

# A Very Real New World Order

By Chuck Baldwin  
January 27, 2009

This column is archived at  
[http://www.chuckbaldwinlive.com/c2009/cbarchive\\_20090127.html](http://www.chuckbaldwinlive.com/c2009/cbarchive_20090127.html)

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."

"Old Hickory" did his best to rid the United States from the death grip that the international bankers were beginning to exert on this country. He may have been the last President to actually oppose the bankers. In discussing the Bank Renewal bill with a delegation of bankers in 1832, Jackson said, "Gentlemen, I have had men watching you for a long time, and I am convinced that you have used the funds of the bank to speculate in the breadstuffs of the country. When you won, you divided the profits amongst you, and when you lost, you charged it to the bank. You tell me that if I take the deposits from the bank and annul its charter, I shall ruin ten thousand families. That may be true, gentlemen, but that is your sin! Should I let you go on, you will ruin fifty thousand families, and that would be my sin! You are a den of vipers and thieves. I intend to rout you out, and by the eternal God, I will rout you out."

Unfortunately, the international bankers proved themselves to be too formidable for President Jackson. And in 1913, with the collaboration of President Woodrow Wilson, the bankers were given charge over America's financial system by the creation of the Federal Reserve.

Ever since the CFR and Trilateral Commission were created, they have filled the key leadership positions of government, big media, and of course, the Federal Reserve.

In his book, "With No Apologies," former Republican Presidential nominee Barry Goldwater wrote, "The Trilateral Commission is intended to be the vehicle for multinational consolidation of the commercial and banking interests by seizing control of the political

government of the United States. The Trilateral Commission represents a skillful, coordinated effort to seize control and consolidate the four centers of power-- political, monetary, intellectual and ecclesiastical. What the Trilateral Commission intends is to create a worldwide economic power superior to the political governments of the nation-states involved. As managers and creators of the system, they will rule the future." Was Goldwater a prophet or what?

And again, the goals of the global elite have been publicly stated. Back in 1991, the founder of the CFR, David Rockefeller praised the major media for their complicity in helping to facilitate the globalist agenda by saying, "We are grateful to the Washington Post, The New York Times, Time Magazine and other great publications whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their promises of discretion for almost forty years. . . . It would have been impossible for us to develop our plan for the world if we had been subjected to the lights of publicity during those years. But, the world is now more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national auto-determination practiced in past centuries."

How could Rockefeller be any plainer? He acknowledged the willful assistance of the major media in helping to keep the elitists' agenda of global government from the American people. To this day, the major media has not deviated from that collaboration. And this includes the aforementioned "conservative" talking heads. They know if they want to keep their jobs, they dare not reveal the New World Order. The NWO, more than anything else, is the "Third Rail" to the national media.

Is it any wonder that President Barack Obama has stacked his government with numerous members of the CFR? Among these are Robert Gates, Janet Napolitano, Eric Shinseki, Timothy Geithner, and Tom Daschle. Other CFR members include CFR President Richard Haass, CFR Director Richard Holbrooke, and founding member of the Trilateral Commission and CFR member Paul Volcker. Obama even asked a CFR member, Rick Warren, to deliver the inaugural prayer.

Still not convinced? Just a few days ago, when asked by a reporter what he thought the most important thing was that Barack Obama could accomplish, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said, "I think his task will be develop an overall strategy for America in this period when, really, a New World Order can be created. It's a great opportunity; it isn't just a crisis."

This is the same Henry Kissinger, you will recall, who said back in 1991, "Today, America would be outraged if UN troops entered Los Angeles to restore order. Tomorrow, they will be grateful! This is especially true if they were told that there were [sic] an outside threat from beyond, whether real or promulgated, that threatened our very existence. It is then that all peoples of the world will plead to deliver them from this evil. The one thing every man fears is the unknown. When presented with this scenario, individual rights will be willingly relinquished for the guarantee of their well-being granted to them by the World Government."

Even Gideon Rachman, the chief foreign affairs commentator for the Financial Times, wrote an editorial expressing his support for world government.

In his column he said, "I have never believed that there is a secret United Nations plot to take over the US. . . . But, for the first time in my life, I think the formation of some sort of world government is plausible.

"A 'world government' would involve much more than co-operation between nations. It would be an entity with state-like characteristics, backed by a body of laws. The European Union has already set up a continental government for 27 countries, which could be a model. The EU has a supreme court, a currency, thousands of pages of law, a large civil service and the ability to deploy military force.

"So could the European model go global? There are three reasons for thinking that it might."

Rachman then goes on to explain the reasons why he believes world government is plausible.

Do you now see why it does not matter to a tinker's dam whether it is a Republican or Democrat who resides at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue? For the most part, both major parties in Washington, D.C., have been under the dominating influence of the international bankers who control the Federal Reserve, the CFR, and the Trilateral Commission. And this is also why it does not matter whether one calls himself conservative or liberal. For the most part, both conservatives and liberals in Washington, D.C., are facilitating the emerging New World Order. It is time we wake up to this reality.

Presidents Bush, Sr., Bill Clinton, and Bush, Jr. have thoroughly set the table for the implementation of the NWO, as surely as the sun rises in the east. All Obama has to do is put the food on the table--and you can count on this: Barack Obama will serve up a New World Order feast like you cannot believe!

That a New World Order is emerging is not in question. The only question is, what will freedom-loving Americans do about it? Of course, the first thing they have to do is admit that an emerging New World Order exists! Until conservatives, Christians, pastors, constitutionalists, and others who care about a sovereign, independent United States acknowledge the reality of an emerging New World Order, they will be incapable of opposing it. And right now, that is exactly what they are not doing.