



Written by [Charles Scaliger](#) on January 4, 2016

Published in the January 4, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 01

---

## Going Global

There was a time when the very notion of world government was taboo, at least in public. Although elites in the United States and every other Western nation have been working for decades to set up a world government, it was, until fairly recently, done behind the scenes, with plausible deniability. Those who dared to accuse the architects of the UN-centered international system as working to build global government were routinely derided as cranks and conspiracy theorists.



In recent years, however, the architects of world government have been more open about their goals. For example, current UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon (shown), at an October event in honor of the 70th anniversary of the UN's founding, characterized the United Nations as the "parliament of humanity."

Those who defend the notion of world government routinely claim that it would be a benign federation of nations structurally similar to our own federal government. Such a world government has long been promoted as the only possible solution to war and other social ills. Strip independent countries of their territorial sovereignty, it is claimed, and international war will cease. Who could possibly object to a benevolent "parliament of humanity" presiding over a future without war and without want?

But the key to effective government has ever been not wishful idealism but sober realism, which is why the American Founders insisted on limiting the powers of the federal government to the protection of God-given rights, and on dividing the apparatus of the state into discrete compartments whose powers checked and offset one another's. And they did this in framing the government of a relatively small country whose inhabitants mostly spoke the same language and had similar religious beliefs and cultural assumptions.

Any world government would have to be sufficiently powerful to exact obedience from billions of people speaking hundreds of different languages, practicing many widely divergent religions, from cultures utterly incompatible with one another, from the entire length and breadth of the inhabited world. To achieve this, it would need to be both extraordinarily powerful and omnipresent. It would need to possess the police powers necessary to suppress insurrection and terrorism, and to compel people of disparate races, religions, and languages to get along.

What's more, most citizens of the nations who make up the UN want socialism, not limited government. They expect government not only to protect their rights, but also to provide for their wants. They will expect a world government to provide healthcare, housing, and employment, and to remedy all of the alleged ills of the free market. In other words, there is zero prospect that any world government would be limited either in size or in power. One need look no further than the institutional priorities of the UN system — radical environmentalism, gun confiscation, wealth transfer from the developed to the developing world, worldwide abortion on demand, and many others — to recognize that the world



Written by [Charles Scaliger](#) on January 4, 2016

Published in the January 4, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 01

---

government project is rooted in socialism and cultural Marxism, and will steamroll national sovereignty, traditional family values, and individual liberties if given half a chance.

A government powerful enough to accomplish all of this would certainly be powerful enough to take away the freedoms of its citizens. Naturally, being submerged into such a system would not bode well for the United States. After all, if a free society were merged with a totalitarian system, would anyone expect the citizens of that society to remain free? And what would happen to that brilliant document, the U.S. Constitution with its accompanying Bill of Rights? It would, of necessity, be superseded by global laws that would almost certainly be inimical to the freedoms Americans enjoy.

Putting all the power in one pot, so to speak, can only be dangerous. Lord Acton's famous quote comes to mind: "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men." Far from being a blueprint for perpetual peace, prosperity, and liberty, world government is a Huxleyan and Orwellian nightmare in the making.

*Photo of Ban Ki-moon: AP Images*



Written by [Charles Scaliger](#) on January 4, 2016

Published in the January 4, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 01

## 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.