

## Bush proclaims brave new world of 'universal peace'

by Joseph Brewda

In a haughty speech, delivered in his usual monotone whine, U.S. President George Bush proclaimed the advent of *Pax Universalis*—Universal Peace—in his address to the United Nations General Assembly on Sept. 23. This new era, Bush declared, has been ushered in by the end of the Cold War, and the genocidal war against Iraq. What *Pax Universalis* means, Bush, and other speakers made clear, is a world empire run by the Permanent Members of the U.N. Security Council—the U.S., Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and China, called the “Perm Five.” Under this new version of the old “Roman peace,” the sovereignty of nations, particularly small nations, will be strictly limited.

In order to provide the appropriate backdrop to what these powers consider their triumph, Bush's speech had been preceded by a contrived crisis which the U.S. government had created over its demands to fly helicopters over Iraqi airspace without restriction. A letter delivered by Iraqi Foreign Minister Ahmed Hussein to the U.N. Security Council the evening prior to his address, in which Iraq capitulated to the latest of intentionally provocative U.N. demands, cheated Bush of an incident. Consequently, the next day, a new one was manufactured: Iraq's defiance of world opinion by not allowing a U.N. inspection team to remove personnel records from an Iraqi ministry.

As we write, on Sept. 26, it appears that another Anglo-American/French assault on Iraq over this latest incident may be in the offing, in part to flaunt the power of the new global empire.

### **Pax Universalis defined**

Bush came right to the point in his dictatorial address: The end of the Cold War defines new opportunities and new perils. We, the now-unified imperial powers, define sover-

eignty. The nations of the Third World will continue to be looted by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), beyond the point of genocide; all those who oppose the new order will get the Iraq treatment.

**Freedom is free trade.** “Here in the chamber we hear about North-South problems,” Bush complained, alluding to Third World demands for debt relief. There will be none of that in the new world order. “Free and open trade, including unfettered access to markets” is the only solution to the world's problems. This means, he said, the unrestrained imperial access to the world markets defined by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) talks. Bush stated that the successful conclusion of the next round of GATT talks, the so-called Uruguay Round, is a non-negotiable demand. “If the Uruguay Round should fail,” he threatened, that would “destroy our hopes for a better future.”

**Nationalism is the new threat.** With the Cold War declared over, Bush defined the new apparent threat to mankind: nationalism. “Communism held history captive for years,” he stated, and it “suspended ancient disputes,” and “suppressed rivalries” and “old prejudices.” The “suspended hatreds that have sprung to life” comprise the new threat.

Included within this notion, that nationalism is the new threat, the U.N. Security Council has abrogated to itself the right to define national borders between states, a bilateral or multilateral matter previously restricted by international law to the nations concerned. The precedent for this usurpation of sovereignty was achieved by the Security Council taking it upon itself the prerogative to define the Iraq-Kuwait border following the war. “No one can promise that today's borders will remain fixed for all time,” he intoned, “but we must strive to ensure the peaceful, negotiated settlement of border disputes.”

It might be presumed that the speaker—if he were not Bush—was talking about the developing war in Yugoslavia, in which Serbian communists are slaughtering Croats, or, perhaps, a new potential war between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Yet it was U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's trip to Yugoslavia over the summer, which gave the go-ahead for the Serbian assault on Croatia; while newly released books by the Council on Foreign Relations, an institution which devises U.S. foreign policy, state that the Armenian-Azerbaijan and related conflicts are in the U.S. interest.

**The war against Iraq is the model.** As could be expected, Bush pointed to the U.S.-led coalition's war on Iraq as the new model for relations between states.

"A year ago," he said, "the Soviet Union joined a host of nations in defending a tiny country against aggression"—a reference to the war supposedly fought to defend the Kuwaiti sheikhdom. "For the first time on a matter of major importance," he said, "superpower competition was replaced with international cooperation."

Depicting the war as "measured and principled," Bush asserted that Iraq's Aug. 2, 1990 invasion of Kuwait would have set a "menacing precedent" for the post-Cold War world, if unchallenged. Instead, he said, "the coalition established a model for collective settlement of disputes."

**The sanctions will continue.** Although millions of Iraqis, especially children, are threatened with death by famine and disease on account of the U.N. sanctions and embargo, Bush insisted that the sanctions will continue. "We must keep the United Nations sanctions in place as long as he [Saddam Hussein] remains in power." Not to do this, he said, would violate principle.

Bush also claimed that he has no argument with the people of Iraq. Only when there is a "just government in Iraq" following the ouster of Saddam Hussein, Bush said, can the "Iraqi people look forward to better lives." The demand to oust Saddam Hussein was not even included in any U.N. resolution. But what of it? The Perm Five make the law.

The only way relief might be doled out in the meantime, Bush stated, is through Resolution 706, a French-authored monstrosity which effectively seizes control of Iraq's oil wealth by U.N. authorities. Under the terms of the resolution, Iraqi oil would be sold by the U.N., in limited amounts, and only a fraction of the proceeds allotted for food for the Iraqi people. The Iraqi government has already rejected the resolution as a new effort to reimpose colonialism.

**Zionism is a U.N. principle.** Finally, as expected, Bush denounced the 1975 U.N. resolution that Zionism is a form of racism. To reject Zionism, he said, "mocks the principles upon which the United Nations was founded," for once speaking the truth. In fact, in one of its first actions, the U.N. established Israel as an alien imposition on Arab lands in the immediate postwar period.

The day following Bush's pronouncement, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir gloated that "all our territories,"

including those illegally seized in 1967, "will be populated by Jews to the end of the horizon."

## **Imperialist powers proclaim new empire**

Following Bush's address, in effect the keynote for the General Assembly, other members of the Perm Five followed suit.

The first of the permanent members of the Security Council to speak after Bush was newly appointed Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin, who made clear, in his Sept. 24 remarks, that whatever the tumult in Moscow, the commitment to an imperial condominium has not changed.

"When President Bush and I met this morning," Pankin reported, "we reiterated the commitment of our two countries to broader cooperation in strengthening the United Nations as well as in other areas. . . . The philosophy of new international solidarity, which is finding its way into practice, signifies a de-ideologization of the United Nations. In renewing our organization we should once and for all leave behind the legacy of the Ice Age like the obnoxious resolution equating Zionism to racism."

Pankin specified the task of the new world order yet ahead, "the development of a long-term concept of the use of U.N. forces . . . including refining rapid response mechanisms for countering threats to international peace, legally codified procedures for deterring a potential aggressor, and optimal strategies for unblocking conflicts."

The next day, British Foreign Minister Douglas Hurd put forward his vision of Pax Universalis, ironically terming it the "end of the principle of empire," based on the annihilation of Iraq.

"Now that Iraq is out of Kuwait, the U.N. is insisting—for the first time—that a Member State forgo weapons of mass destruction and pay compensation to its victims," he said. "The U.N. is resolved to maintain sanctions until Iraq shows it is playing a constructive part in regional stability, until Iraq observes the rules of international law."

Hurd then defined a new concept that will be applied to the Third World: "transparency."

"All states," he stated, "must apply the three principles of transparency, consultation and action. As a significant step towards transparency, Britain has proposed a universal register of arms transfers under U.N. auspices. Such a register would alert the international community to an attempt by a country to build up holdings of conventional weapons beyond a reasonable level."

That same day, French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas called for a new charter to be adopted by the international community, which would give "beleaguered minorities" the right to request "outside intervention" on "humanitarian grounds." This was the favorite pretext of the imperial powers in the 19th century. Dumas cited the recent U.N. intervention into northern Iraq, supposedly to defend the Kurds, as the new precedent.