

# A Very Real New World Order

---

by Chuck Baldwin

It is hard to believe, but a majority of Americans (including Christians and conservatives) seem oblivious to the fact that there is a very real, very legitimate New World Order (NWO) unfolding. In the face of overwhelming evidence, most Americans not only seem totally unaware of this reality, they seem unwilling to even remotely entertain the notion.

On one hand, it is understandable that so many Americans would be ignorant of the emerging New World Order. After all, the mainstream media refuses to report, or even acknowledge, the NWO. Even "conservative" commentators and talk show hosts such as Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Michael Savage, or Joe Scarborough refuse to discuss it. And when listeners call these respective programs, these "conservative" hosts usually resort to insulting the caller as being some kind of "conspiracy kook." One host even railed that if anyone questions the government line on 9/11, we should "lock them up and throw away the key." So much for freedom of speech!

This is an area--perhaps the central area--where liberals and conservatives agree: they both show no patience or tolerance for anyone who believes that global government (in any form) is evolving. One has to wonder how otherwise intelligent and thoughtful people can be so brain dead when it comes to this issue. It makes one wonder who is really pulling their strings, doesn't it?

The list of notable personalities who have openly referenced or called for some kind of global government or New World Order is extremely lengthy. Are all these people "kooks" or "conspiracy nuts"? Why would world leaders--including presidents, secretaries of state, and high government officials; including the media, financial, and political elite--constantly refer to something that doesn't exist? Why would they write about, talk about, or openly promote a New World Order, if there is no such thing?

Many of us recall President George Herbert Walker Bush talking much about an emerging New World Order. For example, in 1989, Bush told the students of Texas A&M University, "Perhaps the world order of the future will truly be a family of nations."

Later, Bush, Sr. said, "We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order . . . When we are successful, and we will be, we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.'s founders."

Bush, Sr. also said, "What is at stake is more than one small country, it is a big idea--a new world order."

Bush, Sr. further said, "The world can therefore seize the opportunity to fulfill the long-held promise of a new world order . . ."

What was President G.H.W. Bush talking about, if there is no such thing as an emerging New World Order? Was he talking out of his mind? Was he hallucinating?

England's Prime Minister, Tony Blair, said, "We are all internationalists now, whether we like it or not." He continued saying, "On the eve of a new Millennium we are now in a new world. We need new rules for international co-operation and new ways of organizing our international institutions." He also said, "Today the impulse towards interdependence is immeasurably greater. We are witnessing the beginnings of a new doctrine of international community."

In 1999, Tony Blair said, "Globalization has transformed our economies and our working practices. But globalism is not just economic. It is also a political and security phenomenon."

What is Tony Blair talking about, if there is no emerging New World Order? What does he mean by "a new doctrine of international community"? What does he mean by "new world"? How can one have globalism, which includes "a political and security phenomenon," without creating a New World Order? Is Tony Blair hallucinating?

Likewise, former President George W. Bush penned his signature to the Declaration of Quebec back on April 22, 2001, in which he gave a "commitment to hemispheric integration and national and collective responsibility for improving the economic well-being and security of our people."

By "our people," Bush meant the people of the Western Hemisphere, not the people of the United States. Phyllis Schlafly rightly reminded us that G.W. Bush "pledged that the United States will 'build a hemispheric family on the basis of a more just and democratic international order.'"

Remember, too, that it was G.W. Bush who, back in 2005, committed the United States to the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP), which is nothing more than a precursor to the North American Community or Union, as outlined in CFR member Robert Pastor's manual, "Toward a North American Community."

If there is no such thing as an emerging New World Order, what was G.W. Bush talking about when he referred to "a hemispheric family" and an "international order"?

The public statements of notable world leaders regarding an emerging New World Order are copious. Consider the statements of former CBS newsman, Walter Cronkite.

In his book, "A Reporter's Life," Walter Cronkite said, "A system of world order--preferably a system of world government--is mandatory. The proud nations someday will see the light and, for the common good and their own survival, yield up their precious sovereignty . . ." Cronkite told BBC newsman Tim Sebastian, "I think we are realizing that we are going to have to have an international rule of law." He added, "We need not only an executive to make international law, but we need the military forces to enforce that law." Cronkite also said, "American people are going to begin to realize that perhaps they are going to have to yield some sovereignty to an international body to enforce world law."

If there is no emerging New World Order, what is Walter Cronkite talking about? Can there be any doubt that Cronkite is talking about global government? Absolutely not!

Now, when Bush, Sr. talks about fulfilling "the promise and vision of the U.N.'s founders," he was talking about the same thing former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali was talking about when he said, "The time for absolute and exclusive sovereignty . . . has passed."

The United Nations has been on the forefront of promoting the New World Order agenda since its very inception. In 1995, the UN released a manual entitled, "Our Global Neighborhood." It states, "Population, consumption, technology, development, and the environment are linked in complex relationships that bear closely on human welfare in the global neighborhood. Their effective and equitable management calls for a systematic, long-term, global approach guided by the principle of sustainable development, which has been the central lesson from the mounting ecological dangers of recent times. Its universal application is a priority among the tasks of global governance."

If there is no emerging New World Order, what is "global governance" all about?

"Who are the movers and shakers promoting global government?" you ask. Obviously, it is the international bankers who are the heavyweights behind the push for global government. Remember, one cannot create a "global economy" without a global government to manage, oversee, and control it.

In a letter written to Colonel E. Mandell House, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "The real truth of the matter is, as you and I know, that a financial element in the large centers has owned the government of the U.S. since the days of Andrew Jackson."

[http://www.postchronicle.com/commentary/article\\_212204321.shtml](http://www.postchronicle.com/commentary/article_212204321.shtml)