



Global Tyranny ... Bloc by Bloc

“How do you eat an elephant?” asks an old riddle. The answer: “One bite at a time.” It is the same with any large task; successful accomplishment requires dividing the project into logical constituent parts and then systematically, incrementally proceeding, step by step, bite by bite. In the case of our elephant metaphor, that would mean skinning, dressing, and quartering or sectioning the animal, cutting it into smaller and smaller parts, until the desired consumable size is reached.

The globalist insiders and their communist partners have done precisely this throughout the course of the 20th century. From one corner of the globe to the other, the Communists have sponsored revolutions and “wars of national liberation,” pitting tribe against tribe, or exploiting some other division based upon race, creed, class, nationality, or past grievances. The insiders, operating from their positions of power in the business, financial, political, and media worlds, have repeatedly supported these ruinous tumults. They have provided financial and propaganda assistance as well as undermined the targeted governments through direct political pressure or diplomatic intrigue from Washington, D.C. and London.

Through this convulsive process of controlled chaos, nations, kingdoms, and empires have been toppled, borders erased and redrawn, stable social and political systems uprooted, and whole peoples annihilated or driven as refugees into foreign lands. The maps of Europe, Africa, and Asia, especially, have been repeatedly redrawn in this fashion, with the result that the number of nation states in the world has increased from 72 at the end of World War II to 195 today. Some of these nations were artificially created by, and had their borders drawn by, the United Nations. Others, though not officially spawned by the UN, are the illegitimate offspring of the insiders and the Communists who created the UN.

These newly created entities have been manipulated, with relative ease, into joining various regional organizations established, ostensibly, for the mutual benefit of the countries involved. Thus, the Organization of American States (OAS), the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the European Union (EU), the European Monetary Union (EMU), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Middle East-North Africa economic area (MENA), and other regional organizations have sprouted and grown into sizable establishments wielding increasing power.

It is no accident that these regional Intergovernmental Organizations (or IGOs, in globospeak) have been grasping for more power — at the expense of their nation-state members. Most of them were planned from the beginning to do that very thing. They were designed eventually to become — through gradual accretions of legislative, executive, and judicial powers — regional supra-state governments which could, ultimately, be merged with other regional entities to form a world government under the United Nations. What is now known as the European Union is a case in point. It was a colossal “bait and switch,” presented as a trade pact, but intended from the start to become a nation-destroying super government.

Submerging the U.S.A.

Two of the main regional IGOs that currently present a real and increasing danger to the United States are NAFTA and NATO, the former being a fairly recent creation formed for economic pretexts (trade, principally), and the latter of considerably older vintage established as a military alliance under a



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 9, 2001

pretext of “collective security.” Each of these IGOs is serving, in the words of top globalist operative Richard N. Gardner, as an “end run around national sovereignty, eroding it bit by bit.”

The North American Free Trade Agreement and the campaign to secure its passage in Congress were closely modeled after the insiders’ game plan four decades earlier to establish the Common Market, later known as the European Community and (most recently) the European Union. And it is very clear that the Pratt House one-worlders intend to “evolve” NAFTA into a full-fledged, supra-national, regional government like the EU, but on an accelerated timeline, accomplishing in one decade what it has taken them four to do in Europe. We are not speculating on this; the world planners have told us this repeatedly, as we will show.

NAFTA, which was originally promoted as a tripartite “free trade” agreement that would open markets and expand trade between Canada, the United States, and Mexico, is now being transformed into a Western Hemisphere Free Trade Association (WHFTA), with a single currency (the U.S. dollar is being proposed, for now), a hemispheric central bank, and an entire hemispheric regime of regulations to “harmonize” business, industry, labor, agriculture, transportation, immigration, environment, health, trade, and other policies “from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego.” NAFTA is not, and never was, about “free trade.” Free trade — real free trade — is a voluntary exchange between two parties, unhampered by government intervention.

But NAFTA, like the European Union, seeks to regulate and control virtually every industrial, agricultural, environmental, and labor matter. Rather than creating or permitting economic freedom by eliminating government intervention, NAFTA seeks to homogenize the plethora of socialist interventions that now hamstring the U.S., Mexican, and Canadian economies.

Insider Jacques Delors, the socialist president of the European Community Commission in 1992, when the NAFTA debate was raging, clearly saw the parallels between the two regional organizations. Delors gloated that “NAFTA is a form of flattery for us Europeans. In many ways, we have shown what positive, liberating effect these regional arrangements can have.” Naturally, what a thorough socialist and internationalist like Delors considers “positive” and “liberating” tends to jarringly conflict with “negative” and “retrograde” concepts such as independence, sovereignty, free enterprise, property rights, and constitutional limitations on power.

Foreign Affairs, the journal of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), led the way, with a continuous fusillade of pro-NAFTA articles, some of which even conceded, in essence, a key point made by this author and other NAFTA opponents at the time, to wit, that NAFTA was, in reality, a stealth plan to foist an EU-type regional government scheme upon Americans. “The creation of trilateral dispute-resolution mechanisms and rule-making bodies on border and environmental issues may also be *embryonic forms of more comprehensive structures*” (emphasis added), M. Delal Baer approvingly wrote in the Fall 1991 *Foreign Affairs*. “After all, international organizations and agreements like GATT and NAFTA by definition minimize assertions of sovereignty in favor of a joint rule-making authority.”

Dr. Baer went on to draw a direct analogy to the EC, suggesting:

It may be useful to revisit the spirit of the Monnet Commission, which provided a blueprint for Europe at a moment of extraordinary opportunity. The three nations of North America, in more modest fashion, have also arrived at a defining moment. They may want to create a wiseman’s North American commission to operate in the post-ratification period.... The commission might also adopt a forward-looking agenda on themes such as North American competitiveness, links between



scientific institutions, borderland integration, the continental ecological system and educational and cultural exchanges.

Dr. Baer was not telling anything new to the CFR's top political operatives; they were already lined up behind the internationalist program. Republican President George H.W. Bush (CFR), Democrat House Majority Leader Richard Gephardt (CFR), and Republican House Minority Leader Newt Gingrich (CFR) played the pivotal political roles in pushing "fast track" authority for NAFTA through Congress — with massive help from their CFR confrères in the worlds of business, banking, media, and academia. And the same players campaigned furiously and continuously for final approval of the deceitful agreement.

The CFR internationalists intend to use NAFTA (and their proposed WHFTA) to foster, first, economic *interdependence* between the United States and other nations and then economic *integration* as a means, ultimately, to achieving *political* interdependence *and* integration. Which is precisely the path the insiders trod in foisting the EU upon the unsuspecting peoples of Western Europe.

European Union

The following points are key to an understanding of the Common Market/United Europe movement and its counterpart, NAFTA, in this hemisphere:

- While posing as a "bottom-up" popular movement, it was completely a "top-down" enterprise, run entirely by an elite coterie of one-worlders.
- While posing as a native European movement, it was largely directed by U.S. insiders and almost totally financed by U.S. taxpayers.
- Presented to Americans as a way to defend Western Europe from Communism, it has instead been used to drive Europe into socialism.
- Warnings that the Common Market would erode national sovereignty were shouted down as paranoid ravings, but they have proven true.
- The national and local governments of the EU countries are being swallowed up and increasingly overruled by unaccountable Eurocrats and Eurojudges.
- The EU currency, the *euro*, and the Eurobank are destroying the value of the individual national currencies and the economic sovereignty of the member states.
- EU governing institutions, acting in coordination with their fellow one-worlders in national governments, are becoming increasingly socialistic and oppressive.

All of this was foreseen by astute observers many years ago, when the foundations for this diabolical scheme were being laid. One of the most knowledgeable historians of the Common Market/EU, and an indefatigable critic of it, is Hilaire du Berrier, a contributing editor to *The New American* (and its predecessors *American Opinion* and *The Review of the News*). For more than four decades he has published his authoritative *HduB Reports* from Monte Carlo, Monaco, and has repeatedly exposed the machinations and plans of the European and American insiders for Europe and the world.

"The CFR," wrote du Berrier in January 1973, "saw the Common Market from the first as a regional government to which more and more nations would be added until the world government which the UN had failed to bring about would be realized. At a favorable point in the Common Market's development, America would be brought in. But the American public had to be softened first and leaders groomed for the change-over."

As du Berrier notes, the first concrete step toward the abolition of the European nation-states was taken in 1951 with the signing of the seemingly innocuous treaty creating the European Coal and Steel



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 9, 2001

Community (ECSC). The ostensible purpose of this move was to so integrate the basic industries of coal and steel that a future war between France and Germany would be “physically impossible.”

The next nail in the coffin of European national sovereignty came on March 25, 1957 with the signing by the six ECSC nations (France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg) of the two Treaties of Rome. These created the European Economic Community (EEC or Common Market) and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom), which greatly furthered the process of merging the economic and energy sectors of the member states.

The next stage involved bringing the rest of Western Europe into the fold. In 1973 the United Kingdom, after more than two decades of resisting, came in, as did Ireland and Denmark. Greece joined in 1981, bringing the number of member states to 10. Spain and Portugal became the 11th and 12th members in 1986. The year 1986 also marked passage of the Single European Act, which mandated the establishment of “an area without internal frontiers, in which the free movement of goods, persons, services, and capital is ensured.”

The 1991 Treaty of Maastricht committed the EU signatories to a single currency and a European central bank. The European Monetary Institute (EMI), the embryonic European central bank created by the treaty, was officially launched on January 1, 1994. Frankfurt was chosen as the site for the new entity and Alexander Lamfalussy, former head of the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) in Basel, Switzerland, was tapped to be president.

Work in the Shadows

Now let’s drop back for a moment and briefly examine the nuts-and-bolts process and the main actors involved in putting this amazing scheme together, beginning with the European Coal and Steel Commission, or ECSC. “This was a truly revolutionary organization,” wrote Georgetown University Professor Carroll Quigley, the insiders’ own inside historian, “since it had sovereign powers, including the authority to raise funds outside any existing state’s power.” The ECSC was, Quigley pointed out, “a rudimentary government.” In his 1966 history of the world, *Tragedy and Hope*, Quigley wrote: “This ‘supranational’ body had the right to control prices, channel investment, raise funds, allocate coal and steel.... Its powers to raise funds for its own use by taxing each ton produced made it independent of governments. Moreover, its decisions were binding, and could be reached by majority vote without the unanimity required in most international organizations of sovereign states.”

The proposal for the ECSC was introduced, amidst great fanfare, in May 1950 as the “Schuman Plan.” Although Jean Monnet, a consummate insider and at that time head of France’s General Planning Commission, was the real author of the plan, he thought it expedient to name it for his comrade Robert Schuman, the Socialist French foreign minister who later became prime minister.

The American insiders leapt to praise the Schuman Plan. John Foster Dulles, a CFR founder, called it “brilliantly creative.” Secretary of State Dean Acheson (CFR) termed it a “major contribution toward the resolution of the pressing political and economic problems of Europe.” The CFR-dominated Carnegie Foundation awarded Monnet its Wateler Peace Prize of two million francs “in recognition of the international spirit which he had shown in conceiving the Coal and Steel Community.”

Insider Jean Monnet, a life-long, self-avowed, multi-millionaire socialist, whom columnist Joseph Alsop (CFR) admiringly dubbed the “good, gray wizard of Western European union,” was appointed the first president of the powerful new ECSC. Monnet knew full well just how subversive and revolutionary his new creation was. Merry and Serge Bromberger record in their biography, *Jean Monnet and the United*



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 9, 2001

States of Europe, that when Monnet and his “brain trust” had outlined the basics of the ECSC proposal, they called in legal expert Maurice Lagrange to take care of the detail work. The Brombergers wrote: “Lagrange was stunned. An idea of revolutionary daring had been launched and was being acclaimed by the Six and the United States — a minerals and metals superstate.... ‘I hope the structure will stand up,’ Monnet said dubiously.”

In other words, Monnet recognized that his scheme was so audaciously subversive it was doubtful that the governments of sovereign nations would ever agree to such a radical proposal. Unless, of course, the proponents just as audaciously employed deception, duplicity, bribery, extortion, and coercion. Which is precisely what they did.

Startling new evidence concerning this cabal was reported in September 2000 by Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the EU reporter in Brussels for the *Telegraph* of London. The story bore the headline, “Euro-federalists financed by US spy chiefs,” and reported on recently declassified American government documents showing “that the US intelligence community ran a campaign in the Fifties and Sixties to build momentum for a united Europe. It funded and directed the European federalist movement.” The U.S. effort was headed by “William J Donovan, head of the American wartime Office of Strategic Services, precursor of the CIA.”

Evans-Pritchard reported:

Washington’s main tool for shaping the European agenda was the American Committee for a United Europe [ACUE], created in 1948. The chairman was Donovan, ostensibly a private lawyer by then.

The vice-chairman was Allen Dulles, the CIA director in the Fifties. The board included Walter Bedell Smith, the CIA’s first director, and a roster of ex-OSS figures and officials who moved in and out of the CIA. The documents show that ACUE financed the European Movement, the most important federalist organisation in the post-war years. In 1958, for example, it provided 53.5 per cent of the movement’s funds.

The European Youth Campaign, an arm of the European Movement, was wholly funded and controlled by Washington. The Belgian director, Baron Boel, received monthly payments into a special account. When the head of the European Movement, Polish-born Joseph Retinger, bridled at this degree of American control and tried to raise money in Europe, he was quickly reprimanded.

What the *Telegraph* article didn’t mention (and perhaps Evans-Pritchard didn’t know) was that all of the OSS-CIA-ACUE principals involved in the “European federalist movement” — Donovan, Smith, and Dulles — were CFR members and key Pratt House operatives.

With the media stranglehold exercised by the ruling elites on both sides of the Atlantic, few Europeans or Americans — even those who were politically sophisticated — could put all of the pieces together. Lone voices — even influential ones — could not break through the media blackout. In 1959, for example, few British citizens heard (and fewer still understood the importance of) the warning of Reginald Maulding, chancellor of the exchequer, concerning the real nature of the Common Market. Said Maulding: “We must recognize that for us to sign the Treaty of Rome would be to accept the ultimate goal — political federation in Europe including ourselves.”

“Twenty years ago, when the process began, there was no question of losing sovereignty,” Sir Peregrine Worsthorne wrote in London’s *Sunday Telegraph* in 1991. “That was a lie, or at any rate, a dishonest obfuscation.” Further, said Worsthorne, “For the past twenty years or so anybody wanting to have a career in the public service, in the higher reaches of the city, or the media has had to be pro-European.



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 9, 2001

In the privacy of the closet or among close friends, even many federalists would admit as much. But such is the momentum behind the European movement that none of these individual doubts, expressed separately, will be remotely sufficient to stop the juggernaut.”

Western Hemisphere EU

The insiders have stepped up their political, economic, and propaganda efforts for the next step, an EU for the Western Hemisphere. Following the pattern of the ECSC-EU, most of the important early activity for the WHFTA was taking place “below the surface of public attention.” In 1999, after years of preparation, the business pages of newspapers began buzzing over the startling proposal by Argentine President Carlos Menem to abandon his country’s peso for the dollar. Similar proposals soon started flowing in from the leaders of Canada, Brazil, Mexico, and Venezuela. All of a sudden, “dollarization” became the sexy economic issue of the day, with Republicans and Democrats alike lining up with euphoric praise for the ultra-radical scheme.

The current dollarization-NAFTA/ WHFTA drive we are now witnessing is the culmination of a massive, long-range effort that began many years ago as an intermediate stepping stone to world government. Myriad documents, publications, statements, speeches, conferences, meetings, and events from the past several decades copiously document that effort. One such document is *Western Hemisphere Economic Integration*, a study by Gary Clyde Hufbauer (CFR and former CFR vice president) and Jeffrey J. Schott, published in 1994 by the Institute for International Economics (IIE). While hardly a household name in America, the IIE, according to Martin Walker of the *London Observer*, “may be the most influential think-tank on the planet,” with “an extraordinary record in turning ideas into effective policy.”

The dedication at the beginning of this IIE book reads: “TO DAVID ROCKEFELLER, For his lifelong devotion to promoting economic development in Latin America and to improving relations among the countries of the Western Hemisphere. His wisdom has been an enormous source of encouragement to the work of the Institute and inspired us to explore the important ties that unite the Americas.”

David Rockefeller, of course, was chairman of the CFR from 1970-85 and, as we will see, has played an especially key role in the dollarization and Western hemispheric economic convergence scheme. Likewise the IIE, which is virtually joined at the hip to the CFR. So what did the Hufbauer-Schott study published by the IIE advocate? Very simply, “a Western Hemisphere Free Trade Area (WHFTA)” following the sovereignty-destroying, mega-state pattern of the European Union (EU). “After four decades of dedicated effort,” said the report, “Western Europe has just arrived at the threshold of ... monetary union, and fiscal coordination. It seems likely that trade and investment integration will proceed at a faster pace within the Western Hemisphere.”

“Finally,” the study stated, “the more countries that participate in integration and the wider its scope, the greater the need for some institutional mechanism to administer the arrangements and to resolve the inevitable disputes, and the stronger the case for a common legal framework.” (Which means supranational legislative, executive, and judicial institutions, naturally.) “The European Commission, Council, Parliament, and Court of Justice have many of the powers of comparable institutions in federal states,” the report noted approvingly before commenting, “On this subject, we score Europe with a 5 [on a scale of 0 to 5].”

Not satisfied with the EU model, the authors proposed going far beyond it. They asserted that “integration between NAFTA and Latin America should be legally open-ended; potentially the WHFTA should include countries outside the hemisphere.”



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 9, 2001

In countless similar studies, speeches, lectures, and programs over the years, the CFR elitists have prepped the upper echelon of the U.S. and Western intelligentsia and business communities so that they would enthusiastically embrace this deadly nostrum — long before it appeared “spontaneously” for general public consumption. But how did they succeed in drawing Latin American leaders into this snare and overcoming the long-standing fear of Yankee “dollar imperialism”? One obvious answer is that through the lending programs of the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and Wall Street banks, they have saddled Latin American countries with hopeless debt burdens that have left them desperate and willing to try radical measures. But a more complete answer is to be found in the long-term activities of groups like the IIE and the Council of the Americas (COA), which have for two generations been assiduously grooming and tutoring the business, academic, and political leaders of Latin America.

The COA describes its origins thusly: “In 1965, David Rockefeller and a group of like-minded business people founded the Council of the Americas based on the fundamental belief that free markets and private enterprise offer the most effective means to achieve regional economic growth and prosperity.” (Those so naïve as to believe in the COA’s professed embrace of “free markets and private enterprise” probably also believe that the Social Security Administration has set up a bank account with their name on it, awaiting their retirement!) Among the CFR brotherhood joining Rockefeller in the COA’s leadership are COA Chairman Robert A. Mosbacher Sr., Vice Chairman Robert E. Wilhelm, Treasurer Richard de J. Osborne, and General Counsel Sergio J. Galvis.

Some 240 COA corporate members with interests in Latin America — ranging from AT&T, Bank of America, Coca Cola, Citibank, and Dow Jones & Company to Exxon, Ford, General Electric, IBM, Microsoft, Newsweek, Turner Broadcasting System, Wal-Mart, and Xerox — provide impressive muscle (and financial support) for the COA’s agenda. Most of these companies, with a heavy CFR presence at their executive and directorate levels, have proven to be reliable supporters of the one-world corporatist line.

Working hand-in-glove with the COA-CFR corporate socialists are the pampered princelings of the U.S.-tax-dollar-subsidized multilateral lending institutions such as the IMF and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), many of whose officers are also CFR members. The preface to the aforementioned Hufbauer-Schott study, for instance, notes that “the Inter-American Development Bank provided support for the research underlying this project and the bank sponsored seminars for the discussion of its preliminary results.”

Of course, what the new world order architects have in mind for the Americas is exactly what they are foisting on Europe in the form of the European Union and the new euro currency. That evolving supranational monstrosity was also presented to unwary Europeans as a “spontaneous” movement aimed at “free trade” and “free markets.” But Europeans are belatedly waking up to the fact that it is no accident that the centralized, socialist bureaucracy of the EU is strangling their freedoms and national sovereignty. As we have seen, it was planned to develop into exactly that from the start.

Like the slime trail that leads to a slug, virtually every trail of American policy disasters leads back to the Council on Foreign Relations. There is no longer reason for any sensible American to doubt that the CFR coterie intends to take us down the same suicidal path that Europe is now traveling.

Words fail to convey the enormity and audacity of this colossal, dangerous fraud we are witnessing in the current “spontaneous movement” to transform the Western Hemisphere into a carbon copy of the increasingly tyrannical European Union. But even that grim prospect of an America under an EU-style,



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on April 9, 2001

centrally controlled economic bloc does not begin to convey the seriousness of the peril we face if we allow these plans to succeed. Regional “integration” is but a stepping stone to the real objective sought by the insiders of this one-world conspiracy: Total, unrestrained power on a planetary scale is the real objective.

This article originally appeared in the April 9, 2001 issue of The New American. It is an abridged version of a chapter from William F. Jasper’s book, The United Nations Exposed.



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.



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.

Subscribe