

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نېاشد تن من مباد بدین بوم ویر زنده یک تن مباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبان های اروپایی

<http://www.strategic-culture.org/news/2015/11/14/the-current-assault-against-democracy-i.html>

The Current Assault Against Democracy (I)

Eric ZUESSE
11/14/2015

U.S. President Barack Obama's proposed international 'trade' deals are actually treaties to destroy democracy in the participating nations, and the remarkably small cadre of owners of the controlling blocks of stock in the major international corporations will collectively take ironclad and virtually permanent control of these nations, if these 'deals' win those governments' approval; but, the proposed treaties are moving forward toward ratification nonetheless; and, apparently nothing can stop them. The powers-that-be are absolutely determined to take us over, and to leave us only the empty shell of democracy: constitutions that are in-name-only, the real power being left entirely in the hands of the international-corporate aristocracy.

On 12 November 2015, the European Commission resumed negotiations with the United States over the crucial ISDS, or Investor State Dispute Settlement, provisions Obama's proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership treaty with the EU. (It will be the largest 'trade' treaty — and about *far more than merely* 'trade' — in history, if it ultimately becomes law.)

Those negotiations between the U.S. and EU had been suspended for over a year, back in March 2014, because of the huge public opposition by Europeans against ISDS and consequently against TTIP itself. Those demonstrations continued to rise; and, so, in October 2014, the American commentator Paul Craig Roberts headlined «The Lie Machine» about not only the

proposed treaty but the Establishment's response to the huge public demonstrations in Europe against that «Lie Machine.» However, now, over a year later, the European Commission evidently feels that things have quieted down enough for them to resume these negotiations.

A week earlier, on November 5th, the preliminary public text of the equivalent Obama-proposed treaty with U.S.-allied Asian countries, the Trans Pacific Partnership or TPP, was issued; and, if it becomes passed into law in all 12 of those countries, then no matter what future scientific research might turn out to show about global warming, product-toxicity, or health-effects from specific toxins, the existing regulations will be essentially locked-in forever: those regulations will be able to be reduced but not to be increased, in any of the participating countries. And, as far as worker-protections are concerned, even a country where labor-union organizers routinely get murdered and where those crimes are never prosecuted, will not be able to be restricted from access to each and every other participating nation's markets. Whether or not labor unions will even be possible then is doubtful, because the race-to-the-bottom will be on in full force, with little if anything to stop it.

These sorts of mega-historical changes don't just come from out of nowhere. There is a substantial history behind them.

In 1954, Western-nation aristocracies began an assault against democracy, and it's coming to culmination right now. It's the biggest anti-democracy assault ever launched; it is global, and it is conceptually brilliant. The very real danger therefore now exists that democracy's fundamental principle (which still remains only the ideal, and not the reality in most if not all countries) of one-person-one-vote, will be irrevocably replaced throughout the world by one-dollar-one-vote. The danger is now imminent, that rule by wealth (individual dollars), instead of rule by persons (individual human beings), will soar and become actually locked-in for the future. (To a large extent, it's the system that already exists, but we're at the tipping-point now of its becoming far more so, and locked-in forever, throughout not only the United States but all nations which are allied with the United States: and that's what this article will be about, so that the information here regarding this may become publicly known as widely as possible, as fast as possible.)

The only extent to which an individual human being, in this billionaires'-dream governmental system, will be able to have a significant say in his or her government, is via how many dollars that particular individual person happens to own, and via the effectiveness with which the individual deploys those dollars so as to control the government to his particular favor. This will be a government via property, instead of via persons. (Already, the wealthiest 80 individuals own at least as much as do the poor half of Mankind, and the wealthiest 0.7% own at least 13.67 times as much as do the world's poorest 68.7%. The billionaires'-dream system will, if it finally becomes instituted — which will certainly happen if U.S. President Barack Obama's three proposed international 'trade' treaties the TTIP, TPP, and TISA, become implemented — sharply increase those ratios, the world's inequalities of wealth. They'll own an even bigger percentage of the world's wealth than they do now.)

The billionaires'-dream system, which has now come to be referred to as «Investor State Dispute Resolution», or «ISDS», actually had its origin at the first meeting of the Bilderberg group, in 1954, at which the need for this system was first put forth, by certain members of that group, to

the others. (Many participants at that meeting were actually representatives whom a billionaire had selected to be there on his or her behalf; others were principals: the billionaires themselves. Even for a meeting like this, it's common for a billionaire to send a trusted representative, not attend personally.)

The Bilderberg group were first called together by the profoundly corrupt aristocrat (and no one can reasonably object to anything that is linked to here unless the given link is *first* examined, which supplies the supporting evidence for what's being linked there) Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, he a 'former' Nazi who had then married the Netherlands' Queen Juliana, which placed him now into a perfect position for calling together such a private gathering in 1954, which was specifically of top European and American aristocrats and their most-trusted agents.

He had been born Bernhard Leopold Friedrich Eberhard Julius Kurt Karl Gottfried Peter Graf von Biesterfeld in Jena, Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, of the German Empire, on 29 June 1911, as the first son of Prince Bernhard of Lippe (younger brother of Leopold IV, Prince of Lippe, the reigning Prince of Lippe) and his wife, Armgard von Cramm. Queen Beatrix was the daughter of his marriage to the Queen. Wikipedia observes of Bernhard, that, "While at university [which was in Switzerland, at the University of Lausanne — *not* at a German university; and, so, this was entirely a reflection of *his free will*], Bernhard joined the Nazi Party. He also enrolled in the Sturmabteilung (SA), which he left in 1934 when he graduated. The Prince later denied that he had belonged to SA, to the Reiter-SS (SS Cavalry Corps), and to the NSKK [Nazi paramilitary organization], but these are well-documented memberships.» Wikipedia goes on to note that, "The Prince eventually went to work for the German chemical giant IG Farben, then the world's fourth-largest company (which survives today as BASF, AGFA, and Bayer). He lodged with the exiled Russian nobleman Count Pavel Kotzue and his wife the American-born Allene Tew. After training, Bernhard became secretary to the board of directors at the Paris office in 1935.»

IG Farben was at the core of the group of international corporations that financed Adolf Hitler's rise to power, and that benefited from his rule. It is simply inconceivable that Prince Bernhard disagreed with the international-corporate agenda of the Nazi Party. Adolf Hitler had said, in a speech at the Industrial Club of Dusseldorf on 27 January 1932, to Germany's assembled aristocrats:

Let no one say that the image which is conveyed as the first impression of the culture of mankind is the impression of its overall achievement. This entire structure of culture, down to its foundations and in each of its building blocks, is nothing other than the result of creative talent, the achievement of intelligence, and the industriousness of individuals. The greatest results are the great crowning achievement of individual geniuses endowed by God [he often invoked God]; the average results are the achievement of men of average ability; and the total result is undoubtedly a product of the application of human working power towards the exploitation of the creations of geniuses and talented men. But this naturally means that, when the capable minds of a nation – who are always in the minority – are given a value equal with all the others, this must result in subjugating the genius to the majority, in subjecting the ability and the value of the individual to the majority, a process which is mistakenly called the rule of the people. This is not the rule of the people, but in fact the rule of stupidity, of mediocrity, of half-measures, of cowardice, of weakness, and of inadequacy. The rule of the people is rather when a people

allows itself to be governed and led in all areas of life by its most capable individuals who are born for the task.

Hitler then said:

You, Gentlemen, are of the opinion that the construction of the German economy must be based upon the concept of private property. Then again, you can only maintain the idea of private property if it appears to be somehow founded in logic. This concept must draw its ethical justification from the insight that it is a necessity dictated by nature... Men are not equally valuable, not equally significant in every area from the onset.

This is the fundamental aristocratic principle: The superior are worth more than the inferior and should therefore rule over them — and an individual's wealth is a reflection of the person's degree of superiority-inferiority. The rich should reign. Hitler said that he and his Party represented this principle.

When Hitler said this in private to Germany's corporate chieftains assembled in Dusseldorf at the start of 1932, many of them already knew it by then; and any who didn't, certainly were able to get word of it afterward from their friends who attended, if they themselves had not attended. Consequently, at the top level in German society, this was Hitler, these were his views, before he rose to power.

The new system is a placing-into-practice of Hitler's worldview that he expressed there. However, Hitler did not consider Jews to be humans at all, but instead as being descended from the snake that caused original sin in Genesis 3; so, any wealth that they owned, was, in his outlook, entirely illegitimate. Other than that, the aristocratic principle applied throughout Hitler's thinking. And no Jews were at the meeting. It was entirely a Christian aristocratic group.

An account of Bernhard's sponsorship of the international Christian far-right, including Washington's Prayer Breakfasts for congressmen, mentions, regarding his marriage in to the Dutch Queen, that:

traveling to the Reich's Chancellery, he met personally with Adolf Hitler who had publicly insinuated that the marriage of the German Prince to the future Queen of the Netherlands was a sign of an alliance between the two nations. Then, for several days leading up to his marriage to Princess Juliana on January 7, 1937, Prince Bernhard entertained SS officer Langenheim in the Dutch royal palace. The Prince provided the SS representative with an assessment of the political situation in the Netherlands and the role of the Dutch Nazi Party, all of which was reported back in detail to the German Foreign Minister, Joachim von Ribbentrop.

Once Hitler invaded Holland, Prince Bernhard joined the war against Germany; he was now Dutch royalty, no longer merely a Christian German aristocrat, and the aristocratic tradition has always been military loyalty to the land one rules. Furthermore, on no grounds could the Prince condone invasion of his own (adopted) country. He had married up, and he was determined to stay up, and on top.

AFTER WW II

After World War II, when the conservative U.S. President Dwight David Eisenhower came into power and appointed to top posts two Wall Street lawyers whose careers had been devoted to the U.S. aristocracy that had assisted in Hitler's rise to power, John Foster Dulles as the U.S. Secretary of State, and Allen Dulles as the Director of the CIA, a movement was started on both sides of the Atlantic to institute the fascist vision (Nazism without the anti-Semitic obsession that Hitler had had), and this was the vision as Benito Mussolini had conceived of it, and which he had gotten from his teacher, Vilfredo Pareto, who wrote extensively about the natural aristocracy and even about the ruthlessness that is essential in order to rise within the aristocracy.

Democratic U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt repeatedly condemned such people. In his 1936 renomination acceptance speech, he had said: «Economic royalists complain that we seek to overthrow the institutions of America. What they really complain of is that we seek to take away their power. Our allegiance to American institutions requires the overthrow of this kind of power. In vain they seek to hide behind the flag and the Constitution». But now, after the war, they were determined to win their goals, though in a different way than through merely fascist militarizing and propaganda.

The European side of this program entailed as a prerequisite the establishment of the European Union, so that Europe's aristocrats collectively could become powerful enough as a group to constitute a sufficiently united partner with America's aristocracy. In fact, this was, to a large extent, what the Bilderberg group was initially intended to establish: a United States of Europe.

On the European side, one major figure toward specifically the establishment of ISDS, was Hermann Abs, who ran Deutsch Bank, from 1957 on. He started attending the annual Bilderberg meetings in 1958. The next time he's publicly known to have attended was 1966. Of course, Prince Bernhard himself was the leader at each meeting.

On the American side, David Rockefeller and his friend George W. Ball were regular attendees, right from the very first meeting of the group.

The key *American* prerequisite to the establishment of ISDS was to overcome the provision in the U.S. Constitution that says, «The President... shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur.» Whereas America was, even then, sufficiently corrupt so as to be able to muster the regular 50%+1 votes that's required for a Senate win for any normal law, the likelihood that 67% of Senators would vote to pass a treaty that has ISDS in it, was recognized to be almost zero. America's aristocrats therefore knew that some way would need to be found to circumvent the U.S. Constitution, because any attempt to *amend* it so as to enable an ISDS treaty to pass Congress, would certainly fail.

The solution they came up with was a provision they buried within the Trade Act of 1974, which Act was surreptitiously written so as to employ the term «treaty» only once (concerning a particular type of circumstance when «there is a treaty or trade agreement in force» and which thus entirely ambiguously handled the key question of whether the «or» meant either one, or else

meant both of them as being synonyms meaning the same thing (which latter was the way that the laws had previously always assumed: a «treaty» is *any* type of international agreement, and a «trade agreement» is merely a particular type of that) and then so as to employ the key phrase «trade agreement» 88 times — thence to handle such an entity («trade agreement») in an entirely different way from what the Constitution set forth as pertaining to a «treaty», under the there-implicit and never-stated assumption that a «trade agreement» between countries does *not* constitute a particular *type* of «treaty» between them: that it's to be handled essentially like any regular law is. By this artificial device, sulphuric acid has become poured over, ultimately, the entire U.S. Constitution, bit by bit. All of this was done so that the U.S. can initiate ISDS treaties (and in other countries, they are always *called* «treaties», because those countries don't have any Constitutional safeguards against passing such monstrous treaties into force — other countries can just *do* it).

The reason why America's Founding Fathers had included the stringent requirement of two-thirds of U.S. Senators voting in favor of a treaty in order for it to become binding law in the U.S. is that they recognized that a treaty can almost never be abandoned by merely an individual country; it's an agreement a core portion of which is its very membership; and any change in that membership is as difficult as is a successful secession of one part of a country from the rest of it — *extremely* difficult. In other words, there is something about any treaty (or 'international agreement') that is potentially far more dangerous than a mere law within any single nation. So: the drafters of the U.S. Constitution required a two-thirds majority, instead of the usual simple majority, whenever a «treaty' is being passed in the U.S. Senate.

In order to understand why the Republican President Richard Nixon was able in 1974 to obtain the support of both of the then-solidly Democratic two houses of Congress to pass into law the unConstitutional Fast-Track-initiating «Trade Act of 1974», notwithstanding the then-ongoing investigations by Democrats regarding Nixon's Watergate scandal, one must go back actually to the first meeting of the extremely secretive elite fascistic international Bilderberg group, in 1954. Here from wikileaks is a 1955 status report from Bilderbergs, on their early-stage results; and the man who wrote that report and hypocritically praised in it «the quintessence of democratic life», was none other than the 'former' Nazi, Prince Bernhard, who went all the way to his grave in 2004 as a champion of global rule by the American and European aristocracies. (The group was subsequently expanded by Bilderbergers David Rockefeller and the born Polish nobleman Zbigniew Brzezinski to include Japan in their Trilateral Commission, many members of which are also Bilderbergers; but Brzezinski is no longer in the group, nor even mentioned on their website). Within just three years, the 1957 membership of the Bilderberg organization became far more American, far less European, but David Rockefeller and his Wall Street friend George W. Ball (the Ball family intermarried with the DuPont family) were, as I mentioned, two of the leading Bilderbergers from the very start.

THE ARISTOCRACY'S RADICAL REJECTION OF DEMOCRACY

The Bilderberg group turned away from the former Democratic President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's international goal for the post-WW II world (conceived in conjunction with Rexford Guy Tugwell, FDR's chief policy-advisor), which international goal, building upon an already-existing grassroots movement, and entirely alien to the artificial concept of top-down aristocratic

global control that the Bilderbergs promote, had been instead the gradual natural evolution, bottom-up, toward a *democratic* world government: a global confederation of free and independent states, not corporate at all but instead a United States of the World, in which the types of imperial international aggressions that the fascist powers had perpetrated and which produced WW II would be outright banned, and this aggression-ban would be backed up by an international military force which would have the participation of each one of the world's states.

In other words: FDR's co-conception, and his enduring goal, was of a *democratic federal world government*, not of a fascist or any other dictatorial and non-federal world government. It envisioned an international democracy, consisting of the world's nations as its federal units, even if some of those nations might still be dictatorships, in which case the democracy at the federal level (and the pressure from the democratic nations of the world) would then encourage any dictatorial nations to change or evolve *in the direction of democracy*. This was Franklin Delano Roosevelt's hope. It was a reasonable one. And it was rooted not only in an existing grassroots American movement but in a conception of how future history could evolve toward peace as naturally as possible, and with a minimum of command-and-control from the top — no aristocracy in control. This was a vision that was fully in keeping with the goals of America's Founders. But it sought to *extend* that vision to the *international* sphere, in the modern age. The concept of a United States of the World was based on that. And the U.N. was to be the first step towards it.