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ABSTRACT

The New World Order — far from being anything "new" — is an order which has been evolving for more than one hundred years. This thesis begins with the idea for an elite establishment of one late 19th century individual, Cecil Rhodes, and shows how it has developed into the several organizations that make up the Global Regime today.

Although the term "New World Order" has been a buzzword since the Bush era, the majority of people around the world remain uncertain of the meaning. This thesis will demonstrate that it is an order with an underlying economic agenda. This is illustrated by examining various reports written by members of the Regime which reveal their goals and intentions, and also by examining detailed studies done on policies they have implemented. Finally, this thesis suggests that the Global Regime is now near its ultimate goal of dominating global economic matters.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A term which has been mentioned repeatedly in the media the past few years is the "New World Order." Although the term appears to suggest something of great importance, a poll by Craig Hulet, political analyst and former consultant to U.S. based multinationals (e.g., Exxon, Weyerhauser, and U.S. Home), reveals that very few people can agree on its meaning or have any idea what it is. However, most of the people who were asked agreed on one point; they felt that whatever it is, it is "a good thing." When National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft was asked about the meaning, he merely stated, "It is not a specific road map ... it's a general kind of thing ...." It seems the term has never been clearly defined.

At a press conference on January 9, 1991 George Bush hinted at what the New World Order might mean, saying that "[The Gulf crisis] has to do with a new world order. And that new world order is only going to be enhanced if this newly activated peacekeeping function of the United Nations proves to be effective." In a televised address on January 16, 1991 Mr. Bush expanded a bit more on the term stating, "When we are successful, and we will be, we have a real
chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible
United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the
promise and vision of the UN's founders. From these bits
and pieces coming from Bush, the public could perhaps infer
that the New World Order has something to do with the United
Nations playing a greater military role in resolving
disputes around the world. However, with still no details
disclosed, how could anyone be certain?

In June of 1991 many Administration officials —
pressured by reporters — pointed to Bush's address to the
U.N. General Assembly in October 1990 as being the outline
for the New World Order. In his address Bush stated:

We have a vision of a new partnership of nations
that transcends the Cold War: a partnership based
on consultation, cooperation and collective
action, especially through international and
regional organizations; a partnership united by
principle and the rule of law and supported by an
equitable sharing of both cost and commitment; a
partnership whose goals are to increase democracy,
increase prosperity, increase the peace and reduce
arms.

Examining the contents of Bush's address, I found two
disturbing contradictions. First of all, as Bush claimed to
support democracy worldwide, the U.S. up to 1991 had been
using financial and political leverage to promote democracy in socialist states while tolerating slow or no change at all among conservative holdouts. For example, the U.S. had been active on democratic changes in the former Soviet Union, but slow on pushing Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and other pro-U.S. or rightist regimes. The second disturbing contradiction was Bush's comment on arms reduction. In May of 1991 Bush proposed an arms-control program for the Middle East. The program intended to ban from the region the production of nuclear, chemical, and other weapons of mass destruction, freeze sales of surface-to-surface missiles, and encourage talks among the five major countries that supply 90% of Middle East arms — the U.S., the former Soviet Union, China, France, and Britain. One month after his arms-control proposal, Bush surprisingly announced plans for major new arms sales, approximately 18-24 billion dollars worth, to five Middle East states. Justifying the U.S. action U.S. officials claimed the sales represented "responsible" arms transfers. Rather than an outline for a New World Order, I felt Bush's address to the U.N. General Assembly came closer to plans for a New World Disorder. It was for this reason I began my own research for an explanation of the New World Order that I could be satisfied with.

My concentration upon the New World Order for the past three years has led me to a vast and complex subject matter.
After reading through an enormous amount of material and attending lectures by political analysts, former CIA agents, and candidates seeking public office, I have narrowed the New World Order down to the following theory: A Global Regime is emerging which is made up of international organizations such as the Trilateral Commission, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Bank of International Settlements, the International Monetary Fund, and a host of governmental, semi-private, and private policy making bodies. The goal of the Global Regime is to attain political influence throughout the world in order to maintain economic prosperity, not for any one country, but basically for the multinational corporations which have no national boundary restrictions. Interestingly enough, contrary to being secretive, these organizations make public just about all their reports. People merely need to read these reports to understand the activities these organizations are involved in.

Two years ago while doing research I picked up a copy of TV evangelist Pat Robertson's book, The New World Order. I was stunned when I read the book, for the book describes — in a vague manner — many of the same issues I had come across in my research. Robertson, for example, discusses some of the threats to personal freedom the New World Order will inevitably bring us. But what I found most interesting
were his views on Bush and the role he felt Bush was playing in the Order at the time. Robertson states, for instance, "Whatever he [Bush] means by it [the New World Order], one thing is certain. The president of the United States has become the key player to prepare the world for the introduction of a new world order which may one day resemble an order defined by someone else, not him."\(^5\) Robertson is referring here to an earlier passage which he states "the phrase [is] uncomfortably close to Hitler's phrase, 'the new order.'"\(^6\) This to me seems to be overreacting a bit, as Robertson is suggesting a comparison of Hitler and Bush. I did not take this very seriously when I read it. Then, Robertson did something in 1992 that just plain shocked me. As I watched the Republican National Convention on TV, Robertson walked up onto the platform and announced his full support for George Herbert Walker Bush for president. This hypocrisy did not make any sense.

Although Robertson does, in my view, accurately identify in his book many of the same organizations which I perceive to be involved in the New World Order, there are two main problems. First, after identifying the various organizations that make up the Global Regime, he then takes on an extreme right-wing attitude as to its purpose. Robertson claims the New World Order is a desire to create a "one-world government" by organizations who are "supporting
socialism in one of its forms." Second, although Robertson's book has an index and a bibliography, it does not contain any footnotes or endnotes. This is unfortunate, for the book, despite its faults, would have been taken more seriously and would have been much more credible when it was released in 1991.

At the other end of the ideological spectrum from which Robertson lies is a woman named Holly Sklar. Sklar turned a massive research project on one aspect of the New World Order into a very credible work in 1980 called Trilateralism. She defines Trilateralism as the doctrine advanced by the Trilateral Commission in which the three most developed regions of the globe – Japan, North America, and the European Community – are striving for economic interdependence. In my view this concept is an essential part of the New World Order and will be discussed in some depth later. Although Sklar's personal interpretation is extremely liberal, she has nevertheless drawn the public's attention to detailed and fully documented material. By identifying specific publications written by the Trilateralists themselves, who are influential businessmen, scholars, politicians, and others from the Trilateral region, she is able to illustrate their views to solutions of certain world problems. Needless to say, Sklar is often skeptical as to who actually benefits from these solutions.
Of course there have been many others who have done extensive research on the subject of the New World Order, including one of Bill Clinton's mentors, the highly respected Professor Carroll Quigley who taught at the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. These individuals, who recognize the term is nothing new, have contributed enormously to the public's understanding of who is actually creating and guiding policies around the world. It appears, however, that much of their material is becoming outdated.\[4\] Another problem is that many researchers tend to write only on their specific area of expertise. It is for this reason that I hope to achieve in this paper a consolidation and analysis of the data by these researchers and bring it all up to date. In doing this, I hope to illustrate the direction our world is headed as we approach the 21st century. At the same time, I would also like to raise some questions regarding the means incorporated by the Global Regime as it strives toward its goal.

To get an idea of what the New World Order involves, but on a smaller scale, one only needs to look back to the conditions in America toward the latter part of the 19th century. From approximately 1860 to 1920 America experienced what is popularly known as "the rise of Big Business." Some, such as author Glenn Porter, feel that the concentration of companies into large corporations spurred
rapid growth, greater technology, and immense wealth for the country. To others, such as author Matthew Josephson, however, this very same period was the era of the "Robber Barons," men who not only found ways to monopolize various industries and exploit workers for huge profits, but also hindered progress. As some people debate whose interpretation is correct, Porter's or Josephson's, others are noticing a similar type of situation occurring here in the latter part of the 20th century. Sklar might be tempted to call this new era the rise of Trilateralism. Personally, I tend to think of this period as being the final phase of concentration of certain targeted corporations into multinational corporations, and the promotion of economic interdependence among the most industrialized countries. These two strategies will of course be guided by the Global Regime. Interestingly enough, the majority of the businesses that were involved in the rise to power approximately one hundred years ago, such as the Morgan group and the Rockefeller family, are the very same ones on the move today as the Regime takes its shape.

I will illustrate in this paper that right-wingers and left-wingers are falling into ideological traps as they attempt to interpret the activities of the Regime, for the actual goal of these Monopolists, that is, men such as David Rockefeller, is to achieve a globally "Planned Economy." As
far as I can see, there will not be so-called Free Market or Socialism in the next century. There will be a "for private profit" system planned totally with the government bodies' assistance in every corner of the world though without the power of production and wealth in the governmental hands. I perceive the Monopolists eliminating all free competition, just as in a socialist regime, but holding on to the power of the purse and production for profit. All this will be guaranteed by laws and agreements within the context of a Global Regime of Interdependence. To future generations, economic and personal freedom will be a thing of the past and socialism merely a myth within this concept.
CHAPTER 2

THE ORIGIN OF THE ANGLO-AMERICAN ESTABLISHMENT AND
THE CREATION OF THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The idea for the current Elite Establishment which is made up of several extremely influential global organizations can be traced back to the latter part of the 19th century to an avid student of Oxford University, Cecil Rhodes. It seems that while attending Oxford University, Rhodes became quite impressed with one of Professor John Ruskin's theories. This fascinating theory was basically about a Platonic ideal society ruled by an elite group. According to Pat Robertson's book *The New World Order*, Ruskin taught Rhodes that "the British upper classes possessed a magnificent tradition of education, beauty, rule of law, decency, and self-discipline that could not be saved unless it were extended to the lower classes in England and to the non-English masses throughout the world." As a word of caution, Ruskin added "The price of failure would be that the minority of upper-class Englishmen would ultimately be submerged by these majorities and their tradition lost." Again, since Robertson does not include notes in his book, there is the problem of how accurate the above passage is.

On February 5, 1891 it is believed that Cecil Rhodes —
still enlightened by Ruskin's teachings — conducted a very special meeting to draw up a plan of organization for a so-called "secret society" and a list of original members.\textsuperscript{14} According to Professor Carroll Quigley, Rhodes had been planning the event for more than seventeen years.\textsuperscript{15} The agenda, simply put, was to carry out "the dream of Cecil Rhodes."

At this point two questions should be raised. First, what evidence is there showing Rhodes actually had plans of forming a secret society? Second, if there was a plan, was the agenda anything similar to what Robertson states? Interestingly enough, we find Rhodes did in fact mention the intention of forming a "secret society" in the first five of his seven wills. Moreover, the fifth will was supplemented with the idea of an educational institution with scholarships, "whose alumni would be bound together by common ideals."\textsuperscript{17}

The intention of Rhodes' secret society is best stated in his first will in 1877. He writes that the purpose was:

The extension of British rule throughout the world, the perfecting of a system of emigration from the United Kingdom and of colonization by British subjects of all lands wherein the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labour, and enterprise, ... the ultimate recovery of the
United States of America as an integral part of a British Empire, the consolidation of the whole Empire, the inauguration of a system of Colonial Representation in the Imperial Parliament which may tend to weld together the disjointed members of the Empire, and finally the foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible and promote the best interests of humanity.\textsuperscript{14}

To achieve his purpose, Rhodes, in the first will, written while he was still an undergraduate of Oxford at the age of twenty-four, left all his wealth to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Carnarvon, and to the Attorney General of Griqualand West, Sidney Shippard. The will specifically instructs the two men to create a secret society patterned on the Jesuits. In Rhodes' words, it is to be "a church for the extension of the British Empire."\textsuperscript{19}

It appears Pat Robertson's claim as to Cecil Rhodes' ideas may be fairly accurate. Rhodes's ideas did eventually materialize into an organization, and although it has changed its name many times over the years, it is still in existence today. To make matters less confusing we can say that before 1901 the proposed organization was mainly referred to as the "Rhodes Secret Society," and after this date as the "Milner Group" (named after another founding
member, Lord Milner). Both terms, nevertheless, refer to the same organization. Other names over the years which refer to this same group have been "Milner's Kindergarten," the "Round Table Group," "The Times crowd," "the Rhodes crowd," the "Chatham house," "All Souls group," and the "Cliveden set."²⁰

Rhodes seemed at times extremely frustrated over the lack of progress his ideas for a society was making in the early stages. Quigley writes: "The one fact which appears absolutely clear in every biography of Rhodes is the fact that from 1875 to 1902 his ideas neither developed nor matured."²¹ This brings us to our next question: How and when did things get under way as to make progress toward achieving a New World Order? The "how" part of our question involves a British gentleman named Lionel Curtis and the organization he founded called the Royal Institute of International Affairs. What makes Curtis such an important figure is that he and his RIIA helped to realize the Anglo-American linkup. The RIIA was — and still is — an offshoot of Rhodes' Milner Group, and in 1921 the RIIA and an American "dinner club" were able to formally establish ties. For a vivid picture of how this all came about we need to go back and examine the conditions of the Paris Peace Conference.

Before Woodrow Wilson sailed off to the Paris Peace
Conference of 1919, his personal confidant, Edward M. House, recruited about one hundred well-educated and well-off people "with some knowledge of the rest of the world" to draw up plans for the peace settlement.22 This apparatus took on the name of The Inquiry. Also sailing with this group were "members of the American upper class."23 These people were expected to give their opinions on the shape of things to come as Foreign Service officers, financial experts, and military strategists. The surprise came, however, when Wilson listened to none of the so-called experts. It appears Wilson felt himself equal to European leaders in brainpower. Three examples will do here as to the atmosphere Wilson created. Robert D. Schulzinger, author of The Wise Men of Foreign Affairs, writes that "Technical experts on the American delegation along with their counterparts from Great Britain, watched in horror as the European heads of government made a fool of the President."24 John Maynard Keynes noted that, like Odysseus, "the President looked wiser when he was seated ... he was not sensitive to his environment at all."25 Finally, Thomas W. Lamont, a Morgan banking partner working with the United States Treasury delegation in Paris, complained saying "by attempting to go it alone, President Wilson handicapped himself greatly."26 Wilson's advisors felt something had to be done to prevent such unexpected actions
by a president from occurring in the future. The unofficial meetings that took place between American and British delegates eventually produced the needed changes.

During the Paris Peace Conference the American and British delegates were housed in two stylish hotels, the British at the Majestic and the Americans at the Crillon. As Wilson kept busy with his private meetings, the delegates met daily at one of the two hotels for breakfast. At one of these breakfasts an idea was expressed that the two teams of delegates continue their collaboration after the war. What was needed, they felt, was a transatlantic research organization, made up of many of the experts at Paris, which would "provide the material from which those who are most influential and who have the greatest amount of knowledge, comprehension and perspective in foreign affairs [to] form public opinion." To the delegates, forming public opinion was essential. Lionel Curtis observed afterward that the peace settlement of Paris had been a reflection of public opinion, and most likely so would future agreements. According to Curtis, "public opinion must be led along the right path ...."

After the Paris Peace Conference the British and American delegates tried for two years to expand their ideas for an Anglo-American research body, but it seemed hopeless. The problem was American anti-British feeling. Finally, in
June of 1921 the Americans contacted Curtis in London and told him that since public opinion would not permit the Americans to join the British, the Americans would go ahead and set up an independent research and discussion group. A small dinner club in New York, consisting of about thirty bankers and lawyers which assembled monthly to talk about American foreign relations, soon took on the role. The group became known as the Council on Foreign Relations. With this accomplished, the British now merely established official sister relations between their Royal Institute of International Affairs and the American Council on Foreign Relations. Thus, the ideals of Cecil Rhodes had finally penetrated into the United States. What we shall look at next is the actual role the CFR has taken on.

Although during the 1920s and 1930s both the RIIA and the CFR had their own publications to spread their propaganda, not much came of their studies of world affairs. It was not until 1939 that the U.S. Government became interested in the CFR and recognized its possibilities. It seems the CFR in early September of 1939 was absolutely sure that war was at hand for America, and Hamilton Fish Armstrong, a member of the CFR, wanted the Council to do more than merely alert the public opinion leaders to the dangers of war. Armstrong felt it was time for the Council to be directly useful to the government. Feeling uneasy
that it had taken over two years during the First World War before the State Department had gotten any help from outside foreign policy experts, Armstrong wanted the CFR to be of immediate service. On September 10, 1939 Armstrong telephoned Assistant Secretary of State George Messersmith and suggested a plan for the Council to help the State Department directly. Armstrong cleverly reminded the State Department that diplomats were so busy following the day-to-day war news between Britain and Germany that they had no time to think of the future. Moreover, the next war, said Armstrong, presented the United States with a "grand opportunity" to become "the premier power in the world." He went on to say how well the country used that power depended on the quality of the plans for the future. Armstrong, of course, volunteered the Council as the appropriate body for drafting those plans. Messersmith was convinced, and the Council was soon authorized by the United States Government to start work on a War and Peace Studies project.

From 1939 the CFR was able to dominate just about every aspect of foreign affairs through the appointments to high Cabinet Office by FDR. In the 1980s the key members of the CFR became known as the "Wise men of Foreign Affairs," and today rule every single appointment to every Cabinet post as well as Director of Central Intelligence and most