

## U.N. Security Council proclaims world empire

by Joseph Brewda

"A turning point in the world" is how British Prime Minister John Major enthusiastically described the unprecedented United Nations Security Council heads-of-state summit on Jan. 31. With the Cold War declared over, and with collaboration among the five permanent members of the Security Council at an unsurpassed height, the British had called the summit to upgrade the council into an efficient mechanism to impose a five-power dictatorship on the world. We're living in "extraordinary times," Major told the meeting, which also included U.S. President George Bush, Russian President Boris Yeltsin, French President François Mitterrand, and Chinese Prime Minister Li Peng.

Not surprisingly, a British-authored declaration was unanimously adopted by the five heads of state, as well as the representatives of the 10 rotating Security Council member states, who were allowed to be present. The declaration eliminates the idea of national sovereignty under the pretext of ensuring "collective security," which is now defined as no longer limited to merely military matters, but also includes ecological, economic, scientific, human rights, ethnic, and even legal issues. Under the new definition, a violation of human rights or the ecology anywhere is a threat to all, and consequently one potentially requiring intervention.

"It's an exciting opportunity for our United Nations, and we must not allow it to slip away," Bush said to the Security Council in endorsement of the British plan. "The will of the majority must never degenerate into the whim of the majority," he said, "this fundamental principle transcends all borders." Shortly after his address, Bush met with Chinese Prime Minister Li Peng, the butcher of Tiananmen Square, who used his visit to New York to meet various U.S. banking and corporate concerns anxious to invest in what are euphe-

mistically called "Special Economic Zones."

French President Mitterrand, fresh from a trip to Oman to sell French arms, stressed that the Security Council's military powers had to be vastly increased to enforce the new plan. To this end, he called for the creation of a U.N. rapid deployment force of 1,000 troops, capable of deployment anywhere in the world within 24 hours, a proposal which was endorsed by Russian President Yeltsin. According to U.S. press accounts, a plan to form a 500,000-man U.N. army reserve is also under discussion among the powers.

### 'Preventive diplomacy'

The Security Council declaration, which the Anglo-American powers hope will be a basis for furthering their new world order, asserts that no longer will respect for national sovereignty and international law be barriers to the collective imperial will.

Proclaiming the Cold War dead, the declaration states that it is now possible and necessary for the U.N. to "play a more central role" in the world than it has previously done. Playing such a role had been the original intent of the U.N.'s founders, noted former Egyptian Deputy Prime Minister Boutros Boutros Ghali, the new U.N. secretary general, in commenting on the declaration. "It is a return to its origins," he declared. The U.N. was founded by Josef Stalin, Winston Churchill, and Franklin Roosevelt.

In order to play this role, the declaration calls for "strengthening" the U.N. by granting it, for the first time, the "capacity for preventive diplomacy," possibly through deploying the rapid deployment force or reserve army now under consideration. It orders the secretary general to determine, by July 1, ways to upgrade the U.N.'s capacity for

identifying "potential crises and areas of instability" in order to use these new "preventive" powers effectively.

### **Intervention on non-military pretexts**

The statement makes absolutely clear that these crises do not have to be military ones to qualify for U.N. military and other intervention. "The absence of war and military conflicts amongst states does not in itself ensure international peace and security," it reads. "The non-military sources of instability in the economic, social, humanitarian, and ecological fields have become threats to peace and security. The United Nations membership as a whole needs to give the highest priority to the solution of these matters."

Russian President Yeltsin, the communist turned democrat, emphasized Moscow's endorsement of this doctrine in his first speech to the body. "Our topmost priority is to ensure human rights and freedoms in their entirety," he said, even if that involves using military force. Such issues, he said, "are not the internal matter of states but rather their obligation under the U.N. charter, the international covenants and conventions." For his part, Chinese Prime Minister Li Peng cautioned that such formulations should not "use human rights as an excuse," although it is doubtful that any of the other Security Council members contemplate war against China.

Beginning with its genocidal war against Iraq last year, the Security Council has concentrated on setting a series of precedents, pretexts for overriding national sovereignty. So, for example, the Security Council authorized the occupation of northern Iraq under the pretext of protecting the Kurds, despite the fact that even the French authors of the U.N. resolution authorizing the deployment admitted that this "humanitarian" intervention into the internal affairs of a state had no basis in international law. In his remarks to the Security Council, Major reported that this intervention must be considered a precedent for future actions. "There will be other such crises [as with the Kurds]. People everywhere expect the U.N. to react, to save lives," he said.

In early January, in another precedent for the British declaration, the Security Council passed a resolution threatening to bomb Libya if it did not hand over two alleged terrorists to the United States and Britain, despite the fact that there is no current extradition treaty between the nations, and the demand is otherwise contrary to normal legal practice. Commenting on this precedent, U.S. Amb. Thomas Pickering said it "makes clear that neither Libya nor any other state can seek to hide support for international terrorism behind traditional principles of international law and state practice."

### **Development also banned**

One of the major points of emphasis in the declaration is the denial of advanced technologies, including weapons technologies, to countries which are not members of the

Security Council. "The proliferation of all weapons of mass destruction constitutes a threat to international peace and security," the declaration claims. The members of the Security Council commit themselves to preventing the spread of technology related to the research for, or production of, such weapons, and to taking appropriate action to that end.

Under the rubric of "dual-use technology," the Security Council deems such technologies as being any that could potentially be used to make weapons, even if that is not their intent. For example, high-speed computers and centrifuges are currently banned from Iraq out of such professed concerns, as is technology to manufacture insecticides, since the U.N. claims that such technology might be used to make poison gas.

On nuclear proliferation, the declaration notes the importance of the the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and emphasizes the role of that treaty in the implementation of fully effective International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA) safeguards. The members of the Security Council will take the appropriate measures in the case of any violations, the declaration declares.

The IAEA, ironically, had been established in the 1950s to promote the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Now, there is intense discussion among the Security Council to change the charter of that U.N.-linked body to give it policing powers over the spread of nuclear energy, whether for civilian or military use. In an earlier Security Council resolution, Iraq has been ordered to end all nuclear research, and even the instruction of nuclear physics in its universities, in order to prevent such proliferation. Now the Security Council is intent on making that resolution a precedent for general application.

That such resolutions are imperially motivated was made clear by a speech given by German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher earlier in January in Washington. There, Genscher warned of the "threat" of "wandering technological mercenaries." Alluding to the so-called "Islamic bomb," Genscher warned that unemployed Russian nuclear scientists might find employment in "rich countries outside of Europe." Genscher called on the Security Council (of which Germany is not a member) to prepare a "bundle of sanctions" that would "isolate" any state seeking to build such weapons, whether a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty or not.

In order to make clear that any state violating these strictures will be annihilated, the declaration also gives approval to the Gulf war and the continuing genocidal destruction of Iraq: "The resolutions adopted by the Security Council [in regard to Iraq] remain essential to the restoration of peace and stability in the region and must be fully implemented." In his address to the Security Council, Bush made a point of condemning Iraq and Libya as "renegade regimes." He demanded that Libya promptly comply with an earlier resolution ordering it to hand over two alleged terrorists, or otherwise presumably face the Iraq treatment.