



Global Fusion: The G20, IMF, and World Government

By the time President Obama and other world leaders headed off to London for the April 2 economic summit of the G20 nations, most Americans may have been still more than a bit fuzzy about the aims and agenda of the alpha-numeric gathering, but virtually everyone above room temperature had at least heard of it, and more than a few were getting an inkling that its outcome might have a significant impact on their jobs, businesses, pocketbooks, pensions, bank accounts, and stock portfolios. In fact, the outcome may be more far-reaching and significant than that, impacting individuals and nations — economically, politically, and socially — far beyond what is generally surmised.



G20 Agenda

Foremost on the G20 agenda is what globalist movers and shakers refer to as "global financial architecture reform," code words for transforming the International Monetary Fund (IMF) into, virtually, a global Federal Reserve System, with vast new monetary and regulatory powers — *and* huge new infusions of cash to be provided principally, as usual, by the citizens of the United States, Japan, and Europe. In addition to pledging \$1.1 trillion to the IMF, the summiteers are proposing that the IMF assume a central role in the monitoring and regulation of global financial markets, and greatly expand Communist China's influence in the IMF structure. In the run-up to the summit, there was even a stunning proposal made by China, Russia, a UN panel, and others — and tacitly endorsed by U.S. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner — to replace the dollar as the world's reserve currency with the IMF's Special Drawing Rights (SDRs)

This "supersizing" of the IMF, as it has become popularly known in globalist circles, falls under the rubric of "global governance stimulus," a term being used to describe the transfer of powers from nation-states to institutions that are part of the United Nations system. That includes, of course, the IMF and World Bank (and regional development banks), which were established as financial sister institutions to the UN by many of the same architects who designed the UN. It includes also the World Trade Organization (WTO), another UN institution that is expected to receive enhanced powers to enforce the G20's announced commitment to "fight all forms of protectionism and maintain open trade."

In fact, French President Nicolas Sarkozy, a closet socialist who is pushing hard to scuttle what little sovereignty remains for nation-states in the European Union, threatened to "walk away" from the London summit if concrete global governance "deliverables" on financial regulation are not met.

And there's much more to come. The London summit, says Dominique Strauss-Kahn, the French economist who is the IMF's managing director, is but the launchpad for an ongoing process. "This reform is a dynamic reform, meaning that it has to be completed over time with several rounds," he said



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 15, 2009

on the eve of the summit. "The first decision, which can be made at the G-20 Summit, will be to shorten this period from 2013 to 2011."

"A new world order is emerging," declared British Prime Minister Gordon Brown at the conclusion of the summit. The signals being sent by Brown, Sarkozy, Strauss-Kahn, Geithner, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, and others should be setting off high-decibel alarm bells. We are witnessing the demolition of our constitutional system and the piecemeal replacement of it with world government. Over the coming months, the architects of this new global system intend to wring every opportunity possible out of the current economic crisis to bulldoze through our constitutional checks and balances that stand in the way of empowering the IMF, the WTO, and the United Nations.

Is the voicing of such concerns being unnecessarily "alarmist"? Of course it is, say the talking heads dispensing the conventional wisdom in the major media.

Coming Out of the Closet

However, it is not only the "alarmists" who are now noting the obvious; some longtime world-government advocates are coming out of the closet and verbally confirming what is empirically and logically apparent: these current "reforms" are pushing us ever closer to actual world government.

One of the semi-uncloseted one-worlders is Gideon Rachman, a leading financial opinionator for the very influential *Financial Times*. In an important op-ed last December 8, Rachman blurted his undisguised enthusiasm for the developing contours of world government appearing from the current so-called reform process. In his column entitled "And now for a world government," the Timesman expresses excitement that "for the first time in my life, I think the formation of some sort of world government is plausible."

And not only plausible, but, as far as Rachman is concerned, very desirable. Rachman describes what he envisions:

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?" Rachman asks. He offers three reasons why he thinks it might: "global warming, a global financial crisis and a 'global war on terror.'"

"The financial crisis and climate change," Rachman avers, "are pushing national governments towards global solutions, even in countries such as China and the US that are traditionally fierce guardians of national sovereignty."

Rachman approvingly quotes from a recent report of a globalist think tank, the Managing Global Insecurity project, calling for a legally binding UN climate-change agreement and the creation of a 50,000-strong UN peacekeeping force. But he observes that the MGI report tellingly avoids using words that might "get people reaching for their rifles in America's talk-radio heartland." "Aware of the political sensitivity of its ideas, the MGI report opts for soothing language," he notes, as for example, using " 'global governance' rather than world government."

But some globalists, especially in Europe, speak more boldly. Rachman notes:

Jacques Attali, an adviser to President Nicolas Sarkozy of France, argues that: "Global governance



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 15, 2009

is just a euphemism for global government." As far as he is concerned, some form of global government cannot come too soon. Mr. Attali believes that the "core of the international financial crisis is that we have global financial markets and no global rule of law."

"So, it seems, everything is in place," says Rachman. "For the first time since homo sapiens began to doodle on cave walls, there is an argument, an opportunity and a means to make serious steps towards a world government."

But, to his disappointment, there is still stubborn resistance to this vision and "any push for 'global governance' in the here and now will be a painful, slow process."

Rachman, the ardent global government proponent, then makes an important admission against interest. He acknowledges:

Even in the EU — the heartland of law-based international government — the idea remains unpopular. The EU has suffered a series of humiliating defeats in referendums, when plans for "ever closer union" have been referred to the voters. In general, the Union has progressed fastest when far-reaching deals have been agreed by technocrats and politicians — and then pushed through without direct reference to the voters. International governance tends to be effective, only when it is anti-democratic.

This, of course, confirms yet again two of the main objections by critics of the processes employed to promote "global governance," "harmonization," "shared sovereignty," "interdependence," and other code words for schemes that subvert national sovereignty and build global government. The first is that globalists perennially mislead and deceive to obtain their objectives; the second is that despite their proclaimed commitments to transparency, democracy, and rule of law, the global-government adherents regularly ignore and violate all of these principles.

Unfortunately, while revealing admissions (and boasts) by other globalists are cropping up, most of Rachman's and Attali's one-world colleagues are more circumspect. When the inquiring journalist or alarmed citizen points to the obvious disturbing destination where this process is taking us, he is given the Wizard of Oz treatment: "Don't pay any attention to that man behind the curtain." In other words, don't believe your eyes, ears, or common sense.

The EU Example

We have a highly apropos example of this as it relates to the skullduggery employed to force the euro currency and the European Central Bank on the people of Europe and the current push to do the same on a global scale with the IMF.

Frederick Forsyth, the bestselling British author, relates a secret meeting to which he was privy some years ago involving Rachman's employer, the *Financial Times*, and EU heavyweights such as Bundesbank President Karl Otto Pohl, German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, British Labour politician Peter Hain, and European Commission President Jacques Delors. Forsyth, an outspoken opponent of the EU threat to national sovereignty, said in a speech to the anti-EU Bruges Group:

I sat once in a meeting ... at the *Financial Times* editorial offices in Blackfriars to listen to Mr. Pohl. He was a former president of the Bundesbank and he had been eased out of that presidency by Helmut Kohl specifically to work with Jacques Delors in the creation of the new currency, the Euro. And he was, I thought, extremely forthcoming. He said, "It is my duty to tell you my English friends ... that you will have to abandon the British nation state because the future has no



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 15, 2009

provision for the nation state within it." There was a stunned silence. And then in the course of the remarks that followed almost immediately afterwards, Peter Hain stood up and told us quite bluntly that we had not heard what we thought we had heard. It hadn't been said. And a rather bemused German former president of the Bundesbank sat there as if someone had accused him of being slightly deranged. He had of course said exactly what he had said. We had all heard it. It was beyond doubt his informed position. He was giving us the final destination of the European Union project.

The *Financial Times* never breathed a word of this meeting or the words of the German central banker to its readers. No indeed, because the *Financial Times* is a very important part of what Forsyth referred to as "a very powerful cabal in our country that is quite literally dedicated, fanatically, to a futuristic dream."

The Forsyth saga related above is especially apropos not only because many of the same deceptive methods are being used to supersize the IMF, but because many of the same key individuals and organizations involved in the euro cabal are now pushing the IMF/SDR scheme.

Take, for instance, Robert Mundell, the Nobel Prize-winning Canadian economist who played a major role in setting up and promoting the euro. He is also a central figure behind the proposed IMF currency, having been a leading advocate of the idea for many years. In a 1990 essay, later reprinted in the *Wall Street Journal*, Mundell wrote: "We have a better opportunity to create a world central bank with a stable international currency than at any previous time in history."

In the week prior to the London summit, when Zhou Xiaochuan, the governor of Communist China's central bank, and Nursultan Nazarbayev, the communist dictator of Kazakhstan, both called for a global currency and a global central bank, Mundell was trotted out in the major media to provide his stamp of approval. "It would be a very good idea if the G20 took that idea up in London," Mundell said.

U.S. Officials "Open to" Ditching Dollar

But it is the *American* globalists, especially those serving as elected and appointed federal officials — not the Chinese, Canadians, or Europeans — who should most concern American citizens. On March 25, U.S. Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-Minn.) rightfully took Secretary Geithner to task for being deceptive about his true intentions concerning China's global currency proposal. Rep. Bachmann's office issued a release declaring:



"Yesterday, during a Financial Services



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 15, 2009

Committee hearing, I asked Secretary Geithner if he would denounce efforts to move towards a global currency and he answered unequivocally that he would," said Bachmann. "And President Obama gave the nation the same assurances. But just a day later, Secretary Geithner has left the option on the table. I want to know which it is. The American people deserve to know."

Asked today about a currency proposal from China at a Council on Foreign Relations event, Secretary Geithner stated he was open to supporting it. Despite attempts to clarify his remarks later in the day, the unguarded initial response calls into question his true intentions.

A transcript and video of Geithner's statement at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) are available on the organization's website. Geithner says: "as I understand his [Zhou Xiaochuan's] proposal, it's a proposal designed to increase the use of the IMF's special drawing rights. *And we're actually quite open to that suggestion.* But you should think of it as rather evolutionary, building on the current architectures ... rather than moving us to global monetary union." (Emphasis added.)

Secretary Geithner's denials notwithstanding, Communist China's proposals for the new currency reserve are indeed a scheme for "moving us to global monetary union." It is an attempt to move us closer to the original vision of Lord John Maynard Keynes, the Fabian Socialist, architect of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. Keynes had hoped to replace the dollar with a new global fiat currency he called the "bancor." Zhou Xiaochuan's proposal, posted on the website of the People's Bank of China, cites Keynes as his inspiration:

Back in the 1940s, Keynes had already proposed to introduce an international currency unit named "Bancor," based on the value of 30 representative commodities. Unfortunately, the proposal was not accepted.... The creation of an international currency unit, based on the Keynesian proposal, is a bold initiative that requires extraordinary political vision and courage.

Nexus of Globalism

It is not surprising that Geithner's comments came at an event of the Council on Foreign Relations. Geithner is a longtime member of the organization, and the CFR has been the principal fount through which proposals to empower the UN and its affiliates have flowed into academia, the media, and official government circles since the UN was created more than six decades ago.

In fact, CFR members in the Roosevelt administration dominated both the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference that created the IMF/World Bank system and the parallel 1944 Dumbarton Oaks Conference that created the United Nations Charter. The principal U.S. official in charge of the Bretton Woods Conference was Treasury official Harry Dexter White, a CFR member (as well as a Soviet agent), who worked closely with Keynes to craft a system that would gradually transfer global financial control to the United Nations.

The most influential proposals for empowering the UN and the IMF today continue to flow from the CFR and its subsidiary think tanks, which include the Greenberg Center for Geoeconomic Studies, the International Institutions and Global Governance Program, the David Rockefeller Studies Program, the Center for Preventive Action, and the Center for Universal Education, as well as similar organizations that are dominated by CFR members: the Peterson Institute for International Economics, the Brookings Institution, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, the Clinton Global Initiative, and the Carter Center — to name a few.

The CFR's International Institutions and Global Governance Program (IIGG) calls for "re-conceptualizing 'sovereignty' in an age of globalization," openly admires the EU model for having



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 15, 2009

"chosen to 'pool' their sovereignty in return for economic, social and political benefits," and speaks approvingly of "the evolution of new norms of state sovereignty" and an "emerging doctrine of 'contingent sovereignty.'" "

This has been the central CFR theme for nearly a century. When the group's leading lights are not attacking outright the very concept of national sovereignty, they are usually attempting to define it into oblivion. National sovereignty is, of course, the main obstacle to what they call "world order." A 1944 CFR study lamented the American public's "sovereignty fetish."

Walt W. Rostow (CFR), a big name in the State Department and National Security Council during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, called in 1960 for "an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined." He also called for "the creation of a world order" which would include "world law and some form of world government."

Ambassador Richard N. Gardner (CFR) argued for patient gradualism in his famous 1974 article in the CFR journal *Foreign Affairs* entitled "The Hard Road to World Order." Since attempts at "instant world government" had been foiled by America's obstinate clinging to sovereignty, he conceded that "an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault."

Similar pronouncements by prominent globalists, both Republican and Democrat, could be multiplied a hundred fold. Most have followed the advice of historian Arnold Toynbee, an ardent globalist and member of the CFR's British sister organization, the Royal Institute for International Affairs (RIIA). Toynbee, who was (and still is) highly venerated in CFR circles, advised fellow one-worlders simply to lie to their countrymen about their revolutionary plans. "I believe that the monster of sovereignty is doomed to perish by our sword," Toynbee confidently declared in a 1931 speech that was later published in the RIIA's journal. "[W]e are at present working, discreetly but with all our might," he said, "to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. *And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands*, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local national states of the world is still a heresy for which a statesman or a publicist can be ... ostracized and discredited." (Emphasis added.)

So, most globalists have adopted the Toynbeean path of prevarication and couching their world government aims in less threatening terms such as "world order," "global governance," and "responsible sovereignty."

Obama's Globalist Brain Trust

Globalist-without-equal Henry Kissinger (CFR) declared in recent interviews with PBS and CNBC that there is "a need for a new world order" to bring the world back from "the abyss," and said that President Obama's "task will be to develop an overall strategy for America in this period, when really a 'new world order' can be created."

President Obama is getting plenty of help with that new world order "task" from the globalist brain trust he has appointed as staff, cabinet, and advisers, including these CFR members: George Mitchell, Richard Holbrooke, Tim Geithner, Robert Gates, Janet Napolitano, Susan Rice, Eric Shinseki, Ivo Daalder, Neal Wolin, Lael Brainard, Ashton Carter, and Michele A. Flournoy. The list could go on and on.

Brookings Institution President Strobe Talbott (CFR), an Obama adviser, is a full-blown one-worlder. In a 1992 essay for *Time* magazine entitled "The Birth of the Global Nation," Talbott rhapsodized over a



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 15, 2009

future he saw materializing in which "nationhood as we know it will be obsolete; all states will recognize a single, global authority."

In this regard, we see little change from previous administrations running all the way back to the days of FDR and Truman. *Washington Post* ombudsman Richard Harwood has described the CFR as "the nearest thing we have to a ruling establishment in the United States." Writing of the council's top-heavy presence in the Clinton retinue, Harwood observed in the October 30, 1993 issue of the *Post* that "they very definitely look like the people who, for more than half a century, have managed our international affairs and our military-industrial complex."

That unbroken trend continued through the Bush retinue and into the new Obama retinue. This is especially disturbing if the charges of the late Admiral Chester Ward have any merit. Admiral Ward resigned from the CFR after being a member for 16 years, having come to the conclusion that the organization existed for the subversive "purpose of promoting disarmament and submergence of U.S. sovereignty and national independence into an all-powerful one-world government."

Turning the Founders Upside Down

The facts support this grim assessment. And hand in hand with the CFR's abhorrence of national sovereignty is its animosity toward limited constitutional government. The CFR's globalists at the IIGG Program lament the United States' resistance to the ideals of global governance. They seem particularly annoyed that "the separation of powers enshrined in the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress a critical voice in the ratification of treaties and endorsement of global institutions, complicates U.S. assumptions of new international obligations." The Founders *intended* that the separation of powers would "complicate" efforts to expand government power, whether under legitimate or phony claims of "obligation."

This IIGG complaint echoes a familiar refrain in CFR literature since its earliest days.

In 1928, the CFR's first *Survey of American Foreign Relations* openly attacked the U.S. Constitution's intricate checks and balances as incompatible with "responsible government." The CFR study charges that our Constitution's most salutary and venerated features are actually defects:

The jealous control of the purse by Congress is a check which would inevitably curb an ambitious president.... The comparative equality of power of the two houses, rendering each a check upon the other, the "states' rights" sentiment which prevents a gradual subordination of the Senate, and the position of the Supreme Court as final interpreter of the constitutional separation of powers — all these militate against the development of responsible government.

Hence it was not surprising that in the 1980s top leaders of the CFR headed up a front group, the Committee on the Constitutional System, to remove those checks and balances. Their principal playbook, *Reforming American Government*, infamously admitted their subversive designs. It declared: "Let us face reality. The framers have simply been too shrewd for us. They have outwitted us. They designed separated institutions that cannot be unified by mechanical linkages, frail bridges, tinkering. If we are to 'turn the founders upside down' — to put together what they put asunder — we must directly confront the constitutional structure they erected."

Turning the American founders upside down is precisely what the CFR-led globalists are attempting to do in their current drives for "global governance." This is very evident in the push to transform the IMF. We are already saddled with the Federal Reserve System, a dangerously arrogant threat to our economy and our constitutional system. However, it is still possible, if enough Americans can be



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 15, 2009

educated, motivated, and activated, to force Congress to curtail the Fed's powers, or even (yes, please!) abolish this unconstitutional monstrosity. The IMF is another matter. Congress can (and should) cut off any further U.S. participation in and contributions to the fund. If it does not and allows the IMF to be bumped up to the levels proposed by the "supersizers," Congress soon will find that it has lost what little leverage it has had on the IMF's conduct and policies.

If the IMF is empowered with global monetary and financial regulatory powers, along with the ability to issue a global currency and bonds, it will no longer have to ask its member states for funding. Nor will the UN. The IMF will be able to provide the UN with the revenues it needs to become an actual world government, completely unbridled by any constitutional constraints, accountable to no one but the "very powerful cabal" (Forsyth's words) running the show.



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.