



Written by [Brian Farmer](#) on April 9, 2009

National Sovereignty Is Under Attack (Again)

It is interesting to note that *A Plan for Action* appeared not long after a May 2008 [paper](#) published by the Council on Foreign Relations, which dealt with many of the same issues. One of the three authors of *A Plan for Action*, Carlos Pascual, is a CFR member.



As Bolton points out in his critique, "There is no question, however, that the ideas advanced in *A Plan for Action* have become mainstays in the liberal vision of the future of American foreign policy. That is what makes *A Plan for Action* especially interesting, and especially worrisome." It is worrisome because its authors view the European Union as a model worth emulating. And a statement from the official communiqué at the conclusion of the recent G20 summit in London reinforces that concern: "We believe that the only sure foundation for sustainable globalization and rising prosperity for all is an open world economy based on market principles, effective regulation, and strong global institutions."

The argument that peace and prosperity depend on "strong global institutions" is a deception easily disproved by history. During the 19th century, a kind of "United Nations" existed which had virtually everything that could be desired to insure the success of a central government for a group of independent states. The member states of that united group all spoke the same language. They had the advantage of the same religious and cultural background. There were no restrictions relating to travel or trade among them. They even had a charter that was generally recognized as ideal for the purpose of uniting independent nations.

Those "United Nations" had the most favorable opportunity ever known to prove the claim that a central government can unite nations and preserve the peace, when there are major differences in the philosophies and goals of the member states. For years the member states openly debated the issues that divided them. But as always happens when vital issues are publicly discussed by various politicians, the resulting inflammatory rhetoric made the situation worse instead of better.

In the end, those "United Nations" fought each other in one of the most destructive wars ever waged. For four long years, they used every weapon available to slaughter each other at every opportunity. Yes, that is the story of the United States of America and its so-called "Civil War." But the same basic story has happened elsewhere, as well: in France, Russia, and China, to name just a few.



Written by [Brian Farmer](#) on April 9, 2009

Despite all of the historical experience and evidence to the contrary, we are still told by the global power elites that global institutions such as the United Nations represent our last best hope for world peace. And yet, since the United Nations was created, there have been violent and deadly conflicts going on continuously.

The American people were asked to sponsor and support a completely alien concept of government, when the United States joined the United Nations. We were asked to reject the traditional American concept of government as a protector of individual rights and instead embrace the collectivist ideology reflected in the UN Charter, which implies that government can decide what rights we have. We have not yet completely abandoned our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our national sovereignty, but we are gradually moving in that direction.

The global power elites view national sovereignty as some quaint, old-fashioned notion that has been overtaken by the complexity of our modern world. They view the political and economic ideas relating to free markets, private property, and limited government as being adequate for the relatively simple conditions of the 19th century, but not for a more advanced global civilization. It is important to understand and debunk this fallacy that we need “effective regulation, and strong global institutions,” because it leads directly to socialistic planning and a collectivist world government.

Imagine the simplest situation, which would be a society populated by two individuals. Could anyone honestly think that Person A would be competent enough to determine what Person B should do with his time, how he should act, etc.? Now imagine a society populated by a hundred people. Would Person A be competent enough to control all of their creative actions? Now imagine a society populated by hundreds of millions of individuals, such as the United States. If one were to suggest that one person, or even a committee of so-called “experts,” would be competent enough to manage their lives and their billions of associations and exchanges, any rational observer would consider that suggestion to be absurd.

Hence, it is obvious that the more complex a society, the more certain it is that governmental control will retard productive effort. And it logically follows that, the more complex a society, the more we should rely on the self-adapting processes of individuals acting freely, liberated from the coercive influence of government. In the end, it should be intuitively obvious that “global institutions” cannot accurately anticipate, let alone intelligently control, every aspect of human activity everywhere on the planet. And yet, that is precisely what the global power elites expect us to believe. That collectivist mindset must be resisted, if we are to retain what rights and freedoms we still possess.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.