



AP/WideWorld Photo/Osamu Honda

Supporters applaud as Hans Corell, the UN under secretary-General for legal affairs announces the ratification of the Rome treaty, which establishes the International Criminal Court, April 11, 2002, United Nations headquarters in New York. Despite vehement U.S. opposition, the world's first permanent war crimes tribunal comes into force on July 1, after receiving more than the 60 needed ratifications.

A World Court for the World Government

BY IRVIN BAXTER JR.

It was among the greatest of the one-worlders' dreams. For the nations of the world to adopt a world court that could try any human being on earth, was more than most globalists could have hoped to see in their lifetimes.

Yet it happened. On April 11th, 2002, the 60th nation ratified the International Criminal Court Statute of Rome. This was the necessary number of ratifications needed to bring the new world court system into being. The mission of the court will be to enforce the intricate web of international law that has been painstakingly woven over the last 57 years since the birth of the UN. On July 1, 2002, the

court takes permanent jurisdiction worldwide. And why not? A world government needs a world court. Although it is being downplayed, the adoption of a permanent world court system is one of the largest advances toward one-world government the world has ever witnessed.

The World Federalist Association, an organization that openly advocates one-world government, led the charge to establish the ICC. Its director, William Pace, is also the head of the NGO which is an umbrella organization covering 1,000 other organizations dedicated to the establishment of the International Criminal Court. He has been the court's number one proponent.

Pace knows that, without a court sys-

tem with a mandate to enforce world law, world government can never be a reality. His World Federalist Activist Guidebook states: "The goal of the World Federalist Association is the abolition of war, the preservation of a livable and healthful global environment and the promotion of a just world community through the development of enforceable world law. Achievement of that goal requires the establishment of a democratic federal world government."

Background

When the UN was formed in 1945, world planners knew they were creating a world government structure. From the outset, they designed the United Nations

to be a world government. President Roosevelt, the chief force behind the formation of the United Nations, placed the words “New World Order” on the back of the U.S. dollar bill. Written in Latin, as if to disguise the intent, are the words “Novus Ordo Seclorum.” Novus means new; Ordo is order; Seclorum means secular or world.

The global planners also knew that, if they were going to have their world government, they would need a world court. In fact, the plans for such a court were included in the original charter language. However, at that time the nations of the world were not ready to countenance such a move toward a bona fide one-world government. Consequently, the world court system was put on the back burner until the political climate was right.

The Nuremberg trials, which took place at the end of World War II, have been cited as a precedent for what is taking place now. In Nuremberg the rulers of Nazi Germany were placed on trial and brought to some level of justice. More recently, special tribunals were established to handle the situations in Rwanda and Yugoslavia, the latter of which is still ongoing. These temporary courts were established to deal with isolated atrocities. However, the United Nations still envisioned a permanent world court that would be in business full-time, and could deal with violations of international law on an ongoing basis.

Clinton proposes world court

In his 1997 address to the General Assembly of the UN, President Clinton said that the time had arrived for the establishment of a world court. On June 15, 1998, the International Criminal Court Conference was convened in Rome—an interesting place for the conference. Work began on the final draft of the International Criminal Court Statute. Thirty-two days later, the final draft had been hammered out. A vote was taken, and it was adopted—120 for, 7 against.

Four categories of crimes were established that would fall under the jurisdiction of the ICC. They are: Genocide, Crimes Against Humanity, War Crimes, and Crimes of Aggression.

Crimes of Aggression

Because of unresolved disagreements over the definition of Crimes of



AP WideWorld Photo/Fred Ernst

Former Yugoslav army chief Dragoljub Ojdanic, right, followed by a United Nations guard, pleaded not guilty to allegations of war crimes on April 26 during his first appearance at the Yugoslavia war crimes tribunal in The Hague, Netherlands.

Aggression, this category of crime will not be tried before the ICC at this time. The category of Crimes of Aggression, however, is the most powerful. The ultimate intent is to make it a crime when any nation takes military action without first obtaining the approval of the United Nations. Only when a military action is approved by a UN resolution would it be considered legal. If not approved, it would be a criminal act prosecutable before the International Criminal Court. Heads of state and military leaders could be placed on trial for Crimes of Aggression.

War Crimes

Interestingly, during the Rome conference, Syria and Egypt proposed an amendment to the ICC statute. This modification made it a crime to transfer population out of a territory that is taken during war, or to transfer your population into territory captured in war. When this was proposed, the whole world understood fully that it was tailor-made for Israel, because there are currently about 200,000 Jewish settlers in the “occupied territories.” This amendment became part of the definition of “war crimes.”

The End of National Sovereignty

The ICC will cast a dark cloud over

every act by every head of state in the world, because it will effectively end national sovereignty. Shimon Peres, the foreign minister of Israel, recently warned his fellow rulers to be careful of what they did during Operation Defensive Shield, lest they may end up on trial before an international court.

Recent examples of world court action include Yugoslavia’s former army commander, Gen. Dragoljub Ojdanic. Ojdanic was indicted by the UN war crimes tribunal for atrocities committed by his forces in Kosovo. He recently surrendered to the court at The Hague. A total of 24 Serbs are on the UN court’s list of suspects wanted for alleged war crimes committed during the Balkan wars in the 1990’s. There have been two suicides in Yugoslavia since that government passed an extradition law allowing them to hand over officials to the world court system. Slobodan Milosevic, the former Yugoslav president, is already on trial at The Hague.

In Chile, the judge prosecuting Augusto Pinochet for crimes committed during his 17-year dictatorship is seeking to extradite Henry Kissinger, the former U.S. Secretary of State, to Chile over his alleged involvement in Pinochet’s 1973 coup. Kissinger was also cited for his part in the Vietnam War and for America’s

Cover Story

secret bombing of Cambodia.

Once Crimes of Aggression become prosecutable, George Bush's actions in the United States' war against terrorism would have put him behind bars since his actions have been taken without UN approval. The lawyer for a Croatian general indicted by the Hague tribunal suggests that former President Clinton could be charged with crimes against humanity for authorizing "Operation Storm," a Croatian military offensive staged in 1995 that recaptured territory from rebel Serbs. The UN approved none of those actions, but they have been tolerated because the UN has lacked authority over them... until now.

Perhaps most important of all, the ICC will have jurisdiction over any individual on earth, whether or not the court is ratified by that person's country. In other words, the United States does not have to ratify the statute in order for Americans to come under The Court's power. Even though the Bush administration has recently sent a letter to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan notifying him that the U.S. is officially withdrawing its signature from the ICC Statute, American citizens could still be arrested by the court if they were travelling abroad. If a U.S. citizen is tried before this court, he will not enjoy the protection of the U.S. Constitution, nor the Bill of Rights

U.S. Rep. Ron Paul has introduced a bill into Congress called the American Servicemen's Protection Act. The bill states that, if any American serviceman is arrested and placed on trial before the ICC because of participation in U.S. military incursions, the U.S. would go to war to rescue him. The American Servicemen's Protection Act has not been passed yet, but could be broadened to include every American.

Genocide: Religious Exclusiveness

One category of crimes under ICC jurisdiction should be particularly troubling for Christians. Genocide is defined as causing physical or mental harm to any minority whether it is a racial minority, sexual minority, or religious minority. While we know that no Christian would ever cause physical harm to anyone, speaking out against another person's religious beliefs is believed by globalists



As if to disguise the intent, the phrase New World Order is printed in Latin on the back of the U.S. dollar bill. "Novus Ordo Seclorum" was placed there during the Roosevelt administration in the early 1930s.

to cause mental harm. The world government planners believe the number one cause of war on earth is religious conflict. They conclude that the world has to be re-educated so that no one would ever speak disparagingly against anyone else's religion.

In Mikhail Gorbachev's book *Perestroika*, he lists several things that endanger peace and security on earth. The list includes religious exclusiveness—the belief that one's religion is the only correct one. Individual countries have begun enacting laws against such "narrow" thinking. France recently passed a law against proselytizing. In Canada there is a hate crime law stating that, if you speak against homosexuality on the airwaves of Canada, you could be sentenced to five years in prison.

A Bible believing Christian is, by definition, guilty of religious exclusiveness. Salvation, according to the Bible, cannot be found outside of Jesus Christ. "For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12).

Understanding the way the global winds are blowing, many "Christian" religions are adjusting their teachings to a position of political correctness. The Vatican stated in its 1994 Catechism of the Catholic Church that the plan of salvation includes the Muslims, in spite of the fact that Muslims do not believe that

Jesus is the Messiah, and they do not believe that Jesus is God. The Presbyterian Church USA, at their June 2001 general assembly, approved homosexuals serving as pastors of their churches though the Bible condemns homosexual practices in the strongest terms. (It should be stated that this decision was subsequently rejected by their presbyteries.) At the same conference the Presbyterian Church established a committee to study whether a person may be able to get to God without Jesus Christ.

The Bible speaks of a day when everyone will be forced to submit to the one-world governmental system. The International Criminal Court, which became reality on April 11th, is the mechanism that will force everyone to bow the knee to the prophesied system of global government.

The prophecy in Daniel 7 describes the power-base from which the Antichrist will rise as a ten-horned beast. It says that this beast will have great iron teeth. Wait no longer. With the birth of the International Criminal Court, the world government system now has teeth. The human race will discover too late that they are teeth of iron! □

"For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be."

Matthew 24:21