

U.N. newspeak turns true ideals into lies

by Nancy Spannaus

The following is excerpted from the introduction to the EIR upcoming Special Report, "Why the United Nations' Plans for World Government Must Be Stopped."

The rhetoric of the United Nations Charter, and even some of its official organizations, offers promise to the unsuspecting nation, or individual. It claims dedication to "social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." It adulates genuine human rights and the ability of all nations, large or small, to live in peace with one another. Yet, for lawful reasons, the application of these nice words turns them into their opposites. It's George Orwell's 1984, where war is peace, and love is hate.

There are three fundamental areas in which this turning of a legitimate ideal into its opposite is currently proceeding. The first is in the area of "peace," and variants like "peacekeeping" and "peacemaking." So far, the only peace which has been achieved through these missions is the "peace of the grave." The second is in the area of "human rights," which have been turned into freedom for terrorists at the expense of the general civilian population. The third is in the area of "development," usually preceded these days by the adjective "sustainable." "Development" has become a synonym for economic backwardness and depopulation, in the perverse translation the U.N. achieves.

The lawfulness of these transformations lies in the actual conceptions which the globalist theoreticians and practitioners at the U.N. have of these ideals. "Peace," in their view, means a lack of conflict, which ultimately translates into refusing to challenge the stronger power. Thus, in the former Yugoslavia, the U.N. is willing to see the Serbians massacre unarmed civilians, rather than lift the arms embargo which has prevented those civilians from defending themselves. This is justified by saying that an increase in weapons would be against the concept of "peace." Yet, it couldn't be clearer to any discerning individual that the only "peace" which will be accomplished in this arena will be the elimination of the ethnic minority—either through death or deportation or flight.

Yet, a sound concept of peace, like that of freedom, has to mean the creation of a positive condition, not just the absence of something. Peace is not the absence of war, but a situation of harmonious work between people, and between

nations. Thus, the pursuit of peace has to include respect for the elementary rights of sovereignty and securing a livelihood for all people. It can never mean the toleration of ethnic cleansing, simply because the perpetrators happen to be the stronger of the parties, or disarmament of only one side to a conflict. . . .

The fraud of 'human rights'

Then there's the U.N.'s concept of "human rights," which has taken a front seat in the current expansion of U.N. powers. In effect, this idea has been transformed into the idea of "western democracy," or the rights of the individual against the state, regardless of the nature of that individual's own political objectives. It is the concept which says that what is important in a nation's political life is the "process," not whether good or humane policies actually win a political contest.

The most vivid example of the way in which the U.N.'s concept of "human rights" turns into its opposite, is in the nation of Peru. There, the population has been subjected to a brutal war by avowed opponents of Christian civilization, the Maoist Shining Path. At least 20,000 persons have been killed by bombs, gunfire, immolations, throat-slitting, and every barbaric means imaginable, and the group's spokesmen have announced their willingness to kill up to a million Peruvians, in their war of conquest. Yet the U.N. human rights groups insist upon attacking the government of Peru for its attempts to stop this group's brutality. Sure, there may have been instances in which the military got out of control under the pressure of the circumstances, but the overwhelming preponderance of violations of basic human rights to live in peace and security came from these communist, narco-terrorist guerrillas. How can anyone call their rights to organize extermination squads, "human rights?" . . .

Malthusianism called 'development'

The third, and perhaps most insidious, principle which the U.N. claims to champion is the concept of "development," usually rendered as "sustainable development." This concept has undergone a metamorphosis over the past two decades into a concept of free-market malthusianism, which is not only guaranteed to destroy the economy of any subject country, but has been demonstrated to have done so over and over again. The examples are myriad, because the economic policy of the United Nations is represented by the dictates of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank.

Such policies, whose results we document in a case study in this report on the economies of Ibero-America, have nothing in common with the drive for scientific and technological progress which was the universal hope of the decolonizing nations at the end of World War II. In fact, the very notion of technological progress has been ruled antithetical to "sustainable development." Sustainable development is being tightly linked to the policies of reducing population growth,

avoiding great infrastructure projects, reducing energy consumption, and protecting untouched wilderness, whether it be species of animals or plants. The pursuit of such measures will lower the ability of any economy to reproduce itself and care for its population.

A clear example of this policy is seen in the latest U.N. "development" thrust, the drive to reduce military spending in especially Third World nations. In fact, the percentage of military spending in many of these nations is totally inadequate, as is spending in all vital areas, and certainly not comparable to that of industrialized nations. The plan for cutting the military budget comes straight from former World Bank head Robert McNamara, not for the benefit of the population, but in order to free up more monies to pay usurious debt service. In addition, reductions of the militaries are ways of eliminating technological capabilities in these countries, or of reducing national sovereignty.

We need more people

On the population question, there is unbelievably evil hypocrisy. Even if it were a good thing to reduce the number of children born in poor countries—which it is not—the reduction of those births would do absolutely nothing to improve the conditions of water, the nutrition, or the availability of the energy required to provide medical care and other necessities of life. Reducing the number of people will not build water treatment plants, or nuclear plants. It will only do what the Henry Kissinger-commissioned National Security Study Memorandum 200 of 1974 indicated: It will reduce the number of people prepared to make political demands for the right to development, against the depredations of imperial powers and their financial institutions.

A dangerous qualitative shift in the acceptance of the malthusian dogma occurred with the so-called "Earth Summit" sponsored by the United Nations Commission on the Environment and Development which was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in June 1992. Although a good number of the specific limits on economic growth and sovereignty demanded by the radical environmentalists, did not get enacted, a false principle of ecologism was ensconced in international relations. What was legitimized was an agenda of malthusianism, as reflected in ideas of conservation of species and land, reductions of energy use, and population control, which are based on totally unscientific premises. In effect, what was passed, with minor modifications, was a pronouncement that the era of technological progress, based on man being responsible for exercising dominion over the earth, was over, and a new era of "environmental stewardship" instituted. If the organizers of the conference get their way, however, the following steps will be mandatory limits on high-technology, foresting, mining, and population growth, with enforcement coming from the supranational bureaucracy. The 1994 U.N. Conference on Population will be the scene of the next major fight on this subject. . . .



Former World Bank president Robert McNamara, who architected the plan to dismantle developing nations' militaries.

The role of the nation-state

It is fashionable these days to attack nationalism and the nation-state as "reactionary" phenomena, or even "fascist." Such lies have to be eliminated, root and branch. . . .

The development of the nation-state was part and parcel of mankind's pursuit of scientific and technological progress. To foster the creative powers of the individual human mind, it is necessary to improve standards of living, political participation, and education. The political unit that has historically been successful in creating the conditions for that progress, has been the nation-state. National banking, for example, is a tested method for establishing a healthy, growing economy.

A nation is bound together by a common history and culture, a common language, and a national purpose. Every nation has a contribution to make to the future and betterment of all mankind. Thus, as the great German poet and historian Friedrich Schiller expressed it in the early nineteenth century, the individual strives to be both a great patriot and a world citizen, by participating in projects for the betterment of his country.

Thus, the individual committed to human progress must defend national sovereignty against all assaults, except in those rare instances where it is overridden by natural law. Restoring the nation-state, as a vehicle for scientific and technological progress, is the **only** way to create a true community of principle among nations, something which the United Nations is trampling into the dust today.