

Old agenda presented for new world order

by William Jones

At a press conference in Washington, D.C. on July 22, members of a task force sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace presented their program for the “new world order” in a glossy brochure entitled “Changing Our Ways: America and the New World.” The commission was labeled as being of a “bipartisan” character, and included leading denizens of the Washington Beltway such as Winston Lord, former U.S. ambassador to China (the commission’s chairman); Morton Abramowitz, former U.S. ambassador to Turkey and Thailand and president of the Carnegie Endowment; former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. William Crowe; C. Fred Bergsten, head of the International Institute of Economics; Barber Conable, former head of the World Bank; population control advocate Jessica Tuchman Mathews; and a gaggle of other Washington figures.

Abramowitz began by complaining how the ongoing presidential campaign had been sorely lacking any discussion of foreign policy. The aim of the report, he explained, was precisely to focus on the new foreign policy requirements of the “post-containment era,” to reintroduce foreign policy issues into the presidential campaign, and to create a “national consensus” on foreign policy.

But why all the fuss with this “new agenda”? Hadn’t President Bush quite effectively launched the “post-containment era” with his bloody carnage in Iraq under the flag of the United Nations and with the consent of the rapidly dissolving Soviet Union? Hadn’t Bush given the one-world agenda a place in the sun by making the United Nations, under the dictate of the Anglo-Americans, the sole arbiters of “nuclear proliferation” and “technology transfer” to the Third World, thus placing in their hands the future of the industrial potential of India, Pakistan, Malaysia, and many other developing nations?

Indeed, the authors of the “new agenda” had praise for the Bush administration for many of its actions. They felt, however, that there were serious gaps in the Bush policy. The continued pressure from an increasingly bankrupt U.S. industry prevented Bush from “taking the lead” on more far-ranging environmental restrictions than those already mandated by the Clean Air Act. The commission proposed to make things easier by raising taxes on gasoline and other petroleum products in order to force consumers to “greater efficiency” in the use of energy, making alternative energy

resources more profitable—and slashing the standards of living of the population as a whole. They also urged that the U.S. Congress quickly ratify the global warming treaty signed by Bush at the Rio Summit.

Although speaking profusely about the new organs of international collaboration, even proposing that Japan and Germany be made members of the U.N. Security Council, it was clear that there would be top-down control imposed on this “brave new world.” “The United States is the world’s leading military power,” says the report, and “we must keep it that way.”

‘U.S. should resume lead in genocide’

Perhaps of most significance for these spokesmen for the Anglo-American political elites was the all-important question of population control. “The U.S. should resume its leadership in world population policy,” said Abramowitz, touching on an issue on which the commissioners felt that the Bush administration had failed. In order not to alienate the strong right-to-life contingent which he inherited from the Reagan-Bush administration, Bush has been politically careful to tone down his championing of population control, one of his lifelong commitments, during his term as President, a fact that genocidalist Jessica Mathews lamented in her remarks.

About one thing, however, there should be no doubt: the Carnegie Endowment report is truly “bipartisan.” Issuing the report during the most intensive period of the U.S. presidential campaign was, of course, no coincidence. In all essential respects, four years with George Bush has laid the foundation for this “new world” espoused by the Carnegie crew. A Clinton administration would probably try to realize the same goals in a little different manner and dressed in a somewhat different ideological garb.

The purpose of the Carnegie Endowment’s “Changing Our Ways” is much more fundamental. This was indirectly indicated by one of the speakers at the press conference, David Gergen, editor-at-large for *U.S. News & World Report*, when he divided the present century into three major epochs: the post-1919 Versailles era, the postwar Bretton Woods era, and the present “post-containment era.” As Bretton Woods was the extension of the “Anglo-American Century” established at Versailles; so the “brave new world” of the Carnegie Endowment is an attempt to ensure Anglo-American dominance of the “post-containment era” by means of a ruthless one-world regime.

In sum, the document reeks of the rot of an *ancien régime*. By attempting to impose their global dictatorship, the theoreticians of this “new world order” have effectively fomented a series of local and regional wars, which are rapidly cascading toward World War III. If the “new world” remains under the “old management” of the Anglo-American financial elites which have wreaked such havoc during this century, the human race may not be around to enjoy the next.