



Photo Courtesy of Jamie Brendan

Marching to World Order

The Creation of a United Nations Military Regime

BY JAMIE BRENDAN

"We are not going to achieve a new world order without paying for it in blood as well as in words and money."

— Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 1995, the official journal of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The idea of creating a permanent "world military force" has long been a

desire of many within the international community. Arguments for such a regime often center on the following line: Just as local communities need police to maintain law and order, so too the international community needs a global force to ensure law, order, and world security.

This vision of order and international security has a long history. Already in 1910, during his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech, Theodore Roosevelt called for an international league to

enforce peace "by force." That same year, under the Republican Presidency of William Taft, Congress passed a "peace resolution" which would combine the navies of the world into an international floating brigade – creating, it was hoped, a type of high seas police force.

With the end of World War I and the subsequent rise of the League of Nations, it was enthusiastically believed that a world police could finally be mustered. After all, the League's charter allowed for itself military assets, including naval and air armaments. But World War II functionally collapsed the League of Nations and its dream of global security. However, the idea itself did not die; rather, out of the ashes of World War II, a new and more potent organization arose.

Power plays in high places

On New Year's Day, 1942, a short document titled the Declaration by the United Nations was signed by twenty-six countries – an agreement to cooperate in overthrowing the Nazi regime. This Declaration was seen as both a war pact

and an instrument of lasting peace. More importantly, it was the first time in which the term “United Nations” was officially used.

During those turbulent war years, the United Nations concept was hammered out inside the power circles of Washington, Moscow, and London. Officials such as Hilary Saunders, the Recorder of Combined Operations for WWII, and Sumner Welles, US Under Secretary of State, frequently referred to the allied military forces as fighting for, and under, the United Nations. Moreover, released wire transcripts reveal that on November 29, 1943, President Roosevelt openly suggested to Stalin that this world organization should have a Police Committee, fully equipped with military forces available to act against “aggressor nations.” In the transcript, Stalin responded by suggesting that this force would have to be coercive. Sadly, Roosevelt never corrected Stalin. Instead, he continued to discuss his Police Committee and openly suggested using “bombardment or even occupation” as a viable solution to opposing nations.

Winston Churchill was a party to this idea as well. Approximately nine months after the official creation of the UN on June 26, 1945, Churchill, speaking at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, stated that “the United Nations Organization must immediately begin to be equipped with an international armed force.”

Although a UN commanded and controlled police force didn’t materialize, the dream persisted amongst foreign policy experts. Thomas C. Schelling, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and a recognized leader in military thinking, published an action plan for a “hypothetical” global army in 1964...

The three main kinds of military action that the force could take against a united country would be pain, conquest, and obstruction. By ‘pain’ I mean sheer coercive damage. Nuclear or other weapons might be used to inflict civil damage at a rate sufficient to induce the government to change its mind and bend to the will of the international authority. By ‘conquest’ I mean invasion or occupation sufficient to put the international authority into the role of occupying power. By ‘obstruction’ I mean military action designed to retard

Whetstone

by John L. Bryant

1. Whose hair was white like wool, as white as snow, eyes were as a flame of fire, feet like unto fine brass?
A. Moses B. Jesus C. David D. Abraham
2. One of the 12 spies, he was preserved when other spies perished.
A. Caleb B. Jonah C. Hur D. Ammiel
3. Jesus said that Martha’s sister had chosen that good part. Who is she?
A. Rachel B. Salome C. Herodias D. Mary
4. He, a king, asked God to give him an understanding heart to judge thy people. Known for his wisdom.
A. Jacob B. Esau C. Solomon D. Job
5. He chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God.
A. Cain B. Esau C. Melchizedek D. Moses
6. Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him was spoken by whom?
A. Isaac B. Job C. Peter D. Paul
7. The name of Peter’s brother.
A. John Mark B. Titus C. Andrew D. Matthias
8. The brothers, the sons of Zebedee.
A. James and John B. Reuben and Simeon C. Dan and Gad D. Judas and James
9. Daughter-in-law to Naomi, wife of Boaz.
A. Orpah B. Ruth C. Deborah D. Leah
10. A tower whose top may reach unto heaven, God stopped the building of it.
A. Siloam B. Shechem C. Babel D. Edar
11. Ordered to go to Nineveh – swallowed by a great fish.
A. Jonah B. Balaam C. Amos D. Simon
12. They were interpreters of the law.
A. Publicans B. Scribes C. Sadducees D. Pharisees
13. This blind beggar called out to Jesus and was healed.
A. Simon Zelotes B. Samson C. Bartimaeus D. Saul of Tarsus
14. God chose him, Samuel anointed him, Israel’s first king.
A. Saul B. Joash C. Hezekiah D. David
15. This great apostle was educated under Gamaliel – born in Tarsus of Cilicia.
A. Bartholomew B. Nathaniel C. Paul D. Judas
16. Created by God, Gabriel and Michael are what?
A. Puppets B. Angels C. Satanic beings D. Mountains
17. Wife of Uriah, becomes David’s wife, mother to Solomon.
A. Michal B. Abigail C. Esther D. Bathsheba
18. This judge, strong man, carried away the gates of the city.
A. Samson B. Jonathan C. Abner D. Jeremiah
19. In a vision Isaiah saw someone sitting on a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Who was it?
A. Hezekiah B. Rehoboam C. Nehemiah D. The Lord
20. The sun stood still, and the moon stayed at the request of this man.
A. Abner B. David C. Elisha D. Joshua

Answers on page 20

World Government Watch

a country's rearmament, to make it more costly than the country could manage, to spoil it altogether or to impede it sufficiently to prevent a major threat to the security of other countries. This might be done either by selective bombing or by selective invasion and occupation of key facilities.

Adding to the speed and efficiency of a world army, Schelling recommended that,

...forces could be kept deliberately within the countries that are most likely to be 'enemies.' This would mean keeping strategic forces within the larger industrial countries. It might include the option of moving more forces into a country toward which threats were being made or with which war was imminent. Moving extra forces into the United States or the Soviet Union would of course be a major political move and might be subject to restriction of access. The purpose of being within the country...would be to minimize the cost and delay of invasion, occupation, or selective destruction – i.e., of war. Particularly for non-nuclear invasion – a quick capture of strategic points in the country – mobile forces already within the country, properly distributed, might enhance the likelihood of quick success. The force could occupy Moscow more reliably with ground forces located thirty miles away than by relying on airborne troops in bad weather. An amphibious landing on the coast of Japan, France, or the United States would be harder than just moving troops already located within these countries.

Schelling further suggested a radical agenda that was more akin to hostage taking than conventional military operations,

...put critically vulnerable parts of a country's economy and essential services directly into the hands of an international force. If the force can control the supply of water, electricity, fuel, transport, and communication to American, German, or Soviet cities, it might minimize strategic bombing, selective occupation, and

other violence. To coerce a country, like the landlord who shuts off the utilities when a tenant refuses to move, the force could put on the squeeze by shutting down services. Rather than bomb electric power installations the force might press a key that sets off a charge of dynamite already installed.

If one really believed in the reliability and permanence of an international arrangement, such schemes for providing the authority with 'hostages' might be more efficient, even more humane, than providing it with bombers and shock troops. One could even go further and let the force have a monopoly of critical medicines to use for bacterial warfare on a transgressor country. As soon as it starts an epidemic, it sends its medical units in to make sure that no one suffers who cooperates.

Schelling's hypothetical proposals were just that – proposals. Yet they demonstrated how dangerously advanced a world military force could become, and how it could be used. Decades after Schelling's extreme proposals, one of the G8 nations would finally present a workable plan to the international community – a new world army would at last be attainable.

Canada makes a proposal

During the last ten years, Canada has positioned itself as a major advocate for empowering the United Nations. In 1992, UN Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali presented his forward-looking "peacekeeping" document, *An Agenda for Peace*. While the US administration showed little formal interest, the Canadian federal government responded favorably by releasing a joint report between its Department of National Defence and its Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs. Following in the steps of Boutros-Ghali, the joint report – titled *Meeting New Challenges: Canada's Response to a New Generation of Peacekeeping* – recommended the creation of a "standing UN army" (bold in original) that would be able to counter military forces "of a lesser order." The following year, the Canadian Department of Defense tabled its 1994 Defense White

Paper – a policy directive – which enhanced the call to establish a UN military authority.

Together, the Senate report and the White Paper became the catalysts for a more formal response. Hence, a high-level committee was established between the Canadian government and members of the Ford Foundation, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, the Council on Foreign Relations, and military and policy officials from Russia, Uganda, Argentina, France, New Zealand, Turkey, Japan, and seven other nations.

The end result would prove to be the most comprehensive national proposal to date, and would provide the momentum needed for the UN to actively pursue its own military brigade.

Vanguards for change

In September, 1995, the Canadian government released the recommendations of its high-level planning committee. The document, titled "Towards A Rapid Reaction Capability for the United Nations", made recommendations that no other federal government had previously dared. The group recommended,

— The forming of a UN rapid reaction force completely controlled by the UN Secretary-General. It was suggested that this military force be given a permanent command center, standardized training, and the go-ahead to obtain and use advanced surveillance and communications equipment, including the ability to monitor road traffic via satellites, ground-sensors, and night-vision technologies. It was also recommended that this force be linked into national intelligence organizations [ed. Note: spy agencies such as the CIA, NSA, British MI-6, and the Russian SVR].

— The development and training of the UN's own civilian police units independent of the UN's rapid reaction forces and independent of national governments.

— Establishing numerous "regionally-based" UN military headquarters along with pre-stocking of UN military hardware in nations and regions strategic to the organization's security objectives.

— Creating an "early-warning alert system," thereby giving the United Nations the ability to monitor national

governments and their citizens, all in the name of ensuring a fast response time. (In reality, this is nothing more than the establishment of a UN-based intelligence/spy division.)

Other ideas such as alternative funding for the world body (international taxes) and granting larger legal authority to the United Nations were presented. After all, an international force would need global funding and world law in order to function without interference from outside governments.

Needless to say, UN officials were delighted by the scope and vision of the Canadian document. Other countries, such as Denmark, saw the “advantages” of a UN military brigade and jumped on the bandwagon. In fact, the Danish government started working on the political will necessary to implement such a force. Other European nations added their voices, and, within a very short time, SHIRBRIG was born.

“SHIRBRIG”

On December 15, 1996, the governments of Austria, Canada, Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Sweden signed a “Letter of Intent,” thereby creating SHIRBRIG – the United Nations Stand-by Forces High Readiness Brigade. Less than a year later, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan officially inaugurated the unit. For the first time in history, the UN would be equipped with a military force under its own authority.

Presently there is a SHIRBRIG operational headquarters just north of Copenhagen, a standardized training manual has been written, and the force has been used in Ethiopia and Eritrea. In many ways SHIRBRIG is currently in the embryo stage – a stepping stone of sorts to a larger UN military vision. In time, it is hoped that the brigade will become a self-contained unit with 5,000-10,000 “rapid-reaction” personnel under its command.

Will SHIRBRIG ultimately succeed?

Throughout SHIRBRIG’s formation, the US government has seemed indifferent to it, and many American researchers and foreign policy experts have viewed this attitude as a major stumbling block for UN military empowerment. However, many in the international community believe US support isn’t as crucial as it’s perceived to be. After all, the International Criminal Court was achieved without the blessing of the United States. So too, SHIRBRIG has already become operational without any tangible US backing.

To top it all off, global players have been positioning themselves to take advantage of any favorable change within US/UN relations. The final Canadian report made it clear that current political conditions “are not immutable.” Perhaps Michael Oliver, president of the United Nations Association of Canada, said it best during a 1995 interview regarding UN military empowerment; “When there’s a shift in the US, we’ll be ready.” □

A “Penetrating” New Video Series

Endtime’s Eddie Sax and documentary producer James Dunn II have just completed work on a new video series with Gary Kah from Hope for the World—“Secrets of the UN: A Penetrating Look at the Real Agenda.”

This 4-program collection takes a unique behind-the-scenes look at the inner workings of global government from a perspective never before seen.

“The video actually ‘stars’ an associate of Gary’s, Jamie Brendan,” explained Sax. “Jamie is not his real name. His identity has to be kept hidden, because he is sharing things that, if his identity became known, it would put him into a compromising position.”

Brendan attends world government meetings, but as he explains in the series, “I don’t go to the conferences or get involved in these organizations from a journalist perspective. I’m not going in as a reporter. I don’t have press credentials. I am either accredited to attend, which means they’ve given me the go-ahead to come and participate, or as a recognized observer. I’m being allowed to witness what is happening with the understanding that I am representing other world government interests. In other words, I’m there as ‘one of them.’ There is a huge difference between those who cover these from a press perspective—those who get press releases at the press conferences, versus those who have the ability to go beyond the doors that read, ‘no one else allowed.’” The above article by Brendan deals with some of the information disclosed in the video series’ first program.

Each of the four videos concentrate on a different element of global governance that, unbeknownst to most people, is fast becoming reality. Creating the World Army, Forming the World Parliament, Imposing the Global Tax, and Executing the World Court are the areas of focus. Most of the information shared is not available anywhere

else, because it come from the “inside” where few are allowed and none talk.

“We appreciate the fact that Jamie is providing this special information that no one else has,” said Gary Kah, co-producer of the series. “He lives on the edge, but feels that God has called him to play this very special role at this precarious time in human history.”

“Jamie Brendan” never actually appears on camera during the series. His part was filmed in mosaic and his voice digitally altered. Actual documents not intended for public consumption are shared onscreen. Hard copies of many of these documents are being made available as a companion resource with the video series.

“I’ve been accused to my face of being an infiltrator,” Brendan reflects. “I have been on the brink several times of almost having to lie for my safety when situations get dicey, which they have a few times.”

“Secrets of the UN: A Penetrating Look at the Real Agenda” is available through Endtime for \$60 on video, \$75 on DVD. Fifty pages of accompanying documents are included for free. Each of the four programs can be purchased separately for \$20 video, \$25 DVD. Ready to ship October 1. (See ad on back cover)

Whetstone Answers

1. B., Jesus, Revelation 1:14, 15
2. A., Caleb, Numbers 13:2-16, 14:37, 38
3. D., Mary, Luke 10:42
4. C., Solomon, I Kings 3:9
5. D., Moses, Hebrews 11:25
6. B., Job, Job 13:15
7. C., Andrew, Matthew 4:18
8. A., James and John, Mark 1:19
9. B., Ruth, Ruth 1:2-4, 4:9-10
10. C., Babel, Genesis 11:4, 9
11. A., Jonah, Jonah 1:1, 17
12. B., Scribes, Ezra 7:6, 10, 12
13. C., Bartimaeus, Mark 10:46-52
14. A., Saul, I Samuel 10:21, 24
15. C., Paul, Acts 22:3
16. B., Angels, Luke 1:19, Revelation 12:7
17. D., Bathsheba, II Samuel 11:3,4
18. A., Samson, Judges 16:3
19. D., The Lord, Isaiah 6:1
20. D., Joshua, Joshua 10: 12,