

Treacherous Treaties: American Imperialism, World Government and the Bilderbergers

By [John Kozy](#)

Global Research, April 02, 2012

2 April 2012

Region: [Europe, USA](#)

Theme: [History](#)

“steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world”

George Washington, 1796

Is American imperialism a Bilderberger plot? Are the American bankers, diplomats, and members of the Council on Foreign Relations all traitors, having turned America into merely an instrument to carry out their Bilderberger maniacal aims? Does America as a sovereign nation even exist anymore?

Consider the possibility that the Bilderbergers have already bought off the governments of Western Europe, North America, and the remnants of the British Empire that still cling to the Queen’s skirts. If that be true, the only remaining obstacles to a Bilderberger success are the BRICS and the Moslem world. The WTO and promises of free trade and pie in the sky prosperity can be used to subvert the BRICS which leaves the Moslem countries as the last bulwark in defense of free, independent, and sovereign nations. When one realizes just how ironic that is, the realization of just how far the Bilderbergers have already come in advancing their agenda really strikes home.

Sometime during the First World War, the well-meaning but naïve American president, Woodrow Wilson, came up with the idea that every ethnic minority in Eastern Europe was entitled to its own nation, a nation for every ethnicity, and he persuaded the victorious powers to create such nations while writing the peace treaties that ended the war. It was a bad idea.

Before the war, central and Eastern Europe was dominated by Germany, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and Russia. The Austro-Hungarian Empire was comprised of more than a dozen ethnic groups. There were Germans (i.e., Austrians), Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ukrainians, Serbs, Croats, Slavs, Romanians, and more.

When the war ended, several treaties were imposed on the defeated nations, all of which had to give up territory to the victorious powers and a number of newly created nations (Poland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Czechoslovakia). Several nations were enlarged (Denmark, Russia, Romania, Yugoslavia, and Italy). The Ottoman Empire was dismembered. Turkey lost most of its land in Europe and Arabia was made into a mandate ruled by the British and French, Syria and Lebanon went to France and Iraq, Transjordan, and Palestine went to Britain. In the end, all of this up-carving was naught but a gigantic failure, the consequences of which we are still living with today.

The bug in the broth was obvious. People migrate. In the fifty-one years of the Austro-

Hungarian Empire, peoples moved within it. All Poles did not stay in the area that became Poland; Serbs did not stay in Serbia; Croats did not stay in Croatia. When the empire was dismembered, peoples of all nationalities were everywhere. Putting them together again in homogenous groups was impossible. Additionally, some of those of German nationality ended up in France, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia and who knows where else.

Realpolitik in Europe in the early twentieth century was characterized by a plethora of treaties. Bismarckian balance of power relationships ruled the day. Nations lined up with each other to oppose other groups of nations to balance another group's power. The idea was that if the groups were equally strong peace was assured. How wrong they were.

Even after the war these balance of power relationships continued. (In fact, they continue to this day.) So when Germany began to balk at the onerous conditions placed upon it by the Treaty of Paris, it wanted to retake the territory it had lost and reunite the German peoples scattered throughout Eastern Europe. The peace lasted a mere twenty-nine years! Germany easily took back the territory that had been ceded to France. The Austrians, being a Germanic people, willingly allowed Austria to be annexed. Then the Germans went for the Germans in the territory that had been ceded to Czechoslovakia. War was on the horizon because England and France objected to all of this German expansion, but they ultimately acquiesced, drawing a line on any German expansion into Poland by committing their countries to go to war with Germany if Poland were invaded. In essence, they wrote a treaty, believing that this treaty would work to balance their power with Germany's and thus prevent war. But it was a sham.

Germany, knowing that neither England nor France were prepared to go to war, invaded Poland on September 1, 1939 after signing the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact with Russia (the USSR) to keep it from joining England and France. As a result, the English and French made some minor forays into Germany that were easily repulsed, and Germany easily overran Poland. After that, the English were driven from the continent and the French surrendered.

Almost everyone knows this story, so why am I retelling it. Well the story is old news and not important, but no one has analyzed the role of the treaties involved in it.

What effect did the English and French treaty to come to the aid of Poland have? It didn't prevent the war. Nor did it help Poland which was overrun at least twice and utterly destroyed. The English and French never liberated Poland. The treaty didn't extinguish Germany's desire to expand its territory, for shortly after France surrendered, Germans invaded Russia. What did this treaty do? It merely expanded the war.

For the purposes of this paper, it doesn't matter that that expansion may have been a good thing in the long run. What is most important is the recognition that when the treaty was invoked, it diminished the sovereignties of both England and France.

A nation is sovereign when it alone is responsible for its behavior. A sovereign nation can go to war or not. A sovereign nation makes its own decisions. But neither the British nor the French made the decision to go to war. The decision was made in Berlin. The German decision to invade Poland was also a decision to bring England and France into the war. After agreeing to come to Poland's aid, the British and French no longer had any say in the matter. It was all up to Germany.

Germany and Italy were in a similar position. They had a mutual assistance treaty with

Japan. When Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, the attack brought Germany and Italy into a war with the United States, a war which neither Germany nor Italy wanted at the time. So the treaty with Japan reduced Italian and German sovereignties. The decision to bring them into war with the United States was not made in Berlin or Rome; it was made in Tokyo. That decision was completely up to the Japanese. The Germans and Italians had nothing to do with it.

So the interesting question is, do all treaties reduce the sovereignties of the nations that enter into them? I am certain the answer is yes. Treaties which are entered into in hopes of preventing wars ultimately expand them and nations find themselves fighting wars they never conceived of because an insignificant member of a treaty can somehow start a war that then extends to all of the treaty's signatories.

In fact, World War I started in exactly that way. The war which killed more than 15 million and wounded more than 20 million was started by the assassination on June 28, 1914 of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, by a Yugoslav nationalist. Because of it, Austria went to war with Serbia. Alliances formed over previous decades, brought the major powers into the war within weeks. How many of these nations would have gone to war over that assassination had the treaties not existed? No one will ever know!

None of the nations except Austria had a hand in deciding to go to war. The decision for every nation involved, except perhaps the United States, was made in Vienna. By signing these treaties, each of these nations gave up their sovereignties. They were no longer masters of their own fates.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has insanely fostered treaty making. There are NATO, SEATO, and only Washington knows what else. Any puny nation that is part of any of these treaties can draw not only the United States but all of the other signatories in to a colossal conflagration. Americans like to pretend that they control these treaty-groups. America refers to itself as a "first among equals." But that expression is an oxymoron. If there is a first, the rest are not equals, and if all are equal, there is no first! How would Americans react if something happened in Bangladesh that drew the United States into a worldwide war? Realpolitik is a recipe for disaster. Why have we not paid attention to the advice of George Washington?

Two European immigrants to America, both Bilderbergers, who speak with heavy European accents and harbor Bismarckian complexes bear much responsibility for this situation, (Bismarck's balance of power policies brought peace to Germany for a mere 43 years) but they are not alone.

However balance of power treaties are not the only culprits. Trade agreements are just as bad. Look at what the Maastricht Treaty which established the European Union has done to Greece and threatens to do to other European countries. Today's Quisling Greek government is now little more than a tool of Europe's more prosperous states. When Greece's former socialist Prime Minister George Papandreou proposed a popular referendum on the Greek sovereign debt bailout, the European Union scotched it. Now Greece no longer has the power to call an election that the Union objects to. Greece has even lost its democracy.

But the effect of trade agreements is far more extensive than the EU.

“. . . [big financial players](#) have another potential weapon in their battle against safety and soundness. This one is more hidden from view and comes from, of all places, the World Trade Organization in Geneva.

Back in the 1990s, when many in Washington — and virtually everyone on Wall Street — embraced the deregulation that helped lead to the recent crisis, a vast majority of W.T.O. nations made varying commitments to what’s called the financial services agreement, which loosens rules governing banks and other such institutions.

Many countries, for instance, said they would not restrict the number of financial services companies in their territories. Many also pledged not to cap the total value of assets or transactions conducted by such companies. These pledges also appear to raise trouble for any country that tries to ban risky financial instruments.

According to the W.T.O., 125 of its 153 member countries have made varying degrees of commitments to the financial services agreement. Now, these pledges could easily be used to undermine new rules intended to make financial systems safer.”

So now, nations may not even have the power to regulate their financial institutions which, in fact, extends to their economies as a whole. The World Trade Organization rules all.

So how did that happen? Well, people have been trying to create a world government for a long time. To do that, nation states must be rendered effete. Consider what David Rockefeller said at a Bilderberg meeting in 1991:

“We are grateful to the Washington Post, The New York Times, Time Magazine and other great publications whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their promises of discretion for almost 40 years. It would have been impossible for us to develop our plan for the world if we had been subjected to the lights of publicity during those years. But the world is more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national auto-determination practiced in past centuries.”

Well given what the “intellectual elite and world bankers” did to the global economy in 2008, do you really want them to rule all? World government, in order to work, requires that ethnic and religious distinctions be expunged. But ethnic characteristics are often physical and the French and the Russians, after their revolutions, tried and failed to extinguish their peoples’ religious beliefs. So how do you believe a new one world government would react to ethnic and religious uprisings world-wide? Would the entire world begin to look like Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Palestine, and countless parts of Africa? Is such a world **surely** preferable to the national auto-determination practiced in past centuries”? More importantly, is American imperialism a Bilderberger plot? Are the American bankers, diplomats, and members of the Council on Foreign Relations all traitors, having turned America into merely an instrument to carry out their maniacal aims? Does America as a sovereign nation even exist anymore? Remember what Jefferson says about banks: “banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies.”

Consider the possibility that the Bilderbergers have already bought off the governments of Western Europe, North America, and the remnants of the British Empire that still cling to the Queen’s skirts and are now using all of these nations as tools to bring about their goal of imposing a single bankers’ government on its New World Order. If that be true, the only

remaining obstacles to a Bilderberger success are the BRICS and the Moslem world. The WTO and promises of free trade and pie in the sky prosperity can be used to subvert the BRICS which leaves the Moslem countries as the last bulwark in defense of free, independent, and sovereign nations. When one realizes just how ironic that is, the realization of just how far the Bilderbergers have already come in advancing their agenda really strikes home.

Vidkun Abraham Lauritz Jonsson Quisling is long dead, but his soul has multiplied and now inhabits the bodies of greedy merchants and maniacal diplomats and politicians the world over. For the most part, these people hold respected places in society. Shouldn't they be vilified instead? What has any Rockefeller or Bilderberger done for you or anyone you know?

***John Kozy** is a retired professor of philosophy and logic who writes on social, political, and economic issues. After serving in the U.S. Army during the Korean War, he spent 20 years as a university professor and another 20 years working as a writer. He has published a textbook in formal logic commercially, in academic journals and a small number of commercial magazines, and has written a number of guest editorials for newspapers. His on-line pieces can be found on <http://www.jkozy.com/> and he can be emailed from that site's homepage.*

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [John Kozy](#), Global Research, 2012

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [John Kozy](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca