
Subject: New World Order

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 04:44:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, seeing as I'm too tired and lazy, I'm not really going to go into details here. NWO is pretty much an elaborate plot of a powerful group on... taking over the world.

Another thing this brings up is the North American Union, which pretty much means that Canada, USA, and Mexico's borders are all going to dissolve, there's going to be one major language, and currency called the "Amero."

North American Union will have the same idea as

European Union

African Union

and the soon to be Asian Union

All done by the same people. They're all soon going to be merged together as the final stage of NWO.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_World_Order_\(conspiracy\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_World_Order_(conspiracy))

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=4PpMdTmVMpo>

Anyways... opinions?

Subject: Re: New World Order

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 05:16:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not gonna happen.

The European Union is a good example why.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7482197.stm>

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/anatole_kaletsky/article4214721.ece

Getting these nations to essentially cooperate as one unit is next to impossible.

Even suggesting Mexico and America joining is funny, because they are already fighting illegal immigration; does anyone honestly think that the States is going to open the border freely to those people? You'll bet your ass that there will be a LOT of angry Americans if that happens, and they all have guns.

I'm tired, so I'm not gonna go into a big tirade either. Hell, if anything, there's a bigger chance of some American states and Canadian provinces SPLITTING from their countries to form Cascadia.

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 13:32:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's not a "New World Order", that's just America uniting with one currency.

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [Sn1per74*](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 13:39:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The currencies are too different to do that. The peso is nothing compared to the dollar. Plus the last thing we want is no borders... All of our building up the border would go to waste... It's not gonna happen.

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 13:51:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One thing I hate about being a libertarian is that there are tons of conspiracy nuts that I get grouped with. I don't believe that the NAU is anywhere near happening, and the NWO is even farther off. I'm not doubting that there are people in power trying to make both happen, but it's just not going to. People need to worry about the issues right in front of us, and not the problems of the future, especially since we can prevent that dark future by focusing on the now.

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 15:49:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It would make no sense to dissolve the Canada and Mexico with the US. US could buy Mexico for a couple million (lol bad joke). Canada and the US might make a good mix, but the Americans would refuse to give up their currency or general standards for either Canadian replacements or mixes of the two.

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 20:32:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't believe that anything short of another World War could lead to such a massive border shift. There are simply too many social, political, and economic differences that would prevent such a meta-nation from forming.

Each country will want to maintain almost every one of their own laws, their own traditions and

cultures. That will require any unifying government to bend over backwards and loop into a pretzel to make everybody happy, which will in turn create an incredibly complicated, slow, and unwieldy political machine. It would be a bureaucratic hell. The only way that a meta-nation could form and remain united is to be forged in the fire of necessity.

Just for a laugh, compare any existing national constitution with that of the EU. Take that comparison and extrapolate, and you'll see exactly why this NWO stuff exists only in the realm of fiction.

Subject: Re: New World Order

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 21:12:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The other thing too, is strategically, I'm not sure if it's in America's best interests to even consider joining with Canada.

For example, with the Arctic ice caps melting, various countries including Denmark, Canada, Russia, and the United States all want a big piece of the resource pie, and superiority over a 'northwest passage'. If an 'AmeriCanadian' nation were to contest Russia, political tensions could run very high, and possibly escalate to a situation not unlike the Cold War. Russia would view it mainly as an American challenge.

However, an independent Canada is seen more as a 'third party', and one that treads neutral ground. Many Canadians are of Eastern European descent, and do share quite a few commonalities with the Russian population. Russia would be less inclined to engage an independent Canada, and the Americans would still have a close ally that will guarantee fair passage through naval waterways, and allow American companies to exploit resources under the Arctic ice.

In terms of foreign policy these days, America needs allies. Although President Bush touts countries like Hungary, and Poland as modern allies of America, and Western ideals, Canada is a member of the G8, and is a counterpoint to Russia, France and Germany, as well as the O5 members like China, and Brazil. We might not agree on a few things, but in many cases, Canada and the U.S. see eye to eye on many issues, and Canada still has considerable clout in international affairs.

Uniting Mexico, Canada, and the States would not only be an economic disaster, but a social one too. The U.S already has a considerable poverty rate, and inheriting Mexico's problems would break any system in place. Mexican's would be demanding a system equal to Canada's E.I., and Welfare system, and many American's will be too. However, Mexico's tax base would not be able to support such a venture, meaning Canadian's, and American's would have to pay higher taxes to subsidize Mexico. Therefore, Canadians would likely end up losing their system of public healthcare, and reasonable welfare benefits, which would cause a LOT of problems, especially for those Canadians that live in rural areas, and up in the Territories.

This discussion is timed pretty well too, seeing as it's taking place on Canada Day, and just before Independence Day.

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 06:43:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SlikRik wrote on Tue, 01 July 2008 17:49It would make no sense to dissolve the Canada and Mexico with the US. US could buy Mexico for a couple million (lol bad joke). Canada and the US might make a good mix, but the Americans would refuse to give up their currency or general standards for either Canadian replacements or mixes of the two.

I don't think anyone in Canada would be eager to merge with America and adopt your backwards laws and social programs.

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 12:10:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixxIn terms of foreign policy these days, America needs allies.
We wouldn't *need* allies if we had a better foreign policy.

"I sincerely join... in abjuring all political connection with every foreign power; and though I cordially wish well to the progress of liberty in all nations, and would forever give it the weight of our countenance, yet they are not to be touched without contamination from their other bad principles. Commerce with all nations, alliance with none, should be our motto." --Thomas Jefferson

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 21:20:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:

"I sincerely join... in abjuring all political connection with every foreign power; and though I cordially wish well to the progress of liberty in all nations, and would forever give it the weight of our countenance, yet they are not to be touched without contamination from their other bad principles. Commerce with all nations, alliance with none, should be our motto." --Thomas Jefferson

I must admit, that's a great quote right there.

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 22:02:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Of course it is, it was said by Mr. Thomas Jefferson.

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 21:15:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Heh, unfortunately easier said than done.

"You need my <insert goods here>. In order for you to get it, I demand that you <insert political agenda here>."

That's what politics is these days, regardless of it being a government or even a business. That whole "I'll scratch your back if you scratch mine" or "I know I hold more power than you, so jump when I say jump!" (and by power I mean in anything... bargaining power, political power, military power, etc.)

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 21:43:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In Capitalism, consumers hold the power over the corporations. If people would understand this, then there wouldn't be a problem. I refuse to purchase CDs from Sony BMG. I'll buy CDs from other manufacturers, but not them. It's a shame, too, there's a few CDs that I've wanted to buy.

Just when you involve the government, they may fix a problem, but they won't ever give you back your rights that they took. As Benjamin Franklin said, "They who can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 22:46:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think it would have sounded better without the "essential", "little" and "temporary"

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 05 Jul 2008 02:26:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think his quote is pretty damn accurate.

Subject: Re: New World Order

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 05 Jul 2008 11:29:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So what about giving up little liberty to obtain essential safety?

Subject: Re: New World Order

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 05 Jul 2008 18:33:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's quite the gray area these days, isn't it?

Subject: Re: New World Order

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 05 Jul 2008 18:36:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd love to see more gray areas and less laws... So many things are dependant on the situation.

Subject: Re: New World Order

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 05 Jul 2008 20:24:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think "essential liberty" is anything that by being left alone doesn't take away the rights of someone else. Which would keep slavery illegal because if you let people have the right to enslave others, you impede on the rights of the individuals who are made into slaves. The same would go for murder, theft, etc...

Subject: Re: New World Order

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sun, 06 Jul 2008 03:57:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Who cares, everyone reading this will be dead in <60 years (half that time for someone like me). A NWO won't appear overnight.

Subject: Re: New World Order

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 06 Jul 2008 05:02:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer wrote on Sat, 05 July 2008 22:57 Who cares, everyone reading this will be dead in <60 years (half that time for someone like me). A NWO won't appear overnight.

Love that answer!

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [Nightma12](#) on Sun, 06 Jul 2008 18:37:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer wrote on Sat, 05 July 2008 22:57Who cares, everyone reading this will be dead in <60 years (half that time for someone like me). A NWO won't appear overnight.

Ill be 77.... so i could very well be alive

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Tue, 08 Jul 2008 18:39:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think eventually the need for nations to survive through commerce and global trade will lead to such bigger nations. They say China is dangerous. Yes, it's true they are big and all that, but they are dependent on us as we are on them. Trade maybe the next deterrent to war instead of weapons.

And Iran too lol
<http://www.cnn.com/2008/US/07/08/iran.us.buying.ap/index.html>

Subject: Re: New World Order
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 00:42:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pawkyfox wrote on Tue, 08 July 2008 13:39I think eventually the need for nations to survive through commerce and global trade will lead to such bigger nations. They say China is dangerous. Yes, it's true they are big and all that, but they are dependent on us as we are on them. Trade maybe the next deterrent to war instead of weapons.

And Iran too lol
<http://www.cnn.com/2008/US/07/08/iran.us.buying.ap/index.html>

Trade could also start wars as vying trade blocks try to corner a market on a certain good or push another block out of a country entirely. There are no examples of this so far as regional trade blocks are a recent (historically) phenomenon (UNASUR is the most recent example) but I foresee something along those lines as a possible precursor to a new world war.

Modern trade disputes are the only concrete evidence I bring to bear to support this but there are

many that have the potential to turn violent, the Russian-Western European and Ukrainian gas trade dispute and the more recent US free trade deal with South Korea that caused a bit of angst on the Korean side.

While this is all hypothetical I wouldn't down play it too much, confederations and leagues have always sprung up to help benefit their populaces with a somewhat "regional" nationalism for the lack of a better word.

Edit: I found this map of most if not all regional trade blocks while looking for a list on wikipedia. Pretty interesting.