



# Accepting the UN as ‘The World Government’ Is Unconstitutional

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

March 21, 1996

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 23, Number 14, March 29, 1996. [View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

Acting in my function as a candidate for the Democratic Party’s 1996 U.S. Presidential nomination, I wish to announce that I am fully in support of the principal claim by Army Specialist Michael New.

There is no allowable margin for doubt, that Army Specialist New rightly judged himself to have received an unlawful order, directly contrary to his oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution. Except in the instance of nullification of our Constitution by virtue of our republic’s defeat in warfare, no branch or other agency of our government has the authority to subvert our national sovereignty by acts tantamount to accepting the United Nations Organization as “The World Government.” To order any sworn officer of the United States to overthrow the sovereignty of the U.S.A. by means of such an unlawful order is a plainly impeachable act, tantamount to treason, whether actionable under the treason clause of our Constitution, or not.

Relative to these United States, there exists on this planet no higher governmental authority than the sovereignty of a nation-state republic.

Furthermore, in the cases of continuing sanctions against Iraq, and in its recent role in the Balkans, and on other counts, the Security Council of the UNO has perpetrated past and continuing violations of the Nuremberg Code prohibiting “crimes against humanity.”

In respect to the U.S. Department of Defense itself, have already noted the unconstitutional features of its September 1995 policy statement entitled United States Security for the Americas. My exposition on this subject is contained in a published, October 1995, policy paper of my campaign, *The Blunder in U.S. National Security Policy*. The DOD’s cited paper contains numerous instances in which the authors of that policy statement proceeded in direct violation of the principle of sovereignty of nation-state republics such as our own.

Respecting the DOD, I am obliged to add the following intelligence respecting the Defense Department's continuing, ten-year record of flip-flops on the issue of international narco-terrorism.

During 1985, acting in consultation with representatives of the U.S. military, I assisted the government of Guatemala with technical advice on the matter of narco-terrorists operating within and athwart its national borders. The proximate outcome of this technical advice was one of the most successful anti-narco-terrorist operations of the 1980s, conducted entirely by sovereign forces of Guatemala, called "Operation Guatusa."

It had been my expectation, that the brilliant success of this operation would demonstrate to even hard-heads in the DOD that, with aid of proper equipment and technical assistance supplied by the U.S.A., the nations of Central and South America could combat the Colombia-centered international narco-terrorist operations within their territory. Instead, I found that, in collaboration with Vice President George Bush, and others, the DOD had suddenly adopted the policy that "narco-terrorism does not exist." During that period, the Bush-directed "Iran-Contra" "focal-point"-style operation was working with the Colombia "narcos" against the narcotrafficking Communist terrorist gangs of Colombia. Today, the latest dispatches indicate, the DOD has reversed that late 1980s policy, this time to protect Colombia's Communist terrorists from the impact of U.S. anti-drug operations, still under the fraudulent, Bush-league presumption that "narcoterrorism" does not exist.

The DOD and State Department should reflect upon their sworn commitment to uphold and defend the U.S. Constitution and the perfect sovereignty of both the United States and of the nation-states with whom our republic has presumably friendly dealings. Specifically, all actions which are tantamount to accepting the UNO as "The World Government," should be considered as either unlawful, or simply nullified in other appropriate ways.