



New World Order Greens Would Use Global Governance

If UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown has his way (and why shouldn't he?), multi-national green shirts will march around the globe in their bio-degradable boots rooting out and punishing those who have committed the 21st Century's greatest crime against the new world order: environmental disregard.

Speaking with a few sour grapes in his mouth from having been excluded from the meeting in Copenhagen (the one attended by President Barack Obama) that produced the non-binding resolution of things that could be done, don't really need to be done, and probably won't be done because they wouldn't be politically prudent, [Brown declared](#) that in order for future summits to be of any real and lasting effect, the leaders of the world must form "international institutions to meet the common challenges we face as a global community." Brown went on to deride China for having pulled the teeth out of an agreement that could have produced a "global deal to move towards a greener future."



In an article entitled "[There'll be no where to run from the new world government](#)" in the *British Telegraph* of December 19, journalist Janet Daily observed that Prime Minister "Brown actually suggested something called a 'global alliance' in response to climate change," and then asked with appropriate facetiousness: "Would this be an alliance against the Axis of Extra-Terrestrials?"

If there is one word that should be exalted as the word of the year it is "global." The word has been used to describe the (undeclared) war on terrorism, the (supposedly) rising temperatures, and the (non-existent) utopian community in which every man, woman, and child has a right to live, work, and play. The enshrinement of the word seems to be but the first step in creating front-of-mind awareness throughout the world in order to draw up a bill of "global" rights and the resultant clamor for the formation of "global" institutions to protect those rights and punish those who deign alienate them or question the validity or legality of their existence.

Given its diaphanous definition and the fuzziness of its focus, why is the word "global" so in vogue with politicians and why is that when faced with a problem for which ready and real solutions are so elusive, with such blinding alacrity they bandy that word about as if it were a gimcrack pocket watch with which they hope to hypnotize a muddled and wearied world? One reason, perhaps at once the best and most frightening, is that the use of a word without a well-defined meaning allows politicians to disguise their impotence behind a mask of dedication to the "big picture," thus alleviating the press to genuinely and



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on December 22, 2009

purposefully address the needs of their constituents. They can pronounce the word “global” with tones indicative of incantation and thus with a sweep of the hand dismiss all recognition and remembrance of the *sine qua non* of representative government: that governments are responsible to and derive their power from, the will of the governed.

The repetitive and unspecific use of the word “global” by those elected by a very specific electorate has the intended effect of corroding the constitutional chains by which leaders are ostensibly bound and concomitantly replacing the accountability that should restrain them and keep them fettered to the welfare of their constituents with a slate of “global agreements” entered into after closed-door meetings which are never exposed to the light of deliberation but to which they can proudly point when voters meekly demand an accounting of their leaders’ time and effort on their behalf. The end of the displacement of the oft-proven republican scheme of representation by the nefarious and immeasurable scheme of active “global governance” is that constitutionally empowered national governments can surreptitiously carry out the boundary obliterating goal of internationalists determined to subsume all national banners under one flag whose managers are answerable to no one for there is no longer a governed from whom consent must be obtained.

The final chilling consideration in the examination of the unchecked growth in the unquestioned ratification of “global agreements” entered into by “global leaders” at the conclusion of “global conferences” to address “global challenges” is the inevitable call for the creation of “global police” to enforce adherence to these as-yet non-binding resolutions. With the intentional smudging of national borders under the pressing thumb of globalists and their haughty disregard (and outright dismissal) of the requirement of sanctification of these supranational agreements by national governments, those still clinging to the ancient and sacred rights of self-rule and in pugnacious possession of the “affection, esteem, and reverence” that the governed should feel for those they have chosen to govern them, there will be nowhere to run. There will be no available enclave of freedom where those hewing faithfully to the immutable principles of liberty can flee from the never-sheathed sword of the “global enforcement” of laws to which they never were offered the opportunity of assent.

A *Washington Post* news analysis of December 20 headlined "[Copenhagen climate deal shows new world order may be led by U.S. China](#)" minced no words in describing what might be termed a 21st century version of *détente*, based not on nuclear non-proliferation (as was the Cold War-era U.S.-Soviet *détente*), but on environmentalism:

If the talks that resulted in an imperfect deal to combat global warming provided anything, it was a glimpse into a *new world order* in which international diplomacy will increasingly be shaped by the United States and emerging powers, most notably China. [Emphasis added.]

There is no reliable model for this novel and noxious government. There are those who point to Europe as the future of global governance, but the European Union is but an embryonic type and shadow of the greater global government that is being midwifed by those steadfastly dedicated to the now sacred principle of global solutions to global problems without reference or reverence to constituent countries or their citizens. Within decades life will be breathed into this international bureaucracy and its armed forces will be given marching orders sealed with the signet of global government and the crimes they prosecute will be intentionally vague so that eco-criminals, gun owners, unrepentant self-interested nationalists, and other violators of the inscrutable and inviolable global code will have no hope of successful defense.



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on December 22, 2009

Furthermore, the deep bench of cocksure jurists populating these international tribunals will be unimpeachable as their right of review descends from powerful puppeteers and as such their rulings will be final and beyond the pale of all appeal, either to a higher court or a vigilant national legislature, for all such atavistic institutions reminiscent of nation-states will have been relegated to the dustbin of history.

The existence of transnational problems does not philosophically suggest the necessity of transnational solutions. The world since its creation has been the site of international crises and they have traditionally (albeit oft-times horribly) dealt with by the governments of the component countries, for it is this method that has been proven to be the most enlightened and effective means of addressing and eradicating the pernicious problems that do so easily beset humans prone to frailty and motivated by narrow self-interest.

If the governments that are closest to the hearts and homes of the governed are unable or unwilling to deliberate and decide on matters deemed of pressing import, then the ballots cast by electors will recompense the reticence or reluctance of those legislators. If President Obama, Prime Minister Brown, and the other high priests of the church of collectivism have their way, then Americans, Britons, and those of all nationalities will choke on the spewing incense of autocracy. All national governments will be dismantled and the ties that bind them to the governed will be dissolved, and the plenary power with which that vaunted “global government” will be endowed will be unchecked, imbalanced, and unaccountable to all but the elite few who willingly, knowingly, and with malignant intent sacrificed their nations’ sacred sovereignty on the unholy altar of “globalism.”

Photo of Gordon Brown: AP Images



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](#)