statement called the "Leipzig Declaration," the Conference pushed forward toward a legally binding Protocol. The conference document, called the "Ministerial Declaration," endorses The SAR; declares that emissions will eventually have to be reduced by 50%; and calls on developed nations to initiate policies to reduce emissions within specific industries: energy, transportation, agriculture, forestry, waste management, and economic instruments.

From Geneva to Global Governance (1998)

When Shirdath Ramphal handed over the IUCN gavel to Jay Hair in 1993, he turned his attention to the Commission on Global Governance which he co-chaired along with Ingvar Carlsson, former Prime Minister of Sweden and then-Leader of the Social Democratic Party in Sweden. Like the Commissions of the 1980s (Brandt, Palme, MacBride, and Brundtland) it was an independent commission, meaning that it was not created by a resolution of the UN General Assembly. It operated officially as an NGO but, as a practical matter, it was an instrument of the United Nations. The Commission on Global Governance received the formal endorsement of Butrous-Butrous Ghali, UN Secretary-General, and funding from the United Nations Development Program. Nine nations and several private foundations also supplied funding. Oscar Arias, former President of Costa Rica was a member of the Commission. Arias won the Nobel Peace Prize for his "peace plan" which called on nations to direct disarmament savings to the UN's development programs.

Adele Simmons, President of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, was a member. Maurice Strong also served on the 28-member Commission.

Several of the Commission's ideas were advanced experimentally at the various world conferences during the early 1990s. They tested the waters particularly for the several global taxation ideas, and for their ideas about global governance through civil society. Their final report was released in conjunction with the 50th anniversary of the United Nations in the fall of 1995, entitled *Our Global Neighborhood: The Report of the Commission on Global Governance*.

The Commission recommended that:

“the General Assembly should agree to hold a World Conference on Governance in 1998, with its decisions to be ratified and put into effect by 2000.”¹⁰³

Hereafter, numbers in parentheses indicate the reference page number in *Our Global Neighborhood*.

The Commission bases its recommendations on the belief that human activities have irreversible environmental impacts and that human activities need to be "managed" to keep the "adverse outcomes within prudent bounds" (p. 11). "Effective and equitable management calls for a systemic, long-term, global approach guided by the principle of sustainable development. Its universal application is a priority among the tasks of global governance" (p. 30).

The Commission is convinced that the world is ready to accept "a set of core values that can unite people of all cultural, political, religious, or philosophical backgrounds.... It is fundamentally important that governance should be underpinned by democracy at all levels and ultimately by the rule of enforceable law" (p.48). "Underpinned by democracy" has a totally different meaning to people who live in a socialist democratic nation, than to people who live in a "free" country such as America. Americans think of "democracy" as the process by which they elect the individuals to represent them in their exercise of the limited power that Americans have chosen to give to their government. In socialist nations, "democracy" means participating in the process by which the sovereign government decides how to manage its subjects.

The "core values" upon which global governance is to be based include liberty. But again, in America, liberty has a totally different meaning from what the Commission describes. "Liberty is threatened by deprivation, economic dislocation, oppression based on gender or sexual orientation, abuse of children, debt bondage, and other social and economic patterns." (p. 50) Americans realize that these conditions are only some of the inherent risks of being free. Liberty is the freedom to exercise individual ingenuity and apply individual energy to avoid the risks and rise above all other dangers.

The very fact that Americans, and others who live in free societies, have risen above these risks, creates an injustice in the world according to the Commission. "Although people are born into widely unequal economic and social circumstances, great disparities in their conditions or life chances are an affront to the human sense of justice. . . . A concern for equity is not tantamount to an insistence on equality, but it does call for deliberate efforts to reduce gross inequalities . . . and to promote a fairer sharing of resources" (p. 51). Mutual respect which is defined to be "tolerance," caring — with a global reach — and integrity, which is defined as supporting the program, round out the Commission's core values.

Voluntary acceptance of global governance is the preferred means of achieving it. Education programs to teach the "global ethic" have been underway by UNESCO and by UNEP for more than 20 years. That the U.S. government, through its representatives to the various UN agencies, has not already crushed this global governance agenda is a testament to the effectiveness of the UN's education program. But the Commission is not content to rely upon voluntary acceptance. An intricate maze of international, enforceable law is encircling the planet in the form of Conventions, Treaties, and Executive Agreements.

To implement, administer, and enforce global governance, the Commission has recommended a major restructuring of the UN system. The Commission recommends an "Assembly of the People" which "should consist of representatives of organizations accredited to the General Assembly as Civil Society Organizations A Forum of 300-600 organs of global civil society would be desirable and practicable" (p. 258-259). A new "Petitions Council" is recommended, to consist of five to seven representatives of "civil society," for the purpose of reviewing petitions from NGOs in the field to direct to the appropriate UN agency for enforcement action (p. 260).

A new Economic Security Council (ESC) would replace the existing Economic and Social Council. The new ESC would consist of no more than 23 members who would have responsibility for all international financial and development activities. The IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO — virtually all finance and development activities — would be under the authority of this body. There would be no veto power by any nation, nor would there be permanent member status for any nation (p. 266f).

The existing Security Council would be restructured. Veto power of the five permanent members would be eliminated, as would permanent member status over time. With the Secretary-General's office expanded to include the function of Commander-in-Chief, the Security Council would oversee a new UN standing army, complete with support and transport capabilities. (p. 100f) The Commission calls for an international convention on curtailment of the arms trade (p. 129), a demilitarization of international society, and disarming of civilians. (p. 131)

A new International Criminal Court would be created, complete with its own "independent prosecutor or a panel of prosecutors of the highest moral character." (p. 324) The International Court of Justice would become "compulsory" and it would issue binding verdicts in order to "strengthen international law." (p.308f)

To protect the environment:

"We propose that the Trusteeship Council . . . be given the mandate of exercising trusteeship over the global commons. The global commons include the atmosphere, outer space, the oceans beyond national jurisdiction, and the related environment and life-support systems that contribute to the support of human life. Its functions would include the administration of environmental treaties in such fields as climate change, biodiversity, outer space and the Law of the Sea. It would refer, as appropriate, any economic or security issues arising from these matters to the Economic Security Council or the Security Council." (p. 251f)

The Commission suggests that "the new Council "would benefit from contributions from civil society organizations. Of major significance is the expansion of the concept of security:

"All people, no less than all states, have a right to a secure existence, and all states have an obligation to protect those rights. (p. 84) Where people are subjected to massive suffering and distress, however, there is a need to weigh a state's right to autonomy against its people's right to security. (p. 71) We believe a global consensus exists today for a UN response on humanitarian grounds in cases of gross abuse of the security of people." (p. 89) The security of the people is challenged "from threats to the earth's life-support systems, extreme economic deprivation, the proliferation of conventional small arms, the terrorizing of civilian populations by domestic factions, and gross violations of human rights." (p. 79)

The Commission believes that the UN should protect the "security of the people" inside the borders of sovereign nations, with or without the invitation of the national government. It proposes the expansion of an NGO "early warning" network to function through the Petitions Council to alert the UN to possible action. It has recommended implementation of the Tobin Tax, and several other taxing schemes. (p. 217f) It has called for a world conference in 1998 to present the treaties and other documents necessary to bring about complete global governance by the year 2000.

1. Basil, Dmytryshyn. Editor. 1974. *IMPERIAL RUSSIA: A SOURCE BOOK, 1700-1917*. Second Edition. Hindsale: The Dryden Press. p. 398, as quoted by Philip C. Bom. *THE COMING CENTURY OF COMMONISM*. 1992. Policy Books, Inc. Virginia Beach, Va., p. 42.
2. Richard Moore, *FODOR'S SOVIET UNION* 1978. David McKay Co., Inc., 1978, p. 107.
3. Ibid, p. 111.
4. Gary H. Kah, *EN ROUTE TO GLOBAL OCCUPATION*. Huntington House Publishers, 1991, Lafayette, Louisiana, p. 29.
5. William Norman Grigg, *FREEDOM ON THE ALTAR: THE UN'S CRUSADE AGAINST GOD AND FAMILY*. American Opinion Publishing, Inc., 1995, Appleton, Wisconsin. p. 18-19.
6. Ibid p. 20.
7. Grigg. Op Cit., p. 21.
8. Kah. Op Cit., p. 31.
9. Harvey Klehr, et al, *THE SECRET WORLD OF AMERICAN COMMUNISM*. (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press. 1995). p. XXVI.
10. Richard Moore, Op Cit., p. 114.
11. Grigg. Op Cit., p. 22.
12. Grigg. Op Cit., p. 174
13. Kah. Op Cit., p. 37.
14. Philip C. Bom, Op Cit., p. 17.
15. William F. Jasper. *GLOBAL TYRANNY . . . STEP BY STEP*, (Appleton, Wisconsin: Western Island Publishers, 1993) p. 16.
16. Kah. Op Cit., p. 36f.
17. Cliff Kincaid. *GLOBAL BONDAGE: THE UN PLAN TO RULE THE WORLD*. (Lafayette, Louisiana: Huntington House Publishers, 1995) p. 36.
18. Kah, Op Cit., p.33.
19. William F. Jasper, Op Cit., p. 165.
20. William Norman Grigg. Op Cit., p. 33.
21. Ibid., p. 38.
22. William Benton, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State, in his initial address before the first meeting of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. September 23, 1946. UNESCO publication No. 356.
23. Harvey Klehr, et al, Op Cit., p. 12.
24. Ibid., p. xxxii
25. William Norman Grigg, Op Cit., p. 23.
26. *THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNITY*. eco-logic. May, 1995. p. 28.
27. *FREEDOM FROM WAR: THE UNITED STATES PROGRAM FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD* (Department of State Publication 7277, Disarmament Series 5, Released September 1961, Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs) as quoted by William F. Jasper. *GLOBAL TYRANNY . . . STEP BY STEP*, p. 13.
28. James Perloff, *THE SHADOWS OF POWER*. (Appleton, Wisconsin: Western Island Publishers, 1992) p.111.
29. Richard Harwood, *RULING CLASS JOURNALISTS*, Washington Post, October 30, 1993, p. A21. (as reported by William Norman Grigg. Op Cit., p. 24.)
30. *THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM — PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS*. eco-logic, May/June. 1996. p. 4.
31. Robert Muller. Comments presented to the College of Law. University of Denver. March 30, 1995, transcribed by Virginia Meves, Brookfield, Wisconsin.
32. *WORLD CORE CURRICULUM MANUAL*, The Robert Muller School, Arlington, Texas. 1985. p. 2.
33. Ibid, preface.
34. Brenda Scott and Samantha Smith. *TROJAN HORSE*. (Lafayette, Louisiana: Huntington House Publishers, 1993) p. 158.
35. Gary H. Kah, Op Cit., p. 77.
36. Michael S. Coffman, *SAVIORS OF THE EARTH*, (Chicago. Illinois: Northfield Publishing Co., 1993), p. 221f.
37. Ron Arnold and Alan Gottlieb, *TRASHING THE ECONOMY*, (Bellevue, Washington: Free Enterprise Press, 1993,), p. 299; from *THE PEOPLE'S FORESTS*, Robert Marshall, p. 210.
38. Larry Abraham with Franklin Sanders, *THE GREENING*, (Atlanta, Georgia: Soundview Publications, 1993, p. 98.
39. Gary H. Kah, Op Cit., p. 43.
40. United States Department Report to Congress, United States Contributions to International Organizations, 40th Annual Report for Fiscal year 1991, p. 20.
41. *MORE THAN YOU WANT TO KNOW ABOUT UNEP*. eco-logic, September/October, 1995, p. 8.
42. Gary H. Kah, Op Cit., p. 43.

43. Ibid., p. 41.
44. MEET MAURICE STRONG. *eco-logic*, November/December, 1995, p. 4.
45. William Norman Grigg, Op Cit., p. 39.
46. Philip C. Bom. Op Cit., p. 36.
47. Philip C. Bom. Op Cit., p. 7.
48. Philip C. Bom. Op Cit., p. x.
49. David A. Witts, *THEFT*, (La Verne, California: University of La Verne Press, 1981, p. 16.
50. MORE THAN YOU WANT TO KNOW ABOUT UNEP. *eco-logic*, September/October, 1995, p. 9.
51. Sean McBride, *MANY VOICES, ONE WORLD*, (New York, New York: Unipub, 1980, p. 270, as quoted by Philip C. Bom. *THE COMING CENTURY OF COMMONISM*, p. 93.
52. HOW THE GAGS DO IT. *eco-logic*. May, 1995, p. 24.
53. Willy Brandt, *NORTH-SOUTH: A PROGRAM FOR SURVIVAL*, (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1980, p. 12f, as quoted by Philip C. Bom. Op Cit., p. 60f.
54. Philip C. Bom. Op Cit., p. 73.
55. Olof Palme, *COMMON SECURITY: A BLUEPRINT FOR SURVIVAL*, (New York, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982), in Philip C. Bom. Op Cit., p.70f.
56. James L. Malone, *MINERAL RESOURCES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENDA*, Mining Voice, November/December, 1995, p. 27. (See also: Convention on the Law of the Sea)
57. Ron Arnold and Alan Gottlieb. Op Cit., p. 537f.
58. Philip C. Bom, Op Cit., p. 81.
59. Gro Harlem Brundtland. *OUR COMMON FUTURE*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987). p. 3.
60. JAMES LOVELOCK VIEWS OUR EARTHLY RELATIONSHIPS. Shared Visions. Global Forum of Spirituality and Parliamentary Leaders on Human Survival. Number 1. 1989, p. 3.
61. COSMOLATRY: THE WORSHIP OF GAIA. *eco-logic*. May, 1995. p. 14f.
62. CATHEDRAL. NEWS OF THE CATHEDRAL OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE. Fall 1994, Volume 8 No. 2 p. 7.
63. IN THEIR OWN WORDS. *eco-logic*, May/June, 1996, p.20f.
64. Ron Arnold and Alan Gottlieb, Op Cit., P. 595f.65.
65. NATIONAL RELIGIOUS PARTNERSHIP FOR THE ENVIRONMENT. STATEMENT OF GOALS, 1047 Amsterdam Ave. New York, NY 10025 (212) 316-7441, Fall, 1995.
66. Robert Jastrow et al, *SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVES ON THE GREENHOUSE PROBLEM*, (Ottawa, Illinois: The Marshall Press, Jameson Books, Inc., 1990), p. 82.
67. CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD. Preamble (paragraph 4).
68. WORLD SCIENTISTS' WARNING TO HUMANITY. Union of Concerned Scientists, 96 Church Street, Cambridge, MA 02238. (617) 547-5552, e-mail: ucs@igc.apc.org.
69. Dixy Lee Ray with Lou Guzzo, *ENVIRONMENTAL OVERKILL*, (Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1993). p.171.
70. Al Gore, *EARTH IN THE BALANCE: ECOLOGY AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT*. (New York, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1992) p. 326.
71. Ibid. p. 270, 274.
72. SECOND TO NONE (The President's address to the Earth Summit). *eco-logic*, August, 1992, p. 13.
73. UNCED REPORT: AN ECO-LOGICAL APPROACH. *eco-logic*, August, 1992, p. 11f.
74. Dixy Lee Ray, *BLAME IT ON RIO? PLATITUDES AND ATTITUDES: A PERSPECTIVE*. *eco-logic*, August, 1992, p. 14.
75. CONSPECTUS, GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENT. United Nations Environment Programme, 5th Issue, November, 1994, p. 1.
76. RESCUE MISSION: PLANET EARTH, Action Update, Issue No. 2 September 5th, 1994, p. 24.
77. We Believe Statement. *SUSTAINABLE AMERICA: A NEW CONSENSUS*. President's Council on Sustainable Development, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996, p. v.
78. IUCN Annual Report, 1993, p. 2.
79. U.S. State Department, Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 1994.
80. OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION, I(D)(45), February, 1994 p. 15.
81. Letter from George Frampton to Dr. Bernd von Droste. UNESCO. June 27, 1995,. A38 (023).
82. Executive Order 12986, January 18, 1996.
83. Global Biodiversity Assessment Section 10, *MEASURES FOR CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF ITS COMPONENTS*. Draft: September 2, 1994, Section 10.4.6.2 p. 243. (See also: Global Biodiversity Assessment. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) p. 1048.

84. Senate Report S. HRG. 103-892. Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations on Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (Ex. R. 96-2). p.18.
85. Ibid. p.5.
86. The New York Times. Friday, April 15 1994, p. A9.
87. Agreement Establishing The World Trade Organization.
88. Jean M Guilfoyle. *THE AGENDA*. Population Research Institute Review. Volume 4, Number 6, November/December 1994, p. 5.
89. Joan M. Veon. *THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS GLOBAL AGENDA FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND FAMILY*, (Olney, MD: TWG, Inc., February, 1996) p. 23.
90. Jacqueline R. Kasun, Ph.D. presentation delivered at the National Conference on Global Environmentalism, Kansas City, Missouri, March 21-23, 1996.
91. Global Biodiversity Assessment Section 9, phase One Draft, Section 9.2.3.2. p. 108 (See also Global Biodiversity Assessment, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 1995, p. 773).
92. NGO Networker, Winter 1994-95, Number 22 p. 4.
93. Rita Joseph, *FROM CAIRO TO COPENHAGEN*, Population Resource Institute Review, Volume 5, Number 2, March/April, 1995, p. 1.
94. Ibid.
95. Ibid. p. 3.
96. Jean M Guilfoyle. *POPULATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE REVIEW*, Volume 5, Number 1, January/February, 1995.
97. Joan M. Veon, Op Cit., p. 24.
98. San Francisco Weekly, May 31, 1995.
99. Lu Haynes, *GORBACHEV IS GIVING BIRTH* Special Report to eco-logic, December 21, 1995.
100. U.S. Department, as reported in eco-logic, March, 1995, p.29.
101. *IS THERE A RIGHT TO HOUSING?* UN DPI/1730/Rev.I/HAB/CON-96-01274, January, 1996.
102. Joan M. Veon, report to eco-logic from Habitat II, Istanbul, Turkey, June 14, 1996.
103. *OUR GLOBAL NEIGHBORHOOD: THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON GLOBAL GOVERNANCE*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) p. 351. (Available from Oxford Press, ISBN 0-190827997-3, 410 pp. , (919) 677-0977)