

# *The New World Order* & *The Constitution of the United States*



*“Invito Beneficium Non Datur”*

*“No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent”*

## **Abstract**

The Charter of the United Nations was drafted at the the UN Conference on International Organizations in San Francisco in 1945. The 50 signatory nations worked with other non-governmental organizations to complete their task in just two months time. The Charter was ratified by the five permanent members of the Security Council on October 21, 1945.

World War II had just ended. The world was trying to get back on its feet from the death and destruction that only war can engender. Cities needed to be rebuilt; lives put back together, wounds healed, souls made whole. It was a time of sorrow, a time of need, a time for reaching out for a helping hand – when innocent vulnerability rises from the ashes of insufferable hardship.

Such were the breeding grounds that led to the surrogate to the League of Nations we examined in our first paper of the New World Order Series. The stated public goal was the same – to foster an international organization empowered beyond a single nation-state to prevent war and to be the protector of human rights. This was to be done by the rule of law – international law, as agreed upon by TREATIES between nations.

The following is a comparison between the United Nations *International Covenant on Civil and Political Right* (1966) and the rights within *The Constitution of the United States* and *The Declaration of Independence*, and a further comparison to certain articles and provisions of *The International Monetary Fund*.

First a number of articles from the U.N. Covenant will be given with comments directly following each one. After the U.N. articles portions of the United States Constitution are offered with comments after each.

Next information on the International Monetary Fund will be provided followed by comments.

The last section is a summary discussion of the series and conclusions drawn therefrom.

## U.N. International Covenant

### Article 4

1. In time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation and the existence of which is officially proclaimed, the States Parties to the present Covenant may take measures derogating from their obligations under the present Covenant to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, **provided** that such measures are not **inconsistent** with their other obligations under **international law** and do not involve discrimination solely on the ground of race, color, sex, language, religion or social origin.  
[1]

### Comment

Note the wording “*provided that such measures are not inconsistent with their other obligations under international law.*” What this is saying is that a Nation-State cannot derogate from this Covenant if such measures are inconsistent with **international law**. International law therefore, is being placed **above** the national laws of any given Nation-State. This represents a loss of sovereignty.

### Article 18

3. Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs **may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law** and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.  
[2]

### Comment

Note the wording “*may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law.*” This is not **freedom** – this is **permission** that is **subject to limitations** prescribed by law.

### Article 19

1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.
2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.

3. The exercise of the rights provided for in paragraph 2 of this article carries with it special duties and responsibilities. It may therefore **be subject to certain restrictions**, but these shall only be such as are provided by law **and are necessary**.<sup>[3]</sup>

### **Comment**

Once again, this is not an unalienable right, as it has “*special duties and responsibilities that can **subject** it to certain **restrictions**.*” And what does “are necessary” mean, and who determines such? Such wording leaves the barn door wide open.

### **Article 21**

The right of peaceful assembly shall be recognized. **No restrictions** may be placed on the exercise of this right **other than those imposed in conformity with the law** and which **are necessary** in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order (ordre public), the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.<sup>[4]</sup>

### **Comment**

Notice the wording “*no restrictions **OTHER** than those **imposed** in conformity with the law.*”

### **Article 24**

2. Every child shall be **registered** immediately after birth and shall have a name.<sup>[5]</sup>

### **Comment**

I simply bring attention to the fact that every child is to be registered and ask how and why and what for? Cui Bono? In the United States would this be the same thing as receiving a social security number? How is being registered a right? Would this fall under the rubric of an unalienable right or natural right? If not – what kind of right?

## **Warburg on World Government**

The US Senate report on Resolutions Relative to Revision of the United Nations Charter, Atlantic Union, World Federation, page 494, 1950, has James P. Warburg stating the following:

“... The great question of our time is not whether or not world government can be achieved, but whether or not it can be achieved by peaceful means. We shall have **world government, whether or not we like it**. The question is only whether world government will be achieved by **consent** or by **conquest**.”<sup>[6]</sup>

### **Comment**

Well, at least Mr. Warburg doesn't mince his words. His position is unabashedly clear – we shall have world government whether we like it or not; and whether we consent or not, and need to be conquered to achieve *their* desired goal. Whose goal might this be – why Mr. Warburg and his elite friend's goal – the moneychangers Christ was so fond of.

“Please allow me to introduce myself, I'm a man of wealth and taste  
I've been around for a long, long year – stole many a man's soul and faith.

Pleased to meet you, hope you guess my name  
What's bugging you – is the nature of my game.” [a]

Now we will compare the wording of the above quoted U.N. “rights” to the rights of our Constitution and to the Declaration of Independence.

## **Article VI – U.S. Constitution**

### **Clause 2:**

“This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution [of any state] or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.” [7]

### **Comment**

Notice that the laws of the United States are to be in **pursuance** of the Constitution – to follow its guiding course, as the Constitution comes before the laws of the state. No law, be it on the local, state, or Federal level, can supercede the Constitution or **not** be in **pursuance** thereof. This also pertains to international law as well.

### **Clause 3:**

“The senators and representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States [government] and of the several states, shall be **bound by oath** of affirmation **to support this Constitution; ...**” [8]

### **Comment**

The above clause clearly indicates that all senators, representatives, members of the state legislators, and all executive and judicial officers – on both the Federal and State level – are **bound by oath to support the Constitution**. It is their **sworn duty** not to go against the Constitution but to support it. This **includes** putting any international law before or above our Constitution.

## The Courts

So far we have discussed certain facets of the UN Covenant versus our own Constitution. There have been several Supreme Court cases on these vary same issues. Now, let's take a look at what the courts have to say.

“No agreement with a foreign nation can confer power on the Congress, or on any other branch of government, which is free from the restraints of the Constitution.” [9]

“All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void.” [10]

“An unconstitutional act **is not law**; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as **inoperative** as though it had never been passed.” [11]

“The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, **is in reality no law**, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it. **No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it.**” [12]

### Comment

It is most obvious that the courts place the Constitution before any law – be it national or international. All law that can apply to an American, within the borders of our country, is in the Constitution, **and or** must be in **pursuance** of the Constitution or it is null and void, conferring no rights or duties – it is as if it never existed.

## Declaration of Independence

Now we will examine and compare the *Declaration of Independence* to the above U.N. Articles. In part the Declaration states:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” [13]

Thomas Jefferson is recognized as the author of the Declaration of Independence. James Madison wrote the *Virginia Declaration of Rights 1776* prior to Jefferson's rendition for the Federal Nation-State. Here is the first article from Madison's pen:

“**Article I:** That all men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain *inherent rights*, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and *possessing property*, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.” [14]

## Comment

Notice the similarity between the two documents, **except** that Madison **included possessing personal property**, while Jefferson **did not** – a most interesting divergence. Why did Jefferson leave this out? Was it an oversight or was it deliberate?

“I stuck around St. Petersburg – when I saw it was a time for a change  
Killed the czar and his ministers – Anastasia screamed in vain

Pleased to meet you, hope you guess my name  
What’s puzzling you – is the nature of my game” [b]

Either way we see that man has **unalienable** rights – rights that are **unascertainable** and **inherent** and cannot be deprived thereof.

The above United States documents clearly state unalienable, unascertainable, inherent rights that cannot be deprived from the individual. They stand **without qualification** in a **free state of nature**.

The United Nations *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* claim to be unalienable, yet they come with **qualifications** and **limitations** that thus render them **ascertainable**.

There is a large difference between the United Nations version and the United State’s version of what constitutes an **unalienable** right that is **unascertainable**.

We have seen that treaties are both part of the Supreme Law of the Land of the United States, as well as being the mechanism by which international agreements and or contracts are ratified by. Let’s now examine treaties.

## Treaties

*Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations,*

“Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any Member of the United Nations after the present Charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and published by it.” [15]

Treaties are agreements between nations. Some nations consider agreements between a nation and international organizations such as the United Nations to be a treaty.

The Constitution grants the US Senate authority to ratify treaties with others. The President does **not** have the **authority** to agree to a treaty **without the Senate’s approval** according to due process.

## Constitution of the United States - Article 1

Section 10 – Paragraph 1

“No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.”<sup>[16]</sup>

## Constitution of the United States - Article 2

### Section 2 – Paragraph 2

“He (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**; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.” [(the President) added by this author].<sup>[17]</sup>

## Constitution of the United States - Article 6

### Paragraph 2

“This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; **and all Treaties made**, or which shall be made, **under the Authority** of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.”<sup>[18]</sup>

## Comment

So, as is clearly evident, the President **cannot** enter into a treaty **without** the help, advice, and a **two thirds majority vote** of consent from the **Senate**.

Evidently what was required for the United States to enter into an international organization such as the U.N. would have been a working group between the President and the Senators.

A vote of **two thirds majority** would be required for ratification, **and** any such “joining” would still have to be in pursuance of the Constitution and be acceptable to We the People who come BEFORE the Constitution.

And lastly, any such treaty must be approved by proper due process PRIOR to any signing of the charter and pledge to join the organization – not ipso facto.

We the People our Sovereign. The Constitution comes next. The government set up by the Constitution by grant from We the People comes last. All is subordinate to We the People.

“There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty in the government of the [federal] United States... In this country sovereignty resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they [the sovereign people] have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it: All else is withheld.” [19]

“In this state as in all republics, it is not the Legislature, however translucent it’s powers, who are supreme- but the people- and to suppose that they may violate the fundamental law, is, as has been most eloquently expressed, to affirm that the deputy is greater than his principle; that the servant is above his master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves; that men acting by virtue of delegated power may do not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid.” [20]

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution did not grant rights to We the People – they simply **acknowledged** unalienable rights or natural rights that **already existed**.

“Life, liberty, and property do not exist because men have made laws. On the contrary, it was the fact that life, liberty, and property existed beforehand that caused men to make laws in the first place.” [21]

The government was granted certain powers by the people to **PROTECT** our unalienable rights. The government serves the people by grant and empowerment of the people. The entire mandate of the government is to **PROTECT** the rights of the people.

“All that government does and provides legitimately is in pursuit of its duty to provide protection for private rights (Wynhammer v. People, 13 NY 378), which duty is a debt owed to it’s creator, WE THE PEOPLE and the private unfranchised individual; which debt and duty is never extinguished nor discharged, and is perpetual. No matter what the government/state provides for us in manner of convenience and safety, the unfranchised individual owes nothing to the government.” [22]

Our Constitution only granted the **US Senate authority to ratify treaties** with others. The President was granted the power to make them or have them drawn up (written) but only the Senate has the power to ratify or dismiss. Americans have been misled into believing that treaties are part of the Supreme Law of the Land with the power to supersede our Constitution. Such a supposition is completely false and spurious. A treaty must be in pursuance of the Constitution or it is null and void – as if it had never existed.

“I watched with glee – while your kings and queens  
Fought for ten decades for the gods they made

I shouted out, who killed the Kennedys?  
When after all it was you and me

Please to meet you, hope you guess my name  
What’s confusing you – is the nature of my game” [c]

## **Court Rulings**

So far, we have discussed the UN Covenant as compared to the U.S. Constitution. The Supreme Court has ruled on these same issues several times. Let’s take a look at what the court has previously ruled regarding treaties.

“This Court has regularly and uniformly recognized the supremacy of the Constitution over a treaty.” [23]

“. . . No agreement with a foreign nation can confer power on the Congress, or any other branch of government, which is free from the restraints of the Constitution. Article VI, the Supremacy clause of the Constitution declares, ‘This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all the Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; . . .’” This case involved the question: Does the NATO Status of Forces Agreement (treaty) supersede the U.S. Constitution? [24]

Thomas Jefferson wrote the following in a letter to Wilson C. Nicholas back in 1803 regarding the issue of treaties and the Constitution.

“Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction [interpretation]. I say the same as to the opinion of those who consider the grant of the treaty making power as boundless. If it is, then we have no Constitution.” [25]

And lastly we have the following decision, which pretty much sums it all up.

“It would be manifestly contrary to the objectives of those who created the Constitution, as well as those who were responsible for the Bill of Rights - let alone alien to our entire constitutional history and tradition - to construe Article VI as permitting the United States to exercise power UNDER an international agreement, without observing constitutional prohibitions.” [26]

“In effect, such construction would permit amendment of that document in a manner not sanctioned by Article V. The prohibitions of the Constitution were designed to apply to all branches of the National Government and they cannot be nullified by the Executive or by the Executive and Senate combined. This Court

has also repeatedly taken the position that an Act of Congress, which MUST comply with the Constitution, is on full parity with a treaty and that when a statute which is subsequent in time is inconsistent with a treaty, the statute to the extent of conflict, renders the treaty null. It would be completely anomalous to say that a treaty need not comply with the Constitution when such an agreement can be overridden by a statute that must conform to that instrument.”

“The treaty power as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the government or of its departments and those arising from the nature of the government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the government, or a change in the character of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter without its consent.” <sup>[27]</sup>

## The International Monetary Fund

Following the end of World War II, the allied countries found themselves in a world of economic disorder, fostered by the severe financial strains created to fund the war. On December 27, 1945, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) emerged from the Bretton Woods Agreement.

Its original goal was to put in order the world’s international monetary and financial systems and to help transition the debilitated war-economy to a vibrant peace-economy. The Fund thus provided temporary loans to countries in financial distress. Twenty-nine countries drafted and signed its original *Articles of Agreement*.

Focus was concentrated on eliminating exchange restrictions between countries, thus providing stability to the various exchange rates between foreign currencies, as well as promoting international trade.

Within the last 30 years the primary purpose of the IMF has been to provide bridge loans to developing nations that are experiencing shortages in foreign exchange or in **paying back existing loans**.

Voting rights are based on the size of a country’s financial contributions called quotas to the IMF. Because the most developed nations contribute the most money, they dominate the policies implemented, especially those of the United States – the largest financial contributor to the Fund.

IMF loans are famous for the imposition of **draconian** measures that require a nation to divert its monies out of public employment, welfare, pension systems, education and healthcare, and into **debt repayment**.

The focus has always been on **extending credit** and the **payment** of the **debt service** thereby engendered; another **wealth transference** mechanism par excellence. The

following information is from the IMF's website as linked and noted below. Highlights in bold type are an addition.

## **The International Monetary Fund**

“**Special Drawing Rights (SDRs)** is a potential **claim** on the freely usable currencies of *The International Monetary Fund* members.

SDRs are defined in terms of a basket of major currencies used in international trade and finance. At present, the currencies in the basket are the euro, the pound sterling, the Japanese yen and the United States dollar.

2006–[2010](#): USD 44%, EUR 34%, JPY 11%, GBP 11%

*[The U.S. dollar-value of the SDR is posted here daily.](#)*

The SDR is an **international** reserve asset, created by the IMF in 1969 to supplement the existing official reserves of member countries. SDRs are allocated to member countries in proportion to their IMF *quotas*. The SDR also serves as the unit of account of the IMF and some other international organizations. Its value is based on a basket of key international currencies (IMF fact sheet).

Why was the SDR created and what is it used for today?

The Special Drawing Right (SDR) was created by the IMF in 1969 to support the Bretton Woods fixed exchange rate system. A country participating in this system needed official reserves—government or central bank holdings of gold and widely accepted foreign currencies—that could be used to purchase the domestic currency in world foreign exchange markets, as required to maintain its exchange rate. But the international supply of two key reserve assets—*gold* and the U.S. dollar—proved inadequate for supporting the expansion of world trade and financial development that was taking place. Therefore, the international community decided to create a new international reserve asset under the auspices of the IMF.

However, only a few years later, the Bretton Woods system collapsed and the major currencies shifted to a floating exchange rate regime. In addition, the growth in international capital markets facilitated borrowing by creditworthy governments. Both of these developments lessened the need for SDRs.

Today, the SDR has only limited use as a reserve asset, and its main function is to serve as the unit of account of the IMF and some other international organizations. The SDR is neither a currency, nor a claim on the IMF. Rather, it is a potential claim on the freely usable currencies of IMF members. Holders of SDRs can obtain these currencies in exchange for their SDRs in two ways: first, through the arrangement of voluntary exchanges between members; and second, by the IMF designating members with strong external positions to purchase SDRs from members with weak external positions.”<sup>[28]</sup>

## Comments

From the above we see that the Special Drawing Right (SDR) is supposedly an international reserve asset. However, it was stated in the very first sentence that the SDR is a **claim** on the currencies of its members.

Furthermore it is stated that the “value” of the SDR is defined by a “basket” of four major world currencies: the dollar (44%), the yen (11%), the euro (34%), and the pound sterling (11%). Consequently, almost half the “value” of the SDR is determined by the U.S. Dollar.

This is the same U.S. Dollar that has **lost 95%** of its **purchasing power** (value) since the Federal Reserve took control in 1913. The U.S. Dollar is nothing but a debt obligation – a paper fiat coupon of debt that can never be paid off. The United States is having problems just paying the interest due on its debt – let alone paying off the debt. And we have seen in previous papers that the debt cannot be paid off – period.

To call the SDR an international reserve asset is like calling one’s mortgage an asset instead of a liability. Debt is not an asset. Debt is what is owed – it is not the means of paying the debt.

Real Honest Money is an asset, as it is the means to pay off debt. Gold and Silver are not anyone’s debt or obligation. Federal Reserve Notes on the other hand, are debt obligations of another. In a paper fiat monetary system debt cannot be paid off – it is discharged, rolled over, or reneged on.

This brings us to a most fascinating point. Once again we quote from the IMF’s website. The last paragraph gets down to the bone as they say.

## SDR Valuation

“The value of the SDR was initially defined as equivalent to 0.888671 grams of **fine gold**—which, at the time, was also equivalent to one U.S. dollar. After the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in 1973, however, the SDR was redefined as a basket of currencies, today consisting of the euro, Japanese yen, pound sterling, and U.S. dollar. The U.S. dollar-value of the SDR is *posted daily* on the IMF's website. It is calculated as the sum of specific amounts of the four currencies valued in U.S. dollars, on the basis of exchange rates quoted at noon each day in the London market.”

## SDR Allocations

“Under its *Articles of Agreement*, the IMF may allocate SDRs to members in proportion to their IMF quotas. Such an allocation provides each member with a costless asset on which interest is neither earned nor paid. However, if a member's SDR holdings rise above its allocation, it earns interest on the excess; conversely, if it holds fewer SDRs than allocated, it pays interest on the shortfall. The Articles of Agreement also allow for

cancellations of SDRs, but this provision has never been used. The IMF cannot allocate SDRs to itself.”<sup>[29]</sup>

## Gold in the IMF

Gold played a central role in the international monetary system until the collapse of the Bretton Woods system of fixed exchange rates in 1973. Since then, the role of gold has been gradually reduced. However, it is still an important asset in the reserve holdings of a number of countries, and the IMF remains one of the largest official holders of gold in the world.

### The IMF's Gold Holdings

“The IMF holds 103.4 million ounces (3,217 metric tons) of gold at designated depositories. The IMF's total gold holdings are valued on its balance sheet at *SDR* 5.9 billion (about \$8.8 billion) on the basis of historical cost. As of March 30, 2007, the IMF's holdings amounted to \$68.4 billion (at then current market prices).

The IMF acquired virtually all its gold holdings through four main types of transactions under the original *Articles of Agreement*. First, the original Articles prescribed that 25 percent of initial *quota subscriptions* and subsequent quota increases were to be paid in gold. This represented the largest source of the IMF's gold. Second, all *payments of charges* (i.e., interest on members' use of IMF credit) were normally made in gold. Third, a member wishing to purchase the currency of another member could acquire it by selling gold to the IMF. The major use of this provision was sales of gold to the IMF by South Africa in 1970–71.

And finally, members could use gold to repay the IMF for credit previously extended.

### The IMF's Policy on Gold Today

The Second Amendment to the Articles of Agreement in April 1978 **eliminated** the use of gold as the common denominator of the post-World War II exchange rate system and as the basis of the value of the *Special Drawing Right (SDR)*. It also **abolished** the official price of gold and **abrogated** the obligatory use of gold in transactions between the IMF and its members. It furthermore required that the IMF, when dealing in gold, avoid managing its price or establishing a fixed price.

The Articles of Agreement now limit the use of gold in the IMF's operations and transactions. The IMF may sell gold outright on the basis of prevailing market prices, and may accept gold in the discharge of a member's obligations at an agreed price, based on market prices at the time of acceptance. These transactions in gold require an 85 percent majority of total *voting power*. The IMF does not have the authority to engage in any other gold transactions—such as loans, leases, swaps, or use of gold as collateral—nor does it have the authority to buy gold.”<sup>[30]</sup>

## Section 2. General exchange arrangements

(a) Each member shall notify the Fund, within thirty days after the date of the second amendment of this Agreement, of the exchange arrangements it intends to apply in fulfillment of its obligations under Section 1 of this Article, and shall notify the Fund promptly of any changes in its exchange arrangements.

(b) Under an international monetary system of the kind prevailing on January 1, 1976, exchange arrangements **may include** (i) the maintenance by a member of a value for its currency **in terms** of the **special drawing right** or another **denominator, other than gold**, selected by the member, or (ii) cooperative arrangements by which members maintain the value of their currencies in relation to the value of the currency or currencies of other members, or (iii) other exchange arrangements of a member's choice.”<sup>[31]</sup>

### Comments

From the above we learn that originally gold played a large part in the international finance of the International Monetary Fund. This was when the U.S. and most major nations were on the “gold standard.” Back then a U.S. Dollar bill was backed by gold or redeemable in gold.

This is **not the same** as the hard currency system of gold and silver coin mandated by the U.S. Constitution – but it was a more sound monetary system than today’s paper fiat debt-money that is backed by nothing but hollow promises that can never be kept.

But the coup d’etat is the last paragraph, which we will attempt to simplify. It first states that under an existing monetary system of the kind prevailing that exchange arrangements, which means payment, can be made by a member (this is giving permission with qualifications) using **special drawing rights**, or another denominator **other than gold**.

Read that again carefully – *other than gold*. This means that you can **not be a member of the IMF if your currency is backed by gold**. That is a startling revelation.

Why on earth would the IMF want to exclude the use of gold, especially when it used to be the anchor of the world’s monetary system?

Even more astounding is that you have an international non-elected organization telling the U.S. that it cannot have a currency backed by gold. This seems particularly odd when one reads the U.S. Constitution that says:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5. The Congress shall have Power... To **coin Money**, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.<sup>[32]</sup>

Article I, Section 10, Clause 1. No State shall... coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but **gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debt**.<sup>[33]</sup>

Where does the IMF receive the authority (quo warranto) to tell the United States or any other **sovereign nation** whether or not it can have a currency backed by gold or gold and silver coin as the U.S. Constitution directs?

Even more outlandish is that according to the U.S. Constitution the IMF is telling the U.S. to go against the mandates of its own Constitution regarding the **fact** that all actions of government, including laws, legislation, and treaties – **must be in pursuance** of the **Constitution** at all times and under all circumstances. The IMF is literally telling the U.S. it to go against its own **Supreme Law of the Land**.

And the most amazing thing in this entire charade is that the U.S. government follows the orders of a non-elected international organization that dictates that it breaks its own Constitution. The Founding Fathers must be spinning in their graves.

This all begs the question: does Congress and the government know and understand what the Constitution states? If not they are derelict in their duty, while breaking their oaths of office, which in part state that they are to uphold, honor, and defend the Constitution.

If ignorance is not the reason, it strongly suggests that Congress and the government are knowingly going against the dictates of the Constitution, and their oaths of office; which really begs the question – why – cui bono? What could be the possible reason for such *seemingly* unaware and irresponsible policy?

“I was round when Jesus Christ – had his moment of doubt and pain  
Made damn sure that pilate washed his hands and sealed his fate

Pleased to meet you, hope you guess my name  
But whats puzzling you – is the nature of my game” [d]

## **Conclusion**

A lot of ground has been covered in this series on the New World Order. We started with the history surrounding World War I and the League of Nations. From there the various elite organizations that were formed after the war and prior to World War II were elaborated upon. Many of the same individuals were seen to be responsible for most of these groups, which all espoused the same goal: a one world government or New World Order. The baton was passed from mentor to protege – to carry on the “great work”.

The last few articles have covered the most recent elite organizations prior to World War II and following the war. The message is still the same – a select elite few superior human beings profess to know how to solve the world’s problems: by establishing a one world government – a one world currency – and a one world force to impose their **enforcement** of the New World Order. Remember well the words of Mr. Warburg:

“We shall have world government, whether or not we like it. The question is only whether world government will be achieved by consent or by conquest.” [34]

This paper compared the writings of the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund with the Constitution of the United States. It is clearly evident that many of the articles of agreement in both the UN Charter and the IMF are at odds with our Constitution. In some instances they were shown to be diametrically opposed to one another.

Change can only take place according to due process – by a constitutional amendment and by no other means. Recall that any law not in pursuance of the Constitution is null and void, as if it never existed.

The purpose of this series was to bring these seldom discussed issues into the public forum so that We The People are aware of just what has happened, is happening, and what can be done.

Simply stand up and be counted. Demand that your elected representatives represent what YOU want – not what some power hungry elite group of world leaders want. They only have the power we allow them to have.

Knowledge is power. Empower yourself – demand that our Constitution be adhered to. Demand that your unalienable rights be protected by our government, as it is the SOLE PURPOSE for which We the People created the government.

A new Presidential election is coming. Listen carefully to all those involved. Listen for words that are in harmony with our Constitution. Listen for those who speak of Honest Money – the hard currency of gold and silver coin mandated by our Constitution.

You will find a fine thread running through all who are worthy to lead our nation – the words of truth that permeate our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. Return our great nation onto the path of righteousness, one that is grounded in a greater purpose – the freedom and liberty that allows all individuals to flourish and grow to their full potential, to obtain unknown heights – to fulfill the destiny of man.

"If you love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude better than the animating contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or your arms.

Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains set lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen." [35]



Copyright © 2005-2007 Douglas V. Gnazzo - All Rights Reserved

- 
- [1] United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Right (1966)
  - [2] Same as above
  - [3] Same
  - [4] Same
  - [5] Same
  - [6] The US Senate report on Resolutions Relative to Revision of the United Nations Charter, Atlantic Union, World Federation, page 494, 1950
  - [7] Article VI U.S. Constitution Clause 2
  - [8] Article VI U.S. Constitution Clause 3
  - [9] Supreme Court in Reid v. Covert, 354 U.S. 1 (1957)
  - [10] Marbury vs. Madison, 5 US 137, 174, 176 (1803)
  - [11] Norton vs. Shelby County, 118, US 425 p. 442
  - [12] 16 Am Jur 2d, Sec. 177, late 2d, Sec 256
  - [13] Declaration of Independence
  - [14] Virginia Declaration of Rights 1776
  - [15] Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations
  - [16] Constitution of the United States - Article 1 Section 10 – Paragraph 1
  - [17] Section 2 – Paragraph 2
  - [18] Constitution of the United States - Article 6 Paragraph 2
  - [19] Supreme Court Justice Field
  - [20] Waring v. Mayor of Savannah, 60 Georgia page 93
  - [21] Frederic Bastiat
  - [22] Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43
  - [23] Reid v. Covert. October 1956; 354 U.S. 1, pg. 17
  - [24] The Reid Court (U.S. Supreme Court)
  - [25] pg 573 - Both quotes taken from "The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson," A. Koch & Wm. Peden, Random House 1944, renewed 1972.
  - [26] (See: Elliot's Debates 1836 ed. - pgs 500-519)
  - [27] Geofroy v. Riggs; 133 U.S. 258 at page 267
  - [28] International Monetary Fund
  - [29] Same
  - [30] Same
  - [31] IMF Articles of Agreement Section 4-2b
  - [32] Constitution of the United States
  - [33] Same
  - [34] Warburg per [6] above
  - [35] Samuel Adams
- a,b,c,d – lyrics by the Rolling Stones – Sympathy For the Devil

