The Future Is Calling

THE CHASM

The Future Is Calling

by G. Edward Griffin

Consider the universal status of the ethic of liberty, and of the natural right of person and property that obtains under such an ethic.

For every person, at any time or place, can be covered by the basic rules:

- *ownership of one's own self,*
- *ownership of the previously unused resources which one has occupied and transformed; and*
- *ownership of all titles derived from that basic ownership —either through voluntary exchanges or voluntary gifts.*

These rules —which we might call the "rules of natural ownership"— can clearly be applied, and such ownership defended, regardless of the time or place, and regardless of the economic attainments of the society.

It is impossible for any other social system to qualify as universal natural law; for if there is any coercive rule by one person or group over another (and all rule partakes of such hegemony), then it is impossible to apply the same rule for all; only a rulerless, purely libertarian world can fulfill the qualifications of natural rights and natural law, or, more important, can fulfill the conditions of a universal ethic for all mankind.

—Murray Newton Rothbard
in *The Ethics of Liberty*

freedom force international

Chapters

1 The Chasm
***The Future Is Calling (Part One)*.....9**

2 Which path for Mankind?.....35

3 Introduction to the Creed of Freedom.....37

4 Secret Organizations and Hidden Agendas
***The Future Is Calling (Part Two)*.....41**

5 Days of Infamy
***The Future Is Calling (Part Three)*.....66**

6 The War on Terrorism
***The Future Is Calling (Part Four)*.....92**

1 The Chasm - The Future Is Calling (Part One)

Introduction

G. Edward Griffin is a writer and documentary film producer with many successful titles to his credit. Listed in *Who's Who in America*, he is well known because of his talent for researching difficult topics and presenting them in clear terms that all can understand. He has dealt with such diverse subjects as archaeology and ancient Earth history, the Federal Reserve System and international banking, terrorism, internal subversion, the history of taxation, U.S. foreign policy, the science and politics of cancer therapy, the Supreme Court, and the United Nations. His better-known works include *The Creature from Jekyll Island, World without Cancer, The Discovery of Noah's Ark, Moles in High Places, The Open Gates of Troy, No Place to Hide, The Capitalist Conspiracy, More Deadly than War, The Grand Design, The Great Prison Break, and The Fearful Master*.

Mr. Griffin is a graduate of the University of Michigan where he majored in speech and communications. In preparation for writing his book on the Federal Reserve System, he enrolled in the College for Financial Planning located in Denver, Colorado. His goal was not to become a professional financial planner but to better understand the real world of investments and money markets. He obtained his CFP designation (Certified Financial Planner) in 1989.

Mr. Griffin is a recipient of the coveted Telly Award for excellence in television production, the creator of the *Reality Zone Audio Archives*, and is President of American Media, a publishing and video production company in Southern California. He has served on the board of directors of The National Health Federation and The International Association of Cancer Victors and Friends and is Founder and President of The Cancer Cure Foundation. He is the founder and president of Freedom Force International.

Overview

Thank you, Richard, and thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. What a terrific introduction that was; but, in all honesty, I must tell you that it *greatly* exaggerates the importance of my work. I should know. I wrote it.

The dangerous thing about platform introductions is that they tend to create unrealistic expectations. You have just been led to anticipate that, somehow, I am going to make a complex subject easy to understand. Well, that's quite a billing. I hope I can live up to that expectation today; but it remains to be seen if I can really do that with this topic: *The War on Terrorism*. How can anyone make that easy to understand? There are so many issues and so much confusion. I feel like the proverbial mosquito in a nudist camp. I know what I have to do. I just don't know where to begin.

There is a well-known rule in public speaking that applies to complex topics. It is: First, tell them what you're going to tell them. Then tell them. And, finally, tell them what you told them. I'm going to follow that rule today, and I will begin by making a statement that I have carefully crafted to be as shocking as possible. That's primarily because I want you to remember it. When I tell you what I'm going to tell you, I know that, for many of you, it will sound absurd, and you'll think I have gone completely out of my mind. Then, for the main body of my presentation, I will tell you what I told you by presenting facts to prove that everything I said is true. And, finally, at the end, I will tell you what I told you by repeating my opening statement; and, by then hopefully, it will no longer seem absurd.

What I am going to tell you is this: Although it is commonly believed that the War on Terrorism is a noble effort to defend freedom, in reality, it has little to do with terrorism and even less to do with the defense of freedom. There are other agendas at work; agendas that are far less praiseworthy; agendas that, in fact, are just the opposite of what we are told. The purpose of this presentation is to prove that, what is unfolding today is, *not* a war on terrorism to defend freedom, but *a war on freedom that requires the defense of terrorism*.

That is what I'm going to tell you today, and you are probably wondering how anyone in his right mind could think he could prove such a statement as that. So let's get right to it; and the first thing we must do is confront the word *proof*. What is proof? There is no such thing as absolute proof. There is only evidence. Proof may be defined as sufficient evidence to convince the observer that a particular hypothesis is true.

The same evidence that is convincing to one person may not convince another. In that event, the case is proved to the first person but not to the second one who still needs more evidence. So, when we speak of proof, we are really talking about evidence.

It's my intent to tell you what I told you by developing the case slowly and methodically; to show motive and opportunity; to introduce eyewitnesses and the testimony of experts. In other words, I will provide evidence – upon evidence – upon evidence until the mountain is so high that even the most reluctant skeptic must conclude that the case has been proved.

Where do we find this evidence? The first place to look is in history. The past is the key to the present, and we can never fully understand where we are today unless we know what path we traveled to get here. It was Will Durant who said: "Those who know nothing about history are doomed forever to repeat it."

Are we doomed to repeat history in the war on terrorism? If we continue to follow the circular path we are now taking, I believe that we are. But to find out if that is true, we need to go back in time. So, I invite you to join me, now, in my time machine. We are going to splash around in history for a while and look at some great events and huge mistakes to see if there are parallels, any lessons to be learned for today. I must warn you: it will seem that we are lost in time. We are going to go here and there, and then jump back further, and then forward in time, and we will be examining issues that may make you wonder "What on earth has this to do with today?" But I can assure you, when we reach the end of our journey, you will see that everything we cover has a direct relevance to today and, in particular, to the war on terrorism.

The Hidden Agenda

Now that we are in our time machine, we turn the dial to the year 1954 and, suddenly, we find ourselves in the plush offices of the Ford Foundation in New York City. There are two men seated at a large, Mahogany desk, and they are talking. They cannot see or hear us, but we can see them very well. One of these men is Rowan Gaither, who was the President of the Ford Foundation at that time. The other is Mr. Norman Dodd, the chief investigator for what was called the Congressional Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations. The Ford Foundation was one of those, so he is there as part of his Congressional responsibilities.

In 1982, I met Mr. Dodd in his home state of Virginia where, at the time, I had a television crew gathering interviews for a documentary film. I previously had read his testimony and realized how important it was; so, when our crew had open time, I called him on the telephone and asked if he would be willing to make a statement before our cameras, and he said, "Of course." I'm glad we obtained the interview when we did, because Dodd was advanced in years, and it wasn't long afterward that he passed away. We were very fortunate to capture his story in his own words. What we now are witnessing from our time machine was confirmed in minute detail twenty years later and preserved on video.

We are now in the year 1954, and we hear Mr. Gaither say to Mr. Dodd, "Would you be interested in knowing what we do here at the Ford Foundation?" And Mr. Dodd says, "Yes! That's exactly why I'm here. I would be very interested, sir." Then, without any prodding at all, Gaither says, "Mr. Dodd, we operate in response to directives, the substance of which is that we shall use our grant making power to alter life in the United States so that it can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union."

Dodd almost falls off of his chair when he hears that. Then he says to Gaither, "Well, sir, you can do anything you please with your grant making powers, but don't you think you have an obligation to make a disclosure to the American people? You enjoy tax exemption, which means you are indirectly subsidized by taxpayers, so, why don't you tell the Congress and the American people what you just told me?" And Gaither replies, "We would never dream of doing such a thing."

A Strategy To Control The Teaching Of History

The question that arises in Mr. Dodd's mind is: How would it be possible for anyone to think that they could alter life in the United States so it could be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union and, by implication, with other nations of the world? What an absurd thought that would be – especially in 1954. That would require the abandonment of American concepts of justice, traditions of liberty, national sovereignty, cultural identity, constitutional protections, and political independence, to name just a few. Yet, these men were deadly serious about it. They were not focused on the question of *if* this could be done. Their only question was *how* to do it? What would it *take* to change American attitudes? What would it *take* to convince them to abandon their heritage in exchange for global union?

The answer was provided by another powerful and prestigious tax-exempt foundation, the Carnegie Endowment Fund for International Peace. When Dodd visited that organization and began asking about their activities, the President said, "Mr. Dodd, you have a lot of questions. It would be very tedious and time consuming for us to answer them all, so I have a counter proposal. Why don't you send a member of your staff to our facilities, and we will open our minute books from the very first meeting of the Carnegie Fund, and your staff can go through them and copy whatever you find there. Then you will know everything we are doing."

Again, Mr. Dodd was totally amazed. He observed that the President was newly appointed and probably had never actually read the minutes himself. So Dodd accepted the offer and sent a member of his staff to the Carnegie Endowment facilities. Her name was Mrs. Catherine Casey who, by the way, was hostile to the activity of the Congressional Committee. Political opponents of the Committee had placed her on the staff to be a watchdog and a damper on the operation. Her attitude was: "What could possibly be wrong with tax-exempt foundations? They do so much good." So, that was the view of Mrs. Casey when she went to the boardroom of the Carnegie Foundation. She took her Dictaphone machine with her (they used mechanically inscribed belts in those days) and recorded, word for word, many of the key passages from the minutes of this organization, starting with the very first meeting.

What she found was so shocking, Mr. Dodd said she almost lost her mind. She became ineffective in her work after that and had to be given another assignment.

This is what those minutes revealed: From the very beginning, the members of the board discussed how to alter life in the United States; how to change the attitudes of Americans to give up their traditional principles and concepts of government and be more receptive to what they call the *collectivist* model of society. I will talk more about what the word *collectivist* means in a moment, but those who wrote the documents we will be quoting use that word often and they have a clear understanding of what it means. At the Carnegie Foundation board meetings, they discussed this question in a very scholarly fashion. After many months of deliberation, they came to the conclusion that, out of all of the options available for altering political and social attitudes, there was only *one* that was historically dependable. That option was *war*. In times of war, they reasoned, only then would people be willing to give up things they cherish in return for the desperate need and desire for security against a deadly enemy. And so the Carnegie Endowment Fund for International *Peace* declared in its minutes that it must do whatever it can to bring the United States into *war*.

They also said there were other actions needed, and these were their exact words: "We must control education in the United States." They realized that was a pretty big order, so they teamed up with the Rockefeller Foundation and the Guggenheim Foundation to pool their financial resources to control education in America – in particular, to control the teaching of history. They assigned those areas of responsibility that involved issues relating to domestic affairs to the Rockefeller Foundation, and those issues relating to international affairs were taken on as the responsibility of the Carnegie Endowment.

Their first goal was to rewrite the history books, and they discussed at great length how to do that. They approached some of the more prominent historians of the time and presented to them the proposal that they rewrite history to favor the concept of collectivism, but they were turned down flat. Then they decided – and, again, these are their own words, "We must create our own stable of historians."

They selected twenty candidates at the university level who were seeking doctorates in American History. Then they went to the Guggenheim Foundation and said, "Would you grant fellowships to candidates selected by us, who are of the right frame of mind, those who see the value of collectivism as we do? Would you help them to obtain their doctorates so we can then propel them into positions of prominence and leadership in the academic world?" And the answer was "Yes."

So they gathered a list of young men who were seeking their doctorate degrees. They interviewed them, analyzed their attitudes, and chose the twenty they thought were best suited for their purpose. They sent them to London for a briefing. (In a moment I will explain why London is so significant.) At this meeting, they were told what would be expected if and when they win the doctorates they were seeking. They were told they would have to view history, write history, and teach history from the perspective that collectivism was a positive force in the world and was the wave of the future.

Now lets go to the words of Mr. Dodd, himself, as he described this event before our cameras in 1982. He said:

> This group of twenty historians eventually formed the nucleus of the American Historical Association. Then toward the end of the 1920's the Endowment grants to the American Historical Association 400,000 [a huge amount of money in those days] for a study of history in a manner that points to what this country can look forward to in the future. That culminates in a seven-volume study, the last volume of which is a summary of the contents of the other six. And the essence of the last volume is, the future of this country belongs to collectivism, administered with characteristic American efficiency.[1]

Now we must turn off our time machine for a few moments and deal with this word *collectivism*. You are going to hear it a lot. Especially if you delve into the historical papers of the individuals and groups we are discussing, you will find them using that word over and over. Although most people have only a vague concept of what it means, the advocates of collectivism have a very clear understanding of it, so let's deal with that now.

1 The complete transcript of Mr. Dodd's testimony may be downloaded at no charge from the web site of Freedom Force International, www.freedom-force.org. The video from which this was taken is entitled *The Hidden Agenda* and may be obtained from The Reality Zone web site, www.realityzone.com.

The Chasm: Two Ethics That Divide The Western World

There are many words commonly used today to describe political attitudes. We are told that there are conservatives, liberals, libertarians, progressives, right-wingers, leftwingers, socialists, communists, Trotskyites, Maoists, Fascists, Nazis; and if that isn't confusing enough, now we have *neo* conservatives, *neo* Nazis, and *neo* everything else. When we are asked what our political orientation is, we are expected to choose from one of these words. If we don't have a strong political opinion or if we're afraid of making a bad choice, then we play it safe and say we are moderates – adding yet one more word to the list.

Social mores and religious beliefs sometimes divide along the Left-Right political axis. In the United States, the Democrat Party is home for the Left, while the Republican Party is home for the Right. Those on the Left are more likely to embrace life styles that those on the Right would consider improper or even sinful. Those on the Right are more likely to be church-going members of an organized religion. But these are not definitive values, because there is a great deal of overlap. Republicans smoke pot. Democrats go to church. Social or religious values cannot be included in any meaningful definition of these groups.

Not one person in a thousand can clearly define the ideology that any of these words represent. They are used, primarily, as labels to impart an aura of either goodness or badness, depending on who uses the words and what *emotions* they trigger in their minds. Most political debates sound like they originate at the tower of Babel. Everyone is speaking a different language. The words may sound familiar, but speakers and listeners each have their own private definitions.

It has been my experience that, once the definitions are commonly understood, most of the disagreements come to an end. To the amazement of those who thought they were bitter ideological opponents, they often find they are actually in basic agreement. So, to deal with this word, *collectivism*, our first order of business is to throw out the garbage. If we are to make sense of the political agendas that dominate our planet today, we must not allow our thinking to be contaminated by the emotional load of the old vocabulary

It may surprise you to learn that most of the great political debates of our time – at least in the Western world – can be divided into just two viewpoints. All of the rest is fluff. Typically, they focus on whether or not a particular action should be taken;

but the real conflict is not about the merits of the action; it is about the principles, the ethical code that justifies or forbids that action. It is a contest between the ethics of *collectivism* on the one hand and *individualism* on the other. Those are words that have meaning, and they describe a philosophical chasm that divides the entire Western world.[2]

The one thing that is common to both collectivists and individualists is that the vast majority of them are well intentioned. They want the best life possible for their families, for their countrymen, and for mankind. They want prosperity and justice for their fellow man. Where they disagree is how to bring those things about.

I have studied collectivist literature for over forty-five years; and, after a while, I realized there were certain recurring themes, what I consider to be the five pillars of collectivism. If they are turned upside down, they also are the five pillars of individualism. In other words, there are five major concepts of social and political relationships; and, within each of them, collectivists and individualists have opposite viewpoints.

1. The Origin And Nature Of Human Rights

The first of these has to do with the nature of human rights. Collectivists and individualists both agree that human rights are important, but they differ over *how* important compared to other values and especially over the origin of those rights.

Rights are not tangible entities that can be viewed or measured. They are abstract concepts held in the human mind. They are whatever men agree they are at a given time and place. Their nature has changed with the evolution of civilization. Today, they vary widely from culture to culture. One culture may accept that rights are granted by rulers who derive authority from God. Another culture may claim that rights are granted by God directly to the people. In other cultures, rights are perceived as a claim to the material possessions of others.

2 In the Middle East and parts of Africa and Asia, there is a third ethic called *theocracy*, a form of government that combines church and state and compels citizens to accept a particular religious doctrine. That was common throughout early European Christendom and it appeared even in some of the colonies of the United States. It survives in today's world in the form of Islam and it has millions of advocates. Any comprehensive view of political ideology must include theocracy, but time does not permit such scope in this presentation. For those interested in the author's larger view, including theocracy, there is a summary called *Which Path for Mankind?* attached to the end of this essay.

People living in tribal or military dictatorships don't spend much time even thinking about rights because they have no expectation of ever having them. Some primitive cultures don't even have a word for rights.

Because of the great diversity in the concept of human rights, they cannot be defined to everyone's satisfaction. However, that does not mean they cannot be defined to *our* satisfaction. We do not have to insist that those in other cultures agree with us; but, if we wish to live in a culture to *our* liking, one in which we have the optimum amount of personal freedom, then we must be serious about a preferred definition of human rights. If we have no concept of what rights *should* be, then it is likely we will live under a definition not to our liking.

The first thing to understand as we work toward a useful definition of rights is that their *source* determines their *nature*. This will be covered in greater detail further along, but the concept needs to be stated here. If we can agree on the source of rights, then we will have little difficulty agreeing on their nature. For example, if a security guard is hired by a gated community to protect the property of its residents, the nature of the guard's activity must be limited to the activities that the residents themselves are entitled to perform. That means the guard may patrol the community and, if necessary, physically deter burglaries and crimes of aggressive violence. But the guard is not authorized to compel the residents to send their children to bed by 10 PM or donate to the Red Cross. Why not? Because the residents are the source of the authority; the nature of the authority cannot include any act that is denied to the source; and the residents have no right to compel their neighbors in these matters.

Rights Are Born On The Battlefield

In societies that have been sheltered for many generations from war and revolution, it is easy to forget that rights are derived from military power. That is their ultimate source. Initially, rights must be earned on the battlefield. They may be handed to the next generation as a gift, but they always are purchased on the battlefield. The Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution is a classic example. The men who drafted that document were able to do so only because they represented the colonists who defeated the armies of Great Britain. Had they lost the War of Independence, they would have had no opportunity to write a Bill of Rights or anything else except letters of farewell before their execution.

Unfortunately, Mao Zedong was right when he said that political power grows from the barrel of a gun. He could just as well have said rights. A man may declare that he has a right to do such and such derived from law or from a constitution or even from God; but, in the presence of an enemy or a criminal or a tyrant with a gun to his head, he has no power to exercise his proclaimed right. Rights are always based on power. If we lose our ability or willingness to physically defend our rights, we will lose them.

Now we come to the chasm between collectivists and individualists. If rights are earned on the battlefield, we may assume they belong to the winners, but who are they? Do governments win wars or do the people? If governments win wars and people merely serve them as in medieval times, then governments hold the rights and are entitled to grant or deny them to the people. On the other hand, if people win wars and governments merely serve them in this matter, then the people hold rights and are entitled to grant or deny them to governments. If our task is to define rights as we think they *should* be in a free society, we must choose between these two concepts. Individualists choose the concept that rights come from the people and governments are the servants. Collectivists choose the concept that rights come from governments and people are the servants. Individualists are nervous about that assumption because, if the state has the power to *grant* rights, it also has the power to take them away, and that concept is incompatible with personal liberty.

The view of individualism was expressed clearly in the United States Declaration of Independence, which says:

> 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. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men....

Nothing could be clearer than that. The dictionary tells us that inalienable (spelled differently in colonial times) means "not to be transferred to another." The assumption is that rights are the innate possession of the people. The purpose of government is, not to *grant* rights, but to *secure* them and protect them.

By contrast, all collectivist political systems embrace the opposite view that rights are granted by the state. That includes the Nazis, Fascists, and Communists. It is also a tenet of the United Nations. Article Four of the UN Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights says:

> The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize that, in the enjoyment of those rights provided by the State ... the State may subject such rights only to such limitations as are determined by law.

I repeat: If we accept that the state has the power to *grant* rights, then we must also agree it has the power to *take them away*. Notice the wording of the UN Covenant. After proclaiming that rights are provided by the state, it then says that those rights may be subject to limitations "as are determined by law." In other words, the collectivists at the UN presume to grant us our rights and, when they are ready to take them away, all they have to do is pass a law authorizing it.

Compare that with the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution. It says Congress shall make *no* law restricting the rights of freedom of speech, or religion, peaceful assembly, the right to bear arms, and so forth – not *except as determined by law*, but *no* law. The Constitution embodies the ethic of individualism. The UN embodies the ethic of collectivism, and what a difference that makes.

2. The Origin Of State Power

The second concept that divides collectivism from individualism has to do with the origin of state power. As stated previously, individualists believe that a just government derives its power, not from conquest and subjugation, but from the people. That means the state cannot have any legitimate powers unless they are given to it by its citizens. Another way of putting it is that governments may do only those things that their citizens also have a right to do. If individuals don't have the right to perform a certain act, then they can't grant that power to their elected representatives. They can't delegate what they don't have. It makes no matter how many of them there may be. If none of them have a specified power to delegate, then a million of them don't have it either.

Let us use an extreme example. Let us assume that a ship has been sunk in a storm, and three exhausted men are struggling for survival in the sea. Suddenly, they come upon a life-buoy ring. The ring is designed only to keep one person afloat; but, with careful cooperation between them, it can keep two of them afloat. However, when the third man grasps the ring, it becomes useless, and all three, once again, are at the mercy of the sea.

They try taking turns: one treading while two hold on to the ring; but after a few hours, none of them have strength to continue. The grim truth gradually becomes clear. Unless one of them is cut loose from the group, all three will drown. What, then, should these men do?

Most people would say that two of the men would be justified in overpowering the third and casting him off. The right of self-survival is paramount. Taking the life of another, terrible as such an act would be, is morally justified if it is necessary to save your own life. That certainly is true for individual action, but what about collective action? Where do two men get the right to gang up on one man?

The collectivist answers that two men have a greater right to life because they outnumber the third one. It's a question of mathematics: *The greatest good for the greatest number*. That makes the group more important than the individual and it justifies two men forcing one man away from the ring. There is a certain logic to this argument but, if we further simplify the example, we will see that, although the action may be correct, it is justified by the wrong reasoning.

Let us assume, now, that there are only *two* survivors – so we eliminate the concept of the group – and let us also assume that the ring will support only one swimmer, not two. Under these conditions, it would be similar to facing an enemy in battle. You must kill or be killed. Only one can survive. We are dealing now with the competing right of self-survival for each individual, and there is no mythological group to confuse the issue. Under this extreme condition, it is clear that each person would have the right to do whatever he can to preserve his own life, even if it leads to the death of another. Some may argue that it would be better to sacrifice one's life for a stranger, but few would argue that *not* to do so would be wrong. So, when the conditions are simplified to their barest essentials, we see that the right to deny life to others comes from the *individual's* right to protect his *own* life. It does not need the so-called group to ordain it.

In the original case of three survivors, the justification for denying life to one of them does not come from a majority vote but from their *individual and separate* right of self-survival. In other words, either of them, acting alone, would be justified in this action. They are not empowered by the group. When we hire police to protect our community, we are merely asking them to do what we, ourselves, have a right to do.

Using physical force to protect our lives, liberty, and property is a legitimate function of government, because that power is derived from the people as *individuals*. It does not arise from the group.[3]

Here's one more example – a lot less extreme but far more typical of what actually goes on every day in legislative bodies. If government officials decide one day that no one should work on Sunday, and even assuming the community generally supports their decision, where would they get the authority to use the police power of the state to enforce such a decree? Individual citizens don't have the right to compel their neighbors not to work, so they can't delegate that right to their government. Where, then, would the state get the authority? The answer is that it would come from itself; it would be self-generated. It would be similar to the divine right of ancient monarchies in which it was assumed that governments represent the power and the will of God. In more modern times, most governments don't even pretend to have God as their authority, they just rely on swat teams and armies, and anyone who objects is eliminated.

When governments claim to derive their authority from any source other than the governed, it always leads to the destruction of liberty. Preventing men from working on Sunday would not seem to be a great threat to freedom, but once the principle is established, it opens the door for more edicts, and more, and more until freedom is gone. If we accept that the state or any group has the right to do things that individuals alone do not have the right to do, then we have unwittingly endorsed the concept that rights are *not* intrinsic to the individual and that they, in fact, *do* originate with the state. Once we accept that, we are on the road to tyranny.

Collectivists are not concerned over such picky issues. They believe that governments do, in fact, have powers that are greater than those of their citizens, and the source of those powers, they say, is, not the individuals within society, but society itself, the *group* to which individuals belong.

3 The related question of a right to use deadly force to protect the lives of *others* is reviewed in Part Four in connection with the White House order to shoot down hijacked airliners if they pose a threat to ground populations.

3. Group Supremacy

This is the third concept that divides collectivism from individualism. Collectivism is based on the belief that the group is more important than the individual. According to this view, the group is an entity of its own and it has rights of its own. Furthermore, those rights are more important than individual rights. Therefore, it is acceptable to sacrifice individuals if necessary for "the greater good of the greater number." How many times have we heard that? Who can object to the loss of liberty if it is justified as necessary for the greater good of society? The ultimate group, of course, is the state. Therefore, the state is more important than individual citizens, and it is acceptable to sacrifice individuals, if necessary, for the benefit of the state. This concept is at the heart of all modern totalitarian systems built on the model of collectivism.

Individualists on the other hand say, "Wait a minute. Group? What is *group*? That's just a word. You can't touch a group. You can't see a group. All you can touch and see are individuals. The word *group* is an abstraction and doesn't exist as a tangible reality. It's like the abstraction called *forest*. Forest doesn't exist. Only trees exist. Forest is the concept of many trees. Likewise, the word *group* merely describes the abstract concept of many individuals. Only individuals are real and, therefore, there is no such thing as group rights. Only individuals have rights.

Just because there are many individuals in one group and only a few in another does not give a higher priority to the individuals in the larger group – even if you call it the *state*. A majority of voters do not have more rights than the minority. Rights are not derived from the power of numbers. They do not come from the group. They are *intrinsic* with each human being.

When someone argues that individuals must be sacrificed for the greater good of society, what they are really saying is that *some* individuals are to be sacrificed for the greater good of *other* individuals. The morality of collectivism is based on numbers. Anything may be done so long as the number of people benefiting supposedly is greater than the number of people being sacrificed. I say supposedly, because, in the real world, those who decide who is to be sacrificed don't count fairly. Dictators always claim they represent the greater good of the greater number but, in reality, they and their support organizations usually comprise less than one percent of the population. The theory is that someone has to speak for the masses and represent their best interest, because they are too dumb to figure it out for themselves. So collectivist leaders, wise and virtuous as they are, make the decisions for them.

It is possible to explain any atrocity or injustice as a necessary measure for the greater good of society. Modern totalitarians always parade as humanitarians.

Because individualists do not accept group supremacy, collectivists often portray them as being selfish and insensitive to the needs of others. That theme is common in schools today. If a child is not willing to go along with the group, he is criticized as being socially disruptive and not a good "team player" or a good citizen. Those nice folks at the tax-exempt foundations had a lot to do with that. But individualism is not based on ego. It is based on principle. If you accept the premise that individuals may be sacrificed for the group, you have made a huge mistake on two counts. First, individuals are the *essence* of the group, which means the group is being sacrificed anyway, piece by piece. Secondly, the underlying principle is deadly. Today, the individual being sacrificed may be unknown to you or even someone you dislike. Tomorrow, it could be you. It takes but a moment's reflection to realize that the greater good for the greater number is *not* achieved by sacrificing individuals but by *protecting* individuals. Society is best served by individualism, not collectivism.

Republics Vs. Democracies

We are dealing here with one of the reasons people make a distinction between republics and democracies. In recent years, we have been taught to believe that a democracy is the ideal form of government. Supposedly, that is what was created by the American Constitution. But, if you read the documents and the speech transcripts of the men who *wrote* the Constitution, you find that they spoke very poorly of democracy. They said in plain words that a democracy was one of the worst possible forms of government. And so they created what they called a republic. That is why the word democracy doesn't appear anywhere in the Constitution; and, when Americans pledge allegiance to the flag, it's to the *republic* for which it stands, not the democracy. When Colonel Davy Crockett joined the Texas Revolution prior to the famous Battle of the Alamo, he refused to sign the oath of allegiance to the future government of Texas until the wording was changed to the future *republican* government of Texas.[4] The reason this is important is that the difference between a democracy and a republic is the difference between collectivism and individualism.

4 "David Crockett: Parliamentarian," by William Reed, *National Parliamentarian*, Vol. 64, Third Quarter, 2003, p. 30.

In a pure democracy, the majority rules; end of discussion. You might say, "What's wrong with that?" Well, there could be *plenty* wrong with that. What about a lynch mob? There is only one person with a dissenting vote, and he is the guy at the end of the rope. That's pure democracy in action.

"Ah, wait a minute," you say. "The majority should rule. Yes, but not to the extent of denying the rights of the minority," and, of course, you would be correct. That is precisely what a republic accomplishes. A republic is a government based on the principle of *limited* majority rule so that the minority – even a minority of one – will be protected from the whims and passions of the majority. Republics are often characterized by written constitutions that spell out the rules to make that possible. That was the function of the American Bill of Rights, which is nothing more than a list of things the government may not do. It says that Congress, even though it represents the majority, shall pass no law denying the minority their rights to free exercise of religion, freedom of speech, peaceful assembly, the right to bear arms, and other "unalienable" rights.

These limitations on majority rule are the essence of a republic, and they also are at the core of the ideology called individualism. And so here is another major difference between these two concepts: collectivism on the one hand, supporting any government action so long as it can be said to be for the greater good of the greater number; and individualism on the other hand, defending the rights of the minority against the passions and greed of the majority.

4. Coercion Vs. Freedom

The fourth concept that divides collectivism from individualism has to do with responsibilities and freedom of choice. We have spoken about the origin of rights, but there is a similar issue involving the origin of responsibilities. Rights and responsibilities go together. If you value the right to live your own life without others telling you what to do, then you must assume the responsibility to be independent, to provide for yourself without expecting others to take care of you. Rights and responsibilities are merely different sides of the same coin.

If only individuals have rights, then it follows that only individuals have responsibilities. If groups have rights, then groups also have responsibilities; and, therein, lies one of the greatest ideological challenges of our modern age.

Individualists are champions of individual rights. Therefore, they accept the principle of individual responsibility rather than group responsibility. They believe that everyone has a personal and direct obligation to provide, first for himself and his family, and then for others who may be in need. That does not mean they don't believe in helping each other. Just because I am an individualist does not mean I have to move my piano alone. It just means that I believe that moving it is my responsibility, not someone else's, and it's up to me to organize the voluntary assistance of others.

The collectivist, on the other hand, declares that individuals are *not* personally responsible for charity, for raising their own children, providing for aging parents, or even providing for themselves. These are group obligations of the state. The individualist expects to do it himself; the collectivist wants the government to do it for him: to provide employment and health care, a minimum wage, food, education, and a decent place to live. Collectivists are enamored by government. They worship government. They have a fixation on government as the ultimate group mechanism to solve all problems.

Individualists do not share that faith. They see government as the creator of more problems than it solves. They believe that freedom of choice will lead to the best solution of social and economic problems. Millions of ideas and efforts, each subject to trial and error and competition – in which the best solution becomes obvious by comparing its results to all others – that process will produce results that are far superior to what can be achieved by a group of politicians or a committee of so-called wise men.

By contrast, collectivists do not trust freedom. They are afraid of freedom. They are convinced that freedom may be all right in small matters such as what color socks you want to wear, but when it come to the important issues such as the money supply, banking practices, investments, insurance programs, health care, education, and so on, freedom will not work. These things, they say, simply must be controlled by the government. Otherwise there would be chaos.

There are two reasons for the popularity of that concept. One is that most of us have been educated in government schools, and that's what we were taught. The other reason is that government is the one group that can legally force everyone to participate. It has the power of taxation, backed by jails and force of arms to compel everyone to fall in line, and that is a very appealing concept to the intellectual who pictures himself as a social engineer.

Collectivists say, "We must force people to do what we think they should do, because they are too dumb to do it on their own. We, on the other hand, have been to school. We've read books. We are informed. We are smarter than those people out there. If we leave it to them, they are going to make terrible mistakes. So, it is up to us, the enlightened ones. We shall decide on behalf of society and we shall enforce our decisions by law so no one has any choice. That we should rule in this fashion is our obligation to mankind."

By contrast, individualists say, "We also think we are right and that the masses seldom do what we think they should do, but we don't believe in forcing anyone to comply with our will because, if we grant that principle, then others, representing larger groups than our own, could compel *us* to act as *they* decree, and that would be the end of our freedom."

The affinity between intellectual egotism and coercion was dramatically demonstrated by Canadian law professor, Alan Young, who wrote an editorial in the March 28, 2004 edition of the *Toronto Star*. His topic was "hate crimes," and his solution was a classic example of the collectivist mindset. He wrote:

> The defining feature of the hate criminal is stupidity. It is a crime born of intellectual deficiency.... Criminal justice actually can do very little to combat stupidity.... The hate criminal probably needs rigorous deprogramming....
>
> Just as some cancers require invasive surgery, the hate crime needs intrusive measures... The usual out-of-site, out-of-mind approach to modern punishment just won't work in this case. For crimes of supreme stupidity we need *Clockwork Orange* justice – strapping the hate criminal into a chair for an interminable period, and keeping his eyes wide-open with metal clamps so he cannot escape from an onslaught of cinematic imagery carefully designed to break his neurotic attachment to self-induced intellectual impairment.
>
> In the context of hate crime, I do have some regrets that we have a constitutional prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment.[5]

5 "Hate Criminal Needs Deprogramming," by Alan Young, *Toronto Star*, March 28, 2004, p. F7.

One of the quickest ways to spot a collectivist is to see how he reacts to public problems. No matter what bothers him in his daily routine – whether it's littering the highway, smoking in public, dressing indecently, bigotry, sending out junk mail – you name it, his immediate response is "There ought to be a law!" And, of course, the professionals in government who make a living from coercion are more than happy to cooperate. The consequence is that government just keeps growing and growing. It's a one-way street. Every year there are more and more laws and less and less freedom. Each law by itself seems relatively benign, justified by some convenience or for the greater good of the greater number, but the process continues *forever* until government is total and freedom is dead. Bit-by-bit, the people, themselves, become the solicitor of their own enslavement.

The Robin Hood Syndrome

A good example of this collectivist mindset is the use of government to perform acts of charity. Most people believe that we all have a responsibility to help others in need if we can, but what about those who disagree, those who couldn't care less about the needs of others? Should they be allowed to be selfish while we are so generous?

The collectivist sees people like that as justification for the use of coercion, because the cause is so worthy. He sees himself as a modern Robin Hood, stealing from the rich but giving to the poor. Of course, not all of it gets to the poor. After all, Robin and his men have to eat and drink and be merry, and that doesn't come cheap. It takes a giant bureaucracy to administer a public charity, and the Robbing Hoods in government have become accustomed to a huge share of the loot, while the peasants – well, they're grateful for whatever they get. They don't care how much is consumed along the way. It was all stolen from someone else anyway.

The so-called charity of collectivism is a perversion of the Biblical story of the Good Samaritan who stopped along the highway to help a stranger who had been robbed and beaten. He even takes the victim to an inn and pays for his stay there until he recovers. Everyone approves of such acts of compassion and charity, but what would we think if the Samaritan had pointed his sword at the next traveler and threatened to kill him if he didn't also help? If that had happened, I doubt if the story would have made it into the *Bible*; because, at that point, the Samaritan would be no different than the original robber – who also might have had a virtuous motive.

For all we know, he could have claimed that he was merely providing for his family and feeding his children. Most crimes are rationalized in this fashion, but they are crimes nevertheless. When coercion enters, charity leaves.[6]

Individualists refuse to play this game. We expect everyone to be charitable, but we also believe that a person should be free *not* to be charitable if he doesn't want to. If he prefers to give to a different charity than the one we urge on him, if he prefers to give a smaller amount that what we think he should, or if he prefers not to give at all, we believe that we have no right to force him to our will. We may try to persuade him to do so; we may appeal to his conscience; and especially we may show the way by our own good example; but we reject any attempt to gang up on him, either by physically restraining him while we remove the money from his pockets or by using the ballot box to pass laws that will take his money through taxation. In either case, the principle is the same. It's called stealing.

Collectivists would have you believe that individualism is merely another word for selfishness, because individualists oppose welfare and other forms of coercive redistribution of wealth, but just the opposite is true. Individualists advocate true charity, which is the voluntary giving of their own money, while collectivists advocate the coercive giving of other people's money; which, of course, is why it is so popular.

One more example: The collectivist will say, "I think everyone should wear seatbelts. That just makes sense. People can be hurt if they don't wear seatbelts. So, let's pass a law and require everyone to wear them. If they don't, we'll put those dummies in jail." The individualist says, "I think everyone should wear seatbelts. People can be hurt in accidents if they don't wear them, but I don't believe in forcing anyone to do so. I believe in convincing them with logic and persuasion and good example, if I can, but I also believe in freedom of choice."

One of the most popular slogans of Marxism is: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." That's the cornerstone of theoretical socialism, and it is a very appealing concept. A person hearing that slogan for the first time might say: "What's wrong with that? Isn't that the essence of charity and compassion toward those in need?

6 Let's be clear on this. If we or our families really were starving, most of us *would* steal if that were the only way to obtain food. It would be motivated by our intrinsic right to life, but let's not call it virtuous charity. It would be raw survival.

What could possibly be wrong with giving according to your ability to others according to their need?" And the answer is, *nothing* is wrong with it – as far as it goes, but it is an incomplete concept. The unanswered question is *how* is this to be accomplished? Shall it be in freedom or through coercion?

I mentioned earlier that collectivists and individualists usually agree on objectives but disagree over means, and this is a classic example. The collectivist says, *take* it by force of law. The individualist says, *give* it through free will. The collectivist says, not enough people will respond unless they are forced. The individualist says, enough people will respond to achieve the task. Besides, the preservation of freedom is also important. The collectivist advocates legalized plunder in the name of a worthy cause, believing that the end justifies the means. The individualist advocates free will and true charity, believing that a worthy objective does not justify committing theft and surrendering freedom.

There is a story of a Bolshevik revolutionary who was standing on a soapbox speaking to a small crowd in Times Square. After describing the glories of socialism and communism, he said: "Come the revolution, everyone will eat peaches and cream."

A little old man at the back of the crown yelled out: "I don't like peaches and cream." The Bolshevik thought about that for a moment and then replied: "Come the revolution, comrade, you *will* like peaches and cream."

This, then, is the fourth difference between collectivism and individualism, and it is perhaps the most fundamental of them all: collectivists believe in coercion; individualists believe in freedom.

5. Equality *Vs*. Inequality Under Law

The fifth concept that divides collectivism from individualism has to do with the way people are treated under the law. Individualists believe that no two people are exactly alike, and each one is superior or inferior to others in many ways but, *under law*, they should all be treated equally. Collectivists believe that the law should treat people *un*equally in order to bring about desirable changes in society. They view the world as tragically imperfect. They see poverty and suffering and injustice and they conclude that something must be done to alter the forces that have produced these effects. They think of themselves as social engineers who have the wisdom to restructure society to a more humane and logical order.

To do this, they must intervene in the affairs of men at all levels and redirect their activities according to a master plan. That means they must redistribute wealth and use the police power of the state to enforce prescribed behavior.

The consequence of this mindset can be seen everywhere in society today. Almost every country in the world has a tax system designed to treat people unequally depending on their income, their marital status, the number of children they have, their age, and the type of investments they may have. The purpose of this arrangement is to redistribute wealth, which means to favor some classes over others. In some cases, there are bizarre loopholes written into the tax laws just to favor one corporation or one politically influential group.

Other laws provide tax-exemption and subsidies to favored groups or corporations. Inequality is the whole purpose of these laws.

In the realm of social relationships, there are laws to establish racial quotas, gender quotas, affirmative-action initiatives, and to prohibit expressions of opinion that may be objectionable to some group or to the master planners. In all of these measures, there is an unequal application of the law based on what group or class you happen to be in or on what opinion you hold.

We are told that all of this is necessary to accomplish a desirable change in society. Yet, after more than a hundred years of social engineering, there is not one place on the globe where collectivists can point with pride and show where their master plan has actually worked as they predicted. There have been many books written about the collectivist utopia, but they never materialized in the real world. Wherever collectivism has been applied, the results have been more poverty than before, more suffering than before, and certainly more injustice than before.

There is a better way. Individualism is based on the premise that all citizens should be equal under law, regardless of their national origin, race, religion, gender, education, economic status, life style, or political opinion. No class should be given preferential treatment, regardless of the merit or popularity of its cause. To favor one class over another is not equality under law.

Proper Role Of Government

When all of these factors are considered together, we come to the sixth ideological division between collectivism and individualism. Collectivists believe that the proper role of government should be positive, that the state should take the initiative in all aspects of the affairs of men, that it should be aggressive, lead, and provide. It should be the great organizer of society.

Individualists believe that the proper function of government is negative and defensive. It is to protect, not to provide; for if the state is granted the power to provide for some, it must also be able to take from others, and once that power is granted, there are those who will seek it for their advantage. It always leads to legalized plunder and loss of freedom. If government is powerful enough to give us everything we want, it is also powerful enough to take from us everything we have. Therefore, the proper function of government is to protect the lives, liberty, and property of its citizens; nothing more.[7]

7 There is a third category of human action that is neither proper nor improper, neither defensive nor aggressive; activity that may be undertaken by the state for convenience – such as building roads and maintaining recreational parks – provided they are funded, not from general taxes, but by those who use them. Otherwise, some would benefit at the expense of others, and that would be coercive re-distribution of wealth. These activities would be permissible because they have a negligible impact on freedom. I am convinced they would be more efficiently run and offer better public service if owned and operated by private industry, but there is no merit in being argumentative on that question when much more burning issues are at stake. After freedom is secure, we will have the luxury to debate these finer points. Another example of an optional activity is the allocation of broadcast frequencies to radio and TV stations. Although this does not protect lives, liberty, or property, it is a matter of convenience to orderly communi-cations. There is no threat to personal freedom so long as the authority to grant licenses is administered impartially and does not favor one class of citizens or one point of view over another. Another example of an optional government activity would be a law in Hawaii to prevent the importation of snakes. Most Hawaiians want such a law for their convenience. This is not a proper function of government because it does not protect the lives, liberty, or property of its citizens, but it is not improper either so long as it is administered so that the cost is borne equally by all. It could be argued that this *is* a proper function of government, because snakes could threaten domestic animals that are the property of its citizens, but that would be stretching the point. It is this kind of stretching of reason that demagogues use when they

want to consolidate power. Almost any government action could be rationalized as an *indirect* protection of life, liberty, or property. The defense against word games of this kind is to stand firm against funding in any way that causes a shift of wealth from one group to another. That strips away the political advantage that motivates most of the collectivist schemes in the first place. Without the possibility of legalized plunder, most of the brain games will cease. Finally, when issues become murky, and it really is impossible to clearly see if an action is acceptable for government, there is always a rule of thumb that can be relied on to show the proper way: That government is best which governs least.

The Political Spectrum

We hear a lot today about right-wingers versus left-wingers, but what do those terms really mean? For example, we are told that communists and socialists are at the extreme left, and the Nazis and Fascists are on the extreme right. Here we have the image of two powerful ideological adversaries pitted against each other, and the impression is that, somehow, they are opposites. But, what is the difference? They are not opposites at all. They are the same. The insignias may be different, but when you analyze communism and Nazism, they both embody the principles of socialism. Communists make no bones about socialism being their ideal, and the Nazi movement in Germany was actually called the National Socialist Party. Communists believe in *international* socialism, whereas Nazis advocate *national* socialism. Communists promote *class* hatred and *class* conflict to motivate the loyalty and blind obedience of their followers, whereas the Nazis use *race* conflict and *race* hatred to accomplish the same objective. Other than that, there is no difference between communism and Nazism. They are both the epitome of collectivism, and yet we are told they are, supposedly, at opposite ends of the spectrum!

There's only one thing that makes sense in constructing a political spectrum and that is to put zero government at one end of the line and 100% at the other. Now we have something we can comprehend. Those who believe in zero government are the anarchists, and those who believe in total government are the totalitarians.

With that definition, we find that communism and Nazism are together at the same end. They are both totalitarian. Why? Because they are both based on the model of collectivism. Communism, Nazism, Fascism and socialism all gravitate toward bigger and bigger government, because that is the logical extension of their common ideology. Under collectivism, all problems are the responsibility of the state and must be solved by the state. The more problems there are, the more powerful the state must become. Once you get on that slippery slope, there is no place to stop until you reach all the way to the end of the scale, which is total government. Regardless of what name you give it, regardless of how you re-label it to make it seem new or different, *collectivism is totalitarianism*.

Actually, the straight-line concept of a political spectrum is somewhat misleading. It is really a circle. You can take that straight line with 100% government at one end and zero at the other, bend it around, and touch the ends at the top. Now it's a circle because, under anarchy, where there is no government, you have absolute rule by those with the biggest fists and the most powerful weapons. So, you jump from zero government to totalitarianism in a flash. They meet at the top. We are really dealing with a circle, and the only logical place for us to be is somewhere in the middle of the extremes. We need social and political organization, of course, but it must be built on individualism, an ideology with an affinity to that part of the spectrum with the *least* amount of government possible instead of collectivism with an affinity to the other end of the spectrum with the *most* amount of government possible. That government is best which governs least.

Now, we are ready to re-activate our time machine. The last images still linger before us. We still see the directors of the great tax-exempt foundations applying their vast financial resources to alter the attitudes of the American people so they will accept the merger of their nation with totalitarian regimes; and we still hear their words proclaiming that "the future of this country belongs to collectivism, administered with characteristic American efficiency." It's amazing, isn't it, how much is contained in that one little word: *collectivism*.

- End of Part One

2 Which path for Mankind?

Four Models for Social Order

Model	1. Barbarism	2. Theocracy	3. Collectivism			4.Individualism
Variants			**Leninism**	**Rhodesism / Fabianism**	**Fascism / Nazism**	
Adherents	Any advocate of rule by brute force with no pretense at ideological justification; includes anarchists	Any advocate of government to coerce citizens to accept a religion (such as Islam and early Christendom)	Marxist/Leninists, Maoists, Communists, Trotskyites, National-Liberation and Proletarian-Revolution groups	Marxist/Fabians, Royal Inst. of Internatl. Affairs, Rhodes Scholars, CFR, Trilateral Commission, Bilderbergers	Fascists and Nazis	*Should be* everyone else
Basis of morality (right *vs*. wrong)	Might makes right	The word of God as interpreted by those who rule	The greater good for the greater number as interpreted by rulers	The greater good for the greater number as interpreted by rulers	The greater good for the greater number as interpreted by rulers	Enlightened self-interest or the word of God as self-interpreted
Nature of rights	Man's only right is to serve the rulers	Man's only right is to serve God represented by rulers	Granted by the state; may be denied by the state	Granted by the state; may be denied by the state	Granted by the state; may be denied by the state	Intrinsic to each individual; protected by the state
Who is supreme?	The state (sovereign monarch and ruling elite)	The state (holy man and ruling elite), claiming to represent God	The state (charismatic leader and ruling elite), claiming to represent the majority	The state (charismatic leader and ruling elite), claiming to represent the majority	The state (charismatic leader and ruling elite), claiming to represent the majority	The individual, claiming to represent only himself
Desirable ends	By coercion of decree	By coercion of law	By coercion of law	By coercion of law	By coercion of law	By voluntary action
People treated	Unequally	Unequally	Unequally	Unequally	Unequally	Equally
Role of government	Subjugate and exploit for the benefit of ruling elite; no limit	Enforce God's word as interpreted by ruling elite; no limit	Anything for greater good of greater number as decided by ruling elite; no limit	Anything for greater good of greater number as decided by ruling elite; no limit	Anything for greater good of greater number as decided by ruling elite; no limit	Limited to protecting the lives, liberty and property of its citizens
Property	Privately owned but subject to confiscation by the rulers	Heavily controlled by the state; ruling elite enjoy exceptions	Owned by the state; ruling elite enjoy use	Privately owned, controlled by state; exceptions for ruling elite	Privately owned, controlled by state; exceptions for ruling elite	Privately owned with minimal state control; no exceptions
Means of production	Privately owned but subject to confiscation by the rulers	Varies with theology but subject to control by the state	Owned and controlled by the state	Privately owned, controlled by the state; ruling elite enjoy competitive advantage	Privately owned, controlled by the state; ruling elite enjoy competitive advantage	Privately owned, minimal state control, no advantage for political influence

Model	**1. Barbarism**	**2. Theocracy**	**3. Collectivism**			**4.Individualism**
Variants			**Leninism**	**Rhodesism / Fabianism**	**Fascism / Nazism**	
Economic model	Plunder	Varies with theology but usually state monopoly	State monopoly	Corporate monopoly enforced by the state	Corporate monopoly enforced by the state	Free-market competition; minimal state interference
Charity	Responsibility of each individual; after plunder by rulers, little is left for charity	Varies with theology but usually required or administered by the state	Responsibility of the state, administered politically, paid by taxation	Responsibility of the state, administered politically, paid by taxation	Responsibility of the state, administered politically, paid by taxation	Responsibility of each individual, administered privately, paid voluntarily
Money	Issued by rulers with bullion backing at their discretion; usually little or no backing; causes inflation, a hidden tax	Christian theocracies did not oppose money with little or no backing; Islam adheres to 100% bullion-backed money	Issued by the state with bullion backing at its discretion; usually little or no backing; causes inflation, a hidden tax	Issued by the banks with protection of the state; usually little or no bullion backing; causes inflation, a hidden tax	Issued by the banks with protection of the state; usually little or no bullion backing; causes inflation, a hidden tax	Issued by the state, banks, or anyone else; that which is backed with bullion becomes money-of-choice; no inflation
Effect	Rulers are solvers of all important problems; totalitarian state accepted as norm; limited freedom, low productivity, scarcity	Rulers are God's agents to solve important problems; leads to totalitarian state, limited freedom, low productivity, scarcity	The state is seen as solver of all important problems; leads to political corruption, totalitarianism, low productivity, scarcity	The state is seen as solver of all important problems; leads to political corruption, totalitarianism, low productivity, scarcity	The state is seen as solver of all important problems; leads to political corruption, totalitarianism, low productivity, scarcity	The state is seen as cause of more problems than it solves; limited state power leads to freedom, high productivity, abundance
Means of expansion	Organization, training, strategy and leadership for military conquest; brutally eliminate opponents	Organization, training, strategy & leadership to win converts, create religious conflict, and prepare for military conquest; brutally eliminate opponents,	Organization, training, strategy and leadership to dominate power centers, create class conflict and internal revolution; brutally eliminate opponents,	Organization, training, strategy and leadership to dominate power centers; quietly capture government; use law and media to eliminate opponents	Organization, training, strategy and leadership to create race conflict and gain political control; military expansion; brutally eliminate opponents	No previous plan but s*hould* be organization, strategy, training, and leadership in power centers; replace opponents; empower freedom

3 Introduction to the Creed of Freedom

There is nothing more common in history than for oppressed people to rise up against their masters and, at great cost in treasure and blood, throw off the old regime only to discover that they have replaced it with one that is just as bad or worse. That is because it is easy to know what we dislike about a political system but not so easy to agree on what would be better. For most of history, it has been the habit of men to focus on personalities rather than principles. They have thought that the problem was with the man who rules, not with the system that sustains him. So, they merely replace one despot for another, thinking that, somehow, the new one will be more wise and benevolent. Even if the new ruler has good intentions, he may be corrupted by the temptations of power; and, in those rare cases where he is not, he eventually is replaced by another who is not as self-restrained. As long as the system allows it, it is just a matter of time before a new despot will rise to power. To prevent that from happening, it is necessary to focus on the system itself, not on personalities. To do that, it is just as important to know what we are *for* as it is to know what we are *against*.

Even today, with so much talk about fighting to defend freedom, who can stand up and define what that means? For some, freedom means merely not being in jail. Who can define the essence of personal liberty? Who can look you in the eye and say: "This I believe, and I believe it for this reason and this reason and this reason also." The world is dying for something to believe in, a statement of principles that leaves no room for misunderstanding; a creed that everyone of good faith toward their fellow human beings can accept with clarity of mind and strength of resolve. There is an old saying that if you don't stand for something, you'll fall for anything. *The Creed of Freedom* that you are about to read is the rock-solid ground that will allow us to stand firm against all the political nostrums of our day, and those in the future as well.

The Creed of Freedom expresses the core ideology that binds the members of Freedom Force together. This is not like the platform of a political party that typically is a position statement on a long list of specific issues and which changes from year to year to accommodate the shifting winds of popular opinion. Instead, it is stated in terms of broad principles that do not change over time and that are not focused on specific issues at all.

If these principles are followed, then most of the vexing political and social issues of the day can be quickly resolved in confidence that the resulting action will be consistent with justice and freedom.

Although I have authored the *Creed*, I cannot claim credit for it. Anyone familiar with the classical treatises on freedom will recognize that most of its concepts have been taken from the great thinkers and writers of the past. My role has been merely to read the literature, identify the concepts, organize them into logical sequence, and condense them into a single page.

The Creed Of Freedom

Intrinsic Nature Of Rights

I believe that only individuals have rights, not the collective group; that these rights are intrinsic to each individual, not granted by the state; for if the state has the power to grant them, it also has the power to deny them, and that is incompatible with personal liberty

I believe that a just government derives its power solely from the governed. Therefore, the state must never presume to do anything beyond what individual citizens also have the right to do. Otherwise, the state is a power unto itself and becomes the master instead of the servant of society.

Supremacy Of The Individual

I believe that one of the greatest threats to freedom is to allow any group, no matter its numeric superiority, to deny the rights of the minority; and that one of the primary functions of just government is to protect each individual from the greed and passion of the majority.

Freedom Of Choice

I believe that desirable social and economic objectives are better achieved by voluntary action than by coercion of law. I believe that social tranquility and brotherhood are better achieved by tolerance, persuasion, and the power of good example than by coercion of law. I believe that those in need are better served by charity, which is the giving of one's own money, than by welfare, which is the giving of other people's money through coercion of law.

Equality Under Law

I believe that all citizens should be equal under law, regardless of their national origin, race, religion, gender, education, economic status, life style, or political opinion. Likewise, no class should be given preferential treatment, regardless of the merit or popularity of its cause. To favor one class over another is not equality under law.

Proper Role Of Government

I believe that the proper role of government is negative, not positive; defensive, not aggressive. It is to protect, not to provide; for if the state is granted the power to provide for some, it must also be able to take from others, and once that power is granted, there are those who will seek it for their advantage. It always leads to legalized plunder and loss of freedom. If government is powerful enough to give us everything we want, it is also powerful enough to take from us everything we have. Therefore, the proper function of government is to protect the lives, liberty, and property of its citizens; nothing more. That government is best which governs least.

The Three Commandments Of Freedom

The Creed of Freedom is based on five principles. However, in day-to-day application, they can be reduced to just three general codes of conduct. I consider them to be The Three Commandments of Freedom:

Individual Rights

Do not sacrifice the rights of any individual or minority for the assumed rights of the group.

Equality Under Law

Do not endorse any law that does not apply to all citizens equally.

Freedom Of Choice

Do not use coercion for any purpose except to protect human life, liberty, or property.



The Three Pillars Of Freedom

Another way of viewing these principles is to consider them as the three pillars of freedom. They are concepts that underlie the ideology of individualism, and individualism is the indispensable foundation of freedom.

4 Secret Organizations and Hidden Agendas - The Future Is Calling (Part Two)

John Ruskin Promotes Collectivism At Oxford

Now let's put theory behind us and get back into some real history. From the minutes of the Carnegie Endowment, we recall the curious words: "We must control education in America." Who is this "*we*?" Who are the people who are planning to do that? To answer that question we must set the co-ordinates on our machine once again, and we are now moving further back in time to the year 1870. We find ourselves suddenly in England in an elegant classroom of Oxford University, and we are listing to a lecture by a brilliant intellectual, John Ruskin.

Ruskin was a Professor of Fine Arts at Oxford. He was a genius. At first I was prepared not to like him, because he was a total collectivist. But, when I got his books and started to read the notes from his lectures, I had to acknowledge his talent. First of all he was an accomplished artist. He was an architect. He was a philosopher. About the only flaw that I could see was that he believed in collectivism. He preached it eloquently, and his students, coming from the wealthy class – the elite and the privileged from the finest areas of London – were very receptive to his message. He taught that those who had inherited the rich culture and traditions of the British Empire had an obligation to rule the world and make sure that all the less fortunate and stupid people had proper direction. That basically was his message, but it was delivered in a very convincing and appealing manner.

Ruskin was not the originator of collectivism. He was merely riding the crest of an ideological tidal wave that was sweeping through the whole Western World at that time. It was appealing to the sons and daughters of the wealthy who were growing up with guilt complexes because they enjoyed so much luxury and privilege in stark contrast to the world's poor and starving masses.

In this milieu there were two powerful ideological movements coming to birth. One of them was Marxism, which offered the promise of defending and elevating these downtrodden masses. Wealthy young people felt in their hearts that this promise was worthy and noble.

They wanted to do something to help these people, but they didn't want to give up their own privileges. I will say this about John Ruskin, he actually did give of his own wealth to help the poor, but he was one of the rare exceptions. Most collectivists are hesitant about giving their own money. They prefer to have government be the solver of problems and to use tax revenues – other people's money. Collectivists recognize that someone has to run this governmental machine, and it might as well be them, especially since they are so well educated and wise. In this way, they can retain both their privilege and their wealth. They can now be in control of society without guilt. They can talk about how they are going to lift up the downtrodden masses using the collectivist model. It was for these reasons that many of the wealthy idealists became Marxists and sought positions of influence in government.

The Fabian Society

But there was another movement coming to birth at about this same time that eventually gave competition to the hard-core Marxists. Some of the more erudite members of the wealthy and intellectual classes of England formed an organization to perpetuate the concept of collectivism but not exactly according to Marx. It was called the Fabian Society. The name is significant, because it was in honor of Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus, the Roman general who, in the second century B.C., kept Hannibal at bay by wearing down his army with delaying tactics, endless maneuvering, and avoiding confrontation wherever possible. Unlike the Marxists who were in a hurry to come to power through direct confrontation with established governments, the Fabians were willing to take their time, to come to power without direct confrontation, working quietly and patiently from inside the target governments. To emphasize this strategy, and to separate themselves from the Marxists, they adopted the turtle as their symbol. And their official shield portrays an image of a wolf in sheep's clothing. Those two images perfectly summarize their strategy.

It is now 1884, and we find ourselves in Surrey, England observing a small group of these Fabians, sitting around a table in the stylish home of two of their more prominent members, Sydney and Beatrice Webb. The Webbs later would be known world wide as the founders of the London School of Economics. Their home eventually was donated to the Fabian Society and became its official headquarters. Around the table are such well-known figures as George Bernard Shaw, Arnold Toynbee, H.G. Wells, and numerous

others of similar caliber. By the way, the Fabian Society still exists, and many prominent people are members, not the least of which is England's Prime Minister, Tony Blair.

H.G. Wells wrote a book to serve as a guide showing how collectivism can be embedded into society without arousing alarm or serious opposition. It was called *The Open Conspiracy*, and the plan was spelled out in minute detail. His fervor was intense. He said that the old religions of the world must give way to the new religion of collectivism. The new religion should be the state, he said, and the state should take charge of all human activity with, of course, elitists such as himself in control. On the very first page, he says: "This book states as plainly and clearly as possible the essential ideas of my life, the perspective of my world.... This is my religion. Here are my directive aims and the criteria of all I do."[8]

When he said that collectivism was his religion, he was serious. Like many collectivists, he felt that traditional religion is a barrier to the acceptance of state power. It is a competitor for man's loyalties. Collectivists see religion as a device by which the clerics keep the downtrodden masses content by offering a vision of something better in the next world. If your goal is to bring about change, contentment is not what you want. You want *dis*contentment. That's why Marx called religion the opiate of the masses.[9] It gets in the way of revolutionary change. Wells said that collectivism should become the *new* opiate, that *it* should become the vision for better things in the next world. The new order must be built on the concept that individuals are nothing compared to the long continuum of society, and that only by serving society do we become connected to eternity. He was very serious.

The blueprint in *The Open Conspiracy* has been followed in all the British dependencies and the United Sates. As a result, today's world is very close to the vision of H.G. Wells. A worship of the god called society has become a new religion. No matter what insult to our dignity or liberty, we are told it's necessary for the advancement of society, and that has become the basis for contentment under the hardships of collectivism. The greater good for the greater number *has* become the opiate of the masses.

8 H.G. Wells, The Open Conspiracy (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1928), p. vii.

9 There is disagreement over the correct translation from the German text. One translation is *opium of the people*. It's a small matter, but we prefer *opiate of the masses* because we believe it is a more accurate translation and is more consistent with the fiery vocabulary of Marx.

Love-Hate Between Fabians And Leninists

Fabians and Marxists are in agreement over their mutual goal of collectivism, but they differ over style and sometimes tactics. When Marxism became fused with Leninism and made its first conquest in Russia, these differences became the center of debate between the two groups. Karl Marx said the world was divided into two camps eternally at war with each other. One was the working class, which he called the proletariat, and the other was the wealthy class, those who owned the land and the means of production. This class he called the bourgeoisie.

Fabians were never enthusiastic over this class-conflict view, probably because most of them were bourgeoisie, but Lenin and Stalin embraced it wholeheartedly. Lenin described the Communist Party as the "vanguard of the proletariat," and it became a mechanism for total and ruthless war against anyone who even remotely could be considered bourgeoisie. In the final paragraph of *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx wrote: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only through the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions." When the Bolsheviks came to power in Russia, landowners and shopkeepers were slaughtered by the tens of thousands, a process that continued well into the 1990s and eventually claimed the lives of over 100 million people murdered by their own government.

This brutality offended the sensibilities of the genteel Fabians, especially since most of them were landowners or shopkeepers. It's not that Fabians are opposed to force and violence to accomplish their goals, it's just that they prefer to use it as a last resort, whereas the Leninists were running amuck in Russia implementing a plan of deliberate terror and brutality. Fabians admired the Soviet system because it was based on collectivism but they were shocked at what they considered to be needless bloodshed. It was a disagreement primarily over style. When Lenin became the master of Russia, many of the Fabians joined the Communist Party thinking that it would become the vanguard of world Socialism. They likely would have stayed there if it hadn't been for the brutality of the regime.

To understand the love-hate relationship between these two groups we must never lose sight of the fact that Leninism and Fabianism are merely variants of collectivism. Their similarities are much greater than their differences.

That is why their members often move from one group to the other – or why some of them are actually members of both groups at the same time. Leninists and Fabians are usually friendly with each other. They may disagree intensely over theoretical issues and style, but never over goals.

Margaret Cole was the Chairman of the Fabian Society in 1955 and '56. Her father, G.D.H. Cole, was one of the early leaders of the organization dating back to 1937. In her book, *The Story of Fabian Socialism*, she describes the common bond that binds collectivists together. She says:

> It plainly emerges that the basic similarities were much greater than the differences, that the basic Fabian aims of the abolition of poverty, through legislation and administration; of the communal control of production and social life ..., were pursued with unabated energy by people trained in Fabian traditions, whether at the moment of time they called themselves Fabians or loudly repudiated the name.... The fundamental likeness is attested by the fact that, after the storms produced first by Syndicalism[10] and then by the Russian Revolution in its early days had died down, those "rebel Fabians" who had not joined the Communist Party ... found no mental difficulty in entering the revived Fabian Society of 1939 –nor did the surviving faithful find any difficulty with collaborating with them.[11]

Fabians are, according to their own symbolism, wolves in sheep's clothing, and that explains why their style is more effective in countries where parliamentary traditions are well established and where people expect to have a voice in their own political destiny. Leninists, on the other hand, tend to be wolves in *wolf's* clothing, and their style is more effective in countries where parliamentary traditions are weak and where people are used to dictatorships anyway.

In countries where parliamentary traditions are strong, the primary tactic for both of these groups is to send their agents into the power centers of society to capture control from the inside. Power centers are those organizations and institutions that represent all the politically influential segments of society.

10 Syndicalism is a variant of collectivism in which labor unions play a dominant role in government and industry.

11 Margaret Cole, *The Story of Fabian Socialism* (Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1961), p. xii.

These include labor unions, political parties, church organizations, segments of the media, educational institutions, civic organizations, financial institutions, and industrial corporations, to name just a few. In a moment, I am going to provide a partial list of members of an organization called the Council on Foreign Relations, and you will recognize that the power centers these people control are classic examples of this strategy. The combined influence of all these entities adds up to the total political power of the nation. To capture control of a nation, all that is required is to control its power centers, and that has been the strategy of Leninists and Fabians alike.

They may disagree over style; they may compete over which of them will dominant the coming New World Order, over who will hold the highest positions in the pyramid of power; they may even send opposing armies into battle to establish territorial preeminence over portions of the globe, but they never quarrel over goals. Through it all, they are blood brothers, and they will always unite against their common enemy, which is any opposition to collectivism. It is impossible to understand what is unfolding in the War on Terrorism today without being aware of that reality.

The Key That Unlocks The Door That Hides The Secrets

The Fabian symbols of the turtle and the wolf in sheep's clothing are emblazoned on a stained glass window that used to be in the Fabian headquarters. The window has been removed, we are told, for safety, but there are many photographs showing the symbols in great detail. The most significant part appears at the top. It is that famous line from Omar Khayyam:

Dear love, couldst thou and I with fate conspire
to grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
would we not shatter it to bits
and then remould it nearer to the hearts desire?

Please allow me to repeat that line. This is the key to modern history, and it unlocks the door that hides the secret of the war on terrorism:

Dear love, couldst thou and I with fate conspire

to grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,

would we not shatter it to bits

and then remould it nearer to the hearts desire?

Elsewhere in the window there is a depiction of Sydney Webb and George Bernard Shaw striking the earth with hammers. The earth is on an anvil, and they are striking it with hammers – to *shatter it to bits*! That's what they were saying at the Carnegie Endowment Fund. That's what they were saying at the Ford Foundation. "War is the best way to remold society. War! It will shatter society to bits, break it apart. Then we can remold it nearer to the heart's desire." And what is their heart's desire? It is collectivism.

The Secret Society Created By Cecil Rhodes

From the vantage point of our time machine, now we return to the classroom where John Ruskin is extolling the virtues of collectivism, and we observe that one of his students is taking copious notes. His name is Cecil Rhodes. It will be revealed in later years that this young man was so impressed by Ruskin's message that he often referred to those notes over the next thirty years of his life. Rhodes became a dedicated collectivist and wanted to fulfill the dream and the promise of John Ruskin.

His life mission was to bring the British Empire into dominance over the entire world, to re-unite with America, and to create world government based on the model of collectivism. While the erudite Fabians were creating discussion groups among intellectuals to theorize the glories and strategies of collectivism, Rhodes was forming a secret society to actually establish collectivism in every nation of the world. What the Fabians hoped to accomplish by intellectual persuasion, Rhodes planned to accomplish by economic leverage and political deceit. His biographer, Sarah Millin, summed it up when she wrote: "The government of the world was Rhodes' simple desire." Most people are aware that Rhodes made one of the world's greatest fortunes in South African diamonds and gold. What is not widely known is that he spent most of that fortune to implement the theories of John Ruskin.

One of the best authorities on the social and political vision of Cecil Rhodes was Carroll Quigley, a highly respected history professor at Georgetown University. One of Quigley's former students was President Clinton. In Clinton's nomination acceptance speech on July 16, 1992, he mentioned Quigley and paid

tribute to him as his mentor. He mentioned Quigley many times after that in other public speeches as well. Clearly, Clinton was profoundly affected by his exposure to Quigley's ideas twenty-seven years earlier, and we may assume that the relationship between teacher and student was similar to that between Ruskin and Rhodes.

The significance of this intellectual bond is that Carroll Quigley taught the conspiratorial view of history – as explained by the conspirators themselves. He admired the conspiracy. He was close to it for much of his life, and was considered by many to be its historian. So, when President Clinton paid tribute to Professor Quigley, his remarks carried two messages. To the average person, he was merely honoring some nice, kindly professor for providing intellectual inspiration. But, to those who knew Quigley's status, it was an embedded message that the new president was aware of the conspiracy and was in its service.

What Conspiracy?

It's time to define the word *conspiracy*. A composite definition taken from several dictionaries is that a conspiracy must have three components: (1) It includes two or more people; (2) It involves a plot to commit an illegal or immoral act; and (3) It employs deceit or coercion to accomplish its objective. As we shall see, the group that evolved from the funding of Cecil Rhodes' fortune has far more than two people and it is a master of deceit and coercion. On those counts it is clearly a conspiracy, but on count number three, we must understand that the participants themselves do not consider their goal to be immoral. In fact, they affectionately describe it as The New World Order, and they consider its attainment to be the highest morality possible in social affairs. In their view, the virtue of this goal is so great that it justifies any act of destruction or sacrifice of individuals if it is necessary for its advance.

As for legality, these are the people who *make* the laws. They have passed thousands of them so that almost everything they do is entirely legal – and they force everyone else to comply in the *name* of law. So, in terms of a dictionary definition, this is not a conspiracy. However, in the eyes of those who are the target of its deceit and who are being forced into a collectivist system against their will, the word is entirely appropriate.

Quigley wrote the history of this conspiracy and published it in two books, *Tragedy and Hope* and *The Anglo-American Establishment*. They were not intended for mass readership. One-thousand

seven-hundred pages altogether, they were written primarily for scholars, students of political science, and those who are involved with the conspiracy at some limited level and want a better understanding of its totality.

What Quigley taught in his classes was similar to what John Ruskin had taught and, like Rhodes before him, he took those lectures very seriously. Incidentally, it should not go unnoticed that Clinton was given a Rhodes Scholarship (most likely obtained with the help of Quigley), which took him to London to study at Oxford University, the alma mater of Ruskin and Rhodes.

Quigley Summarized

If reading one-thousand seven-hundred pages or dry history is not high on your list of things to do, then here is a summary of Quigley's message regarding the hidden hand behind world events:

> At the end of the 19th Century, a secret society was formed by Cecil Rhodes. Most of his great wealth was given to extend this organization throughout the world. It exists today and has been a major historical force since World War I. Its original goal was to extend the British Empire and Anglo-Saxon culture throughout the world. It soon evolved into something even bigger in scope. The goal became world government of an international character based on the model of collectivism ruled from behind the scenes by an oligarchy composed of those who are loyal to the secret society.

The primary method of conquest is to infiltrate and capture control of the power centers of society. (Power centers are those organizations and institutions that wield influence over political action and public opinion.) Once the power centers are controlled, the nation will follow. People believe that organizations respond to the will of their membership, not realizing that they respond, instead, to the will of their leadership.

The structure of the secret society is based on the classical conspiracy model taken from Adam Weishaupt's Illuminati. There is no reason to think that Rhodes was a member of the Illuminati, which according to Bavarian records, was disbanded there in 1784. However, there is no doubt that he had studied it carefully, because the structure he chose was modeled after it. It is characterized by organizational rings within rings. At the center is the leader and a few trusted associates called the Elect. These people create a slightly larger organization around themselves, which attracts

members who have no knowledge that there is an inner core of direction. This outer ring then creates another, larger organization around itself with the same relationship to its inner ring of control. The larger organization then creates yet another larger organization, and so forth. These rings extend outward until, finally, they reach into the mainstream community where they enlist the services of innocent people who perform various tasks of the secret society without realizing who is creating the agenda or why.

Members of the outer rings are not allowed to see the existence of the inner rings. Only those few who prove themselves worthy are shown the deeper connection and invited to advance. It is through this structure that a small group of men can direct the activities of mass organizations and determine the policies of nations.

One of the benefits of this structure is that the Rhodes Secret Society, although it has attained extensive power, remains invisible to the casual observer.

Also of benefit in this regard is the fact that it avoids a formal name. Quigley vacillates between calling it The Group and The Network. Others call it The Rhodes Secret Society. But it has no name! Without a name, it is difficult to even discuss it, much less expose it. The result is a high degree of invisibility.

The inner circle of this conspiracy is called the Society of the Elect. Originally, it consisted of Rhodes and a small brain trust from British banking and politics. After Rhodes' death, and with the arrival of such powerful participants as Andrew Carnegie, J.P. Morgan, and John D, Rockefeller, the center of gravity began to shift from London to New York and eventually came to rest in the Rockefeller group with additional centers of influence in such organizations as the Bilderberg Group and the Trilateral Commission. It was at this point that the goal also shifted from the expansion of the British Empire to the creation of global collectivism.

The secondary ring around the Society of the Elect is called The Round Table. It was established with branches in Britain, each of the British dependencies, and the United States. These, in turn, created outer rings in each country as front groups for the inner Round Tables. In Britain and it dependencies, the outer rings are called The Royal Institute for International Affairs. In Britain, it is informally known as Chatham House, named after the 18th century mansion in which it is located once occupied by William Pitt, First Earl of Chatham. The word Royal is not attractive to Americans; so, in the United States, the outer ring was called The Council on Foreign Relations.

After a hundred years of penetration into the power centers of the Western World, this Network now is close to the final achievement of its goal: the creation of a true world government based on the model of collectivism.

It is important to recall that the Rhodes Secret Society has primary influence in the *Western World* or, more specifically, those countries that have spun off from British rule. It also is influential in those parts of the world where American military and economic presence is strong. In most of the rest of the world, the dominant force is Leninism which – and it cannot be repeated too often – has the same goal of establishing a global government based on the model of collectivism but is a fierce competitor with the Rhodesians over which faction will rule.

Let The Conspirators Themselves Describe It

Many will find it difficult to believe that this summary of history is accurate; so, now let's allow the conspirators themselves to describe it in their own words. In his book, Quigley says:

> I know of the operation of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years during the 1960's to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have for much of my life been close to it and to many of its instruments. In general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown.[12]

In The Anglo-American Establishment Quigley says:

> The Rhodes scholarship established by the terms of Cecil Rhodes' seventh will are known to everyone. What is not so widely known is that Rhodes, in five previous wills, left his fortune to form a secret society, which was to devote itself to the preservation and expansion of the British Empire. And what does not seem to be known to anyone is that this secret society ... continues to exist to this day. To be sure, [it] is not a childish thing like the Ku Klux Klan, and it does not have any secret robes, secret handclasps, or secret passwords.

12 Caroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 326.

> It does not need any of these, since its members know each other intimately. It probably has no oaths of secrecy nor any formal procedure of initiation. It does, however, exist and holds secret meetings.... This Group is, as I shall show, one of the most important historical facts of the twentieth century.[13]

One of the leaders and organizers of this secret society was William Stead who wrote a book entitled *The Last Will and Testament of CJ Rhodes*. In that book, he said:

> Mr. Rhodes was more than the founder of a dynasty. He aspired to be the creator of one of those vast semi-religious, quasi-political associations which, like the Society of Jesus, have played so large a part in the history of the world. To be more strictly accurate, he wished to found an Order as the instrument of the will of the Dynasty....[14]

> I contend that we [English] are the finest race in the world and that the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race.... What scheme could we think of to forward this object? I look into history and I read the story of the Jesuits. I see what they were able to do in a bad cause and I might say under bad leaders. In the present day I became a member of the Masonic order. I see the wealth and power they possess, the influence they hold, and I think over their ceremonies, and I wonder that a large body of men can devote themselves to what at times appear the most ridiculous and absurd rites without an object and without an end. The idea gleaming and dancing before one's eyes, like a will-of-the wisp, at last frames itself into a plan. Why should we not form a secret society with but one object: the furtherance of the British Empire and the bringing of the whole uncivilized world under British rule.[15]

In Quigley's words, the goal of this secret society was:

13 Carroll Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment: from Rhodes to Cliveden* (New York: Books in Focus, 1981), p. ix. The existence of this secret society is also confirmed by Rhodes' biographer, Sarah Millin, *op. cit*, pp. 32, 171, 173, 216.

14 Quoted by Quigley, *Ibid.*, p. 36.

15 Cecil Rhodes' Will, users.cyberone.com.au/myers/rhodes-will.html.

> ... nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. The system was to be controlled in a feudalist fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert by secret agreements arrived at in frequent private meetings and conferences. The apex of the system was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basil, Switzerland, a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks which were themselves private corporations. Each central bank ...sought to dominate its government by its ability to control Treasury loans, to manipulate foreign exchanges, to influence the level of economic activity in the country, and to influence cooperative politicians by subsequent economic rewards in the business world.[16]

On page 4 of The Anglo-American Establishment, Quigley says:

> This organization has been able to conceal its existence quite successfully, and many of its most influential members, satisfied to possess the reality rather than the appearance of power, are unknown even to close students of British history ... partly because of the deliberate policy of secrecy which this Group has adopted, partly because the Group itself is not closely integrated but rather appears as a series of overlapping circles or rings partly concealed by being hidden behind formally organized groups of no obvious political significance.

Regarding the organization's structure, Quigley tells us this:

> In the secret society, Rhodes was to be leader. Stead, Brett (Lord Esher), and Milner were to form an executive committee [called "The Society of the Elect"]. Arthur (Lord) Balfour, (Sir) Harry Johnston, Lord Rothschild, Albert (Lord) Grey, and others were listed as potential members of a "Circle of Initiates"; while there was to be an outer circle known as the "Association of Helpers" (later organized by Milner as the Round Table organization).[17]

After the death of Cecil Rhodes, the organization fell under the control of Lord Alfred Milner, who was Governor General and High Commissioner of South Africa, also a very powerful person in

16 Quigley, *Tragedy*, p. 324.

17 Caroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 131. Additional reference to "The Society of the Elect" is in *Anglo-American Establishment,* pp. 3, 39.

British banking and politics.[18] He recruited young men from the upper class of society to become part of the Association of Helpers. Unofficially, they were known as "Milner's Kindergarten." They were chosen because of their upper-class origin, their intelligence, and especially because of their dedication to uplifting mankind through collectivism. They were quickly placed into important positions in government and other power centers to promote the agenda of the secret society. Eventually, this Association of Helpers became the inner rings of larger groups, which expanded throughout the British Empire and into the United States.

Not everyone who implements the goals of Cecil Rhodes is a member of the inner councils of the Rhodes Network – any more than those who implement the Leninist strategy are necessarily members of the Communist Party. In both cases, the number of people who comprise the inner directorates of these movements is relatively small compared to their followers. Therefore, when we identify these people by the movements they support, it must be understood that this refers, not to actual membership but to ideological orientation. The genius of both camps is their ability to mobilize large numbers of followers into doing their work. Most of the foot soldiers have no knowledge of the history we are now examining. Nevertheless, we will refer to them as Rhodesians or Leninists if they consistently promote these respective agendas. This is especially true if they are in leadership positions; for, in that case, a conscious affinity to these movements becomes highly probable.

Arnold Toynbee, The Ultimate Rhodesian

Let us pause here for a moment and reflect on a fact that is easy to overlook when concentrating on historical chronology. It is that all of this recruiting and organizing and placing agents into power centers of society was done in secret. More than that, it was done deceitfully. Not only were the goals of this group hidden from view; it was a matter of policy to deliberately lie about them to the public. To illustrate this point, let us consider the career of Arnold Toynbee, one of the better-known members of Milner's Kinder-

18 Since this secret society continues to exist today, I am often asked who the leaders have been after Rhodes and Milner. Under normal circumstances, that would be a silly question; because, if anyone on the outside knew the answer, it would no longer be a secret organization. However, in a rare turn of events, we *do* know who the leaders have been up until fairly recent times. Quigley was privy to the records of this organization and knew their names and order of succession. A major portion of his book, *The Anglo-American Establishment:* was devoted to their role in history.

garten. Toynbee, was the ultimate Rhodesian: a prominent member of the Fabians, a professor at the London School of Economics (founded by Fabians Sydney and Beatrice Webb), and Director of Studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, which is a front for the British Round Table Group, which is a front for the Rhodes secret society. He also served in the Intelligence Department of the British Foreign Office in World Wars I and II. Toynbee was the author of a twelve-volume work entitled *A Study of History*, which expounds the theme that national sovereignty is doomed to extinction and the future belongs to collectivism. In 1931, in an article that appeared in *International Affairs*, published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Toynbee wrote:

> I will hereby repeat that we are at present working, discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands....[19]

Replacing national sovereignty with world government doesn't happen merely by writing articles in periodicals or even twelve-volume histories of the world. It happens only when people who champion that goal become leaders within government and other power centers of society. Only then can those ideas be transformed into reality. Quigley explains how this came about:

> Through Lord Milner's influence, these men were able to win influential posts in government, in international finance, and become the dominant influence in British imperial affairs and foreign affairs up to 1939.
>
> In 1909 through 1913, they organized semi-secret groups known as known as Round Table Groups, in the chief British dependencies and the United States. These still function in eight countries.... Once again the task was given to Lionel Curtis who established, in England and each dominion, a front organization to the existing local Round Table Group. This front organization, called the Royal Institute of International Affairs, had as its nucleus in each area the existing, submerged Round Table Group. In New York it was known as the Council on Foreign Relations, and was a front for J.P. Morgan and Company.[20]

19 "The Trend of International Affairs Since the War," by Arnold Toynbee, *International Affairs*, Vol. X, No. 6 (November 1931), pp. 803-826.

20 Quigley, *Tragedy*, pp. 132, 951-52.

At last we come to that obscure yet ubiquitous organization that plays such a decisive roll in contemporary American political life: The Council on Foreign Relations. Now we understand that it was spawned from the secret society of Cecil Rhodes, that it is a front for a Roundtable Group (originally embodied in J.P. Morgan and Company but now the Rockefeller consortium), and that its primary goal is to promote world government based on the model of collectivism.

Why is that important? Because members of the Council on Foreign Relations have become the hidden rulers of America.

The Council On Foreign Relations

So who are the members of the CFR? Let's start with the **Presidents of the United States**. Members of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) include: Herbert Hoover, Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, James Carter, George Bush Senior, and William Clinton. John F. Kennedy claimed he was a member, but his name does not appear on former membership lists. So there is confusion on that one, but he said he was a member. Incidentally, Kennedy was a graduate of the London School of Economics, which was founded by Sydney and Beatrice Webb to promote the ruling-class and collectivist concepts of the Fabians. Former presidential candidate John Kerry is also a member as is Vice President Richard Cheney.

Secretaries of State who were CFR members include: Robert Lansing, Frank Kellogg, Henry Stimpson, Cordell Hull, E.R. Stittinius, George Marshall, Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Christian Herter, Dean Rusk, William Rogers, Henry Kissinger, Cyrus Vance, Edmund Muskie, Alexander Haig, George Schultz, James Baker, Lawrence Eagelberger, Warren Christopher, William Richardson, Madeleine Albright, Colin Powell, and Condoleezza Rice.

Secretaries of Defense who were members of the CFR include James Forrestal, George Marshall, Charles Wilson, Neil McElroy, Robert McNamara, Melvin Laird, Elliot Richardson, James Schlesinger, Harold Brown, Casper Weinberger, Frank Carlucci, Richard Cheney, Les Aspin, William Perry, William Cohen, and Donald Rumsfeld. It is interesting that Rumsfeld has asked that his name be removed from the current list of CFR members. However, you will find his name on previous lists.

CIA Directors who were members of the CFR include Walter Smith, William Colby, Richard Helms, Allen Dulles, John McCone, James Schlesinger, George Bush, Sr., Stansfield Turner, William Casey, William Webster, Robert Gates, James Woolsey, John Deutch, William Studeman, George Tenet, and Porter Goss.

Some of the better known corporations controlled by past or present members of the CFR include The Atlantic Richfield Oil Co., AT&T, Avon Products, Bechtel (construction) Group, Boeing Company, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Chevron., Coca Cola and Pepsi Cola, Consolidated Edison of New York, EXXON, Dow Chemical, du Pont Chemical, Eastman Kodak, Enron, Estee Lauder, Ford Motor, General Electric, General Foods, Hewlett-Packard, Hughes Aircraft, IBM, International Paper, Johnson & Johnson, Levi Strauss & Co., Lockheed Aerospace, Lucent Technologies, Mobil Oil, Monsanto, Northrop, Pacific Gas & Electric, Phillips Petroleum, Procter & Gamble, Quaker Oats, Yahoo, Shell Oil, Smith Kline Beecham (pharmaceuticals), Sprint Corp., Texaco, Santa Fe Southern-Pacific Railroad, Teledyne, TRW, Southern California Edison, Unocal, United Technologies, Verizon Communications, Warner-Lambert, Weyerhauser, and Xerox.

In the Media there are past or present members of the CFR holding key management or control positions – not just working down the line – but in top management and control positions of Atlantic magazine, The Army Times, American Publishers, American Spectator, Atlanta Journal-Constitution, Associated Press, Association of American Publishers, Boston Globe, Business Week, Christian-Science Monitor, Dallas Morning News, Detroit Free Press, Detroit News, Dow Jones News Service, Farm Journal, Financial Times, Financial World, Forbes, Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy, Harper's, Industry Week, Insight, London Times, Los Angeles Times, Medical Tribune, MySpace, National Geographic, National Review, Naval War College Review, New Republic, New York Post, New York Times, New Yorker, New York Review of Books, Newsday, News Max, Newsweek, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, The Progressive, Political Science Quarterly, Public Interest, Random House, Reader's Digest, Rolling Stone, Rupert Murdoch News Corp, San Diego Union-Tribune, Scientific American, Time, Times Mirror, Time-Warner, U.S. News & World Report, USA Today, Wall Street Journal, Warner Books, Washington Post, Washington Times, The Washingtonian, Weekly Standard, World Policy Journal, Worldwatch, W.W. Norton & Co., ABC, CBS, CNN, Fox News, NBC, PBS, RCA, and the Walt Disney Company.

CFR media personalities include David Brinkley, Tom Brokaw, William Buckley, Dan Rather, Diane Sawyer, Barbara Walters, and Katie Couric, and Andrea Mitchell wife of CFR member Alan Greenspan.[21]

In the universities, the number of past or present CFR members who are professors, department chairman, presidents, or members of the board of directors is 563.

In financial institutions, such as banks, the Federal Reserve System, the stock exchanges, and brokerage houses the total number of CFR members in controlling positions is 284.

In tax exempt foundations and think tanks, the number of CFR members in controlling positions is 443. Some of the better known names are: The American Civil Liberties Union,[22] Aspen

21 Peter Jennings and Bill Moyer, although not members of the CFR, are members of the Bilderberg Group, which has the same ideological orienta-tion as the CFR but functions at the international level as a kind of steering committee to coordinate the activities of similar groups in other countries.

22 The ACLU enjoys the reputation of being a defender of civil liberties. In keeping with that image, it has spoken against the Patriot Act and other legislation that denies civil liberties in the name of fighting terrorism. So far, so good, but there is a difference between speaking out on a topic and actually doing something about it. When it comes to applying its legal and financial resources, the ACLU moves in other directions. At the time of this writing, the Executive Director of the ACLU is Anthony Romero, a member of the CFR. Previously, he had been in charge of the Ford Foundation's grant program where he channeled approximately90 million to organizations promoting "crisis" messages that frighten the public into accepting bigger government, which means into accepting laws like the Patriot Act. For example, The Ford Foundation has funded studies and groups promoting the concepts of environmental crisis and population-growth crisis and then calling for vast new government powers as the only way to head off global catastrophe. The Foundation has been a major source of funding for MALDEF, LaRaza, and other Hispanic separatist groups, which means it finances those who call for breaking away parts of California and Texas and giving them to Mexico. It also has funded the American Indian Movement, which has a similar separatist agenda for parts of the U.S. where American Indian populations are prominent. It is not likely that either movement would ever succeed; but if enough revolutionaries can be funded and mobilized into the streets with violent demonstrations and riots, peaceful citizens are expected to gratefully accept martial law and internationalization of these areas as acceptable alternatives to violence. In all of these cases, the role played by the Ford Foundation is to fan the flames of fear, to frighten us into accepting a police state at home, comfortably merged with other police states at the UN, in a world government based on the model of collectivism. The ACLU supports these causes strongly and speaks against their consequences softly. This is a classic case of controlling one's own opposition to insure that it does not succeed. It is an extension of the strategy described to Norman Dodd in 1954 by Ford Foundation President, Rowan Gaither when he explained that war – and the dread of war – was the most effective way to bring people to accept a

Institute, Atlantic Council, Bilderberg Group, Brookings Institute, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Carnegie Foundation, Ford Foundation, Guggenheim Foundation, Hudson Institute, John D. & Catherine T. MacArther Foundation, Mellon Foundation, RAND Corp., Rhodes Scholarship Selection Commission, Sloan and Kettering Foundations, Rockefeller Foundation and Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Trilateral Commission, and the UN Association.

And finally, the labor unions that are dominated by past or present members of the CFR include the AFL-CIO, United Steel Workers of America, United Auto Workers, American Federation of Teachers, Bricklayers and Allied Craft, Communications Workers of America, Union of Needle Trades, and Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers.

Please understand that this is just a sampling of the list. The total membership is about four thousand people. There are many churches in your community that have that many members or more. What would you think if it were discovered that members of just one church in your community held controlling positions in 80% of the power centers of America? Wouldn't you be curious? First of all you would have to find out about it, which would not be easy if those same people controlled the avenues of information that you rely on to learn of such things.

I should emphasize that most of these people are not part of a secret society. The CFR calls itself a *semi*-secret organization, which, indeed, it is. It is not *the* secret society. It is at least two rings out from that. Most members are not aware that they are controlled by an inner Round Table Group. Most of them are merely opportunists who view this organization as a high-level employment agency. They know that, if they are invited to join, their names will appear on a prestigious list, and collectivists seeking to consolidate global control will draw upon that list for important jobs. However, even though they may not be conscious agents of a secret society, they all have been carefully screened for suitability. Only collectivists are invited, and so they have the necessary mindset to be good functionaries within the New World Order.

---

rapid shift in society toward collectivism. Dread of war is still the most powerful motivator, but collectivists have discovered that dread of terrorism, dread of environmental catastrophe, and dread of overpopulation are also useful for this purpose. For that part of the story, see chapter twenty-four, "Doomsday Mechanisms," in *The Creature from Jekyll Island; A Second Look at the Federal Reserve.*

The Quigley Formula

The CFR embraces members of both major American political parties. It is not a partisan organization. Voters are led to believe that, by choosing between the Democrat and Republican parties, they have a choice. They think they are participating in their own political destiny, but that is an illusion. To a collectivist like Professor Quigley, it is a *necessary* illusion to prevent the voters from meddling into the important affairs of state. If you have ever wondered why the two American parties appear so different at election time but so similar afterward, listen carefully to Quigley's approving overview of American politics:

> The National parties and their presidential candidates, with the Eastern Establishment assiduously fostering the process behind the scenes, moved closer together and nearly met in the center with almost identical candidates and platforms, although the process was concealed as much as possible, by the revival of obsolescent or meaningless war cries and slogans (often going back to the Civil War). ... The argument that the two parties should represent opposed ideals and policies, one, perhaps, of the Right and the other of the Left, is a foolish idea acceptable only to the doctrinaire and academic thinkers. Instead, the two parties should be almost identical, so that the American people can "throw the rascals out" at any election without leading to any profound or extreme shifts in policy. ... Either party in office becomes in time corrupt, tired, unenterprising, and vigorless. Then it should be possible to replace it, every four years if necessary, by the other party, which will be none of these things but will still pursue, with new vigor, approximately the same basic policies.[23]

What are those basic policies? They are anything that advances the network's long-range goal. Quigley says that candidates and parties can and should differ on many things so long as they mutually advance world government based on the model of collectivism. While campaigning, they should appear to be fierce opponents; but when the elections are over, they must work in harmony for the main objective. Everything else is showmanship. Let us examine a few examples.

23 Quigley, *Tragedy*, pp. 1247–1248.

In the Carter Administration, the U.S. electorate was overwhelmingly opposed to giving away the Panama Canal, yet the leadership of both parties voted to do so, led on both sides of the isle by members of the CFR.

Republicans call for war in the Middle East and advocate that we give more power to the UN. Democrats call for peace and advocate that we give more power to the UN. The voters don't want that, but it is a goal of CFR. Neither party objects to the fact that a UN resolution was the legal basis for war rather than the U.S. Constitution.

Republicans promote legislation to restrict personal rights in the name of antiterrorism. Democrats give speeches of concern and then vote for those laws. The voters don't want that, but it is the goal of the CFR. The legislation was written by members of the CFR even before 9/11.

Republicans give speeches about the danger of illegal immigration. Democrats give speeches about compassion to immigrants. Both parties unite in merging the U.S. with Mexico and Canada so that national borders soon will be meaningless. The voters don't want that, but it is the goal of CFR.

Republican leaders steal elections with rigged voting machines. Democrat leaders accept their fate with no serious challenge. That's because rigging elections by pre-programmed voting machines is merely the latest and perhaps ultimate implementation of the Quigley Formula. It's the end of the line for honest elections and representative government.

The leaders of both political parties are like TV wrestlers. They put on a great show in the ring. They slam each other onto the mat. They jump on each other, pummel each other with apparently bone-breaking blows. They throw each other out of the ring; but it is not a real contest. They have agreed in advance who is going to win, and they are content to wait their turn to be the winner next time. They are professionals, and it's good for their business.

Likewise, politicians today are professionals. They also know what is good for their business, and they play the game well. Meanwhile, voters are like tennis balls, smashed back and forth across the net of politics. The tennis players win half the time, but the tennis ball never wins. And so the game goes on, as our nation and freedom fade into history.

Controlled Opposition

This game would not be convincing without the media pied pipers who serve the two major parties. These celebrity-status commentators and organizations offer themselves as unbiased observers with no political ambitions of their own; but, in reality, they are highly partisan propagandists. No matter what grave issue is up for discussion, their analysis will skew it as a reason to vote Republican or Democrat, depending on their bias. Here are a few examples.

Talk-show host, Rush Limbaugh, does a great job of exposing and ridiculing corrupt Democrats and their policies, but he never met a Republican he didn't like. He's all for the United Nations and never mentions the CFR.

Film producer, Michael Moore, does a great job of exposing and ridiculing corrupt Republicans and their policies, but he never met a Democrat he didn't like. He's all for the United Nations and never mentions the CFR.

The organization called *Accuracy in Media* does a great job of exposing deceit and treachery within the ranks of Democrats, but it finds little to criticize in the Republican camp and never mentions the CFR.

The organization called *Move-On* does a great job of exposing deceit and treachery within the ranks of Republicans, but it finds little to criticize in the Democrat camp and never mentions the CFR.

The Internet news and commentary service, *Human Events Online*, calls itself a "conservative" weekly; but it is an obedient supporter of the Republican Party even when it's policies are the opposite of traditional conservatism. It never mentions the CFR.

The editors of the Internet news service, *Unknown News*, say they are disgusted with both parties because they do not offer serious solutions to the problems they mutually have created. Hooray! But, in their commentary, they routinely identify corrupt Republicans by party label (implying they are scumbags *because* they are Republicans). They usually omit the party label when reporting on corrupt Democrats. If they do include it, they often accompany it by saying: "Even the Democrats" were involved with this or failed to oppose that. The clear message is that they expect more from the Democrats. *Unknown News* reports the deeds of such corrupt world leaders, as Putin, Castro, and Chavez in sympathetic or admiring tones. We are never reminded of their failures or crimes.

Domestic leaders who are Marxist/Leninists also receive favorable coverage, which reveals that the affinity of its editors is with Leninism. Collectivism is their solution-of-choice for every problem. They are disgusted with both political parties, not because they have led us deeper into collectivism, but because they are not aligned with Leninism. The Democrats are more so, in the sense that most U.S. based Leninists are within the Democrat Party and have a strong voice there, which explains the more gentle treatment the Democrats receive from *Unknown News*. It never mentions the CFR.

The Politics Of Plunder, Stupidity, And Hatred

The result of this two-party charade is that Americans – and those in most other countries in the Western World – are the victims of a great deception. Voters have been fooled into thinking they are participating in their own political destiny when, in reality, they are being herded into a high-tech feudalism entirely without their consent and, to a large degree, even without their knowledge. This is accomplished by the mirage of a meaningful choice at election time when, in fact, the major parties and their candidates are merely two branches of the same tree of collectivism. Voters today are not attracted to candidates because of their political principles. They have none. Political principles are never allowed as a topic of debate, anyway. Instead, voters make choices on the basis of candidates' good looks, their smiles, how clever they are in televised debates, their perceived sincerity, and especially how many "benefits" they promise to give to some citizens that are paid from taxes from other citizens. Legalized plunder is a powerful motivator, and it is used with precision by both major parties.

Many voters have come to regard elections as magnificent games in which only the cleverest contestants are entitled to win. They become fascinated by the strategies and deployment of resource, and techniques for evading tough issues, and cleverness of TV spots, and ability to appeal to large voting blocs. They don't really care who wins as much as they want to pick the winner. To them, it's like betting in a football pool. They may favor one team over another, but they will place their bet on the team they think stands the best chance of winning, even if it is not their favorite. Winning is everything.

That is how they cast their votes. They may prefer a certain candidate, but they will not vote for him if they think someone else will win. How many times have we heard: "I like Bill Smith but he

can't win. So I'm voting for Harry Stone." All the media has to do is convince people that Bill Smith can't win, and that will influence enough people to withdraw their vote and make the prediction a self-fulfilling prophecy. The primary purpose of a vote is, not to choose a winner, but to express a choice. It is to create a public record of how many people support the policies and principles of a particular candidate so that, even if he does not win, the winner and the community will be aware of how much support the losing candidate has. It is the ultimate public-opinion poll. We do not want a winner-take-all type of system where those who are considered to have the best chance of winning receive an overwhelming but misleading vote of support. A tyrant who receives 51% of the vote will be more restrained than one who has 80%.

The good man who receives 49% of the vote, even though not a winner, becomes a rallying point for those of like mind. He becomes a much more serious contender in the next election than if he receives only 20% of the vote. There is no point in voting for a candidate unless it is a true reflection of our choice. Representative government is serious business, and treating it as a football pool is succumbing to the politics of stupidity.

There is a third scenario that is even worse. Voters may vote for Harry Stone, not because they think he has a better chance than Bill Smith but because they think he is the lesser of two evils. They vote, not *for* someone but *against* someone. It's not that they like candidate A but they *hate* candidate B. This is exactly as prescribed by the Quigley Formula. Quigley said that a controlled two-party system will allow people to "throw the rascals out" and replace them with a fresh team with new vigor so the government can continue the bi-partisan drive toward global collectivism with the support of the electorate – until the next cycle when it may be advantageous to swing back again to the previous party. If people wonder why we have evil in government, it's because they voted for it. The lesser of two evils is still evil. This is the politics of hatred, and it is a highly effective weapon against those who are not aware of the tactic – which is to say, most voters.

Voting for a candidate because we hate the other one, and thinking that we cannot go outside the two-party system because a third-party candidate cannot win, is a trap. To escape that trap, we must understand, not only the Quigley Formula, but also the secret society and its outer rings that have implemented it.

Review

Now it's time to review. The power centers of the United States – including both major political parties – are controlled by members of the Council on Foreign Relations. This, in turn, is controlled by a submerged Round Table Group, which is associated with other Round Tables in other countries. These are extensions of a secret society founded by Cecil Rhodes and still in operation today. I call it the Rhodesian Network, not because these people are members of an organization by that name, but because they share the ideology and strategies envisioned by Cecil Rhodes and because, today, they are clustered around the organizations that were created by his followers.

5 Days of Infamy
The Future Is Calling (Part Three)

Colonel House

As we re-activate our time machine, we find ourselves in the presence of one of the most colorful and mysterious figures of history. His name is Colonel Edward Mandell House. House was never in the military. The title of Colonel was honorary, granted by the Governor of Texas in appreciation for political services. He was one of the most powerful men in American politics and, yet, virtually unknown to most Americans today. He was the personal advisor to Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt. He was close to the Morgan banking dynasty and also to the powerful banking families of Europe. He attended school in England and surrounded himself with Fabians. His father, Thomas, was an exporter in the Southern states and also a lending agent for London banks, which preferred to remain anonymous. It was widely believed that he represented the Rothschild consortium. Thomas House was one of the few in the South who emerged from the War Between the States with a great fortune.

Colonel House was what they called a "king maker" in Texas politics. He personally chose Woodrow Wilson, the most unlikely of all political candidates, and secured his nomination for President on the Democratic ticket in 1912. It was House who convinced the Morgan group, and others with power in politics and media, to throw their support to Wilson, which is what enabled him to win the election and become the 28th President of the United States. House was certainly a member of the Round Table and possibly a member of its inner circle. He was a founder of the CFR.

In 1912 he wrote a novel, entitled *Philip Dru Administrator*. It was intended to popularize the Fabian blueprint for converting America to collectivism using the Fabian strategy of working slowly as a turtle and secretly as a wolf in sheep's clothing. The hero of his story is Philip Dru, who is a fictionalized version the author, himself: a quiet, unassuming intellectual, working behind the scenes advising and controlling politicians who are easily purchased and just as easily discarded.

Speaking through Dru, House describes his political ideal as: "socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx."[24] Dru's socialism, of course, was the Fabian version. It was to have gentle and humane qualities to soften its impact and set it apart from the Leninist version called Communism.

Like all collectivists, House spoke eloquently about defending the poor and the downtrodden, but in reality, he had great disdain for the masses. In his view, they are too stupid and lazy to take an interest in their own government, so it's up to the professionals to do that for them. Speaking through the fictional character of Senator Selwyn, House says:

> The average American citizen refuses to pay attention to civic affairs, contenting himself with a general growl at the tax rate, and the character and inefficiency of public officials. He seldom takes the trouble necessary to form the Government to suit his views. The truth is he has no cohesive or well-digested views, it being too much trouble to form them; therefore, some such organization as ours is essential.[25]

Philip Dru foments civil war, leads an uprising against the old order, captures control of the government, becomes a dictator with the grateful support of the people, is given the title *Administrator of the Republic*, scraps all constitutional restrictions against government power, establishes a progressive income tax, creates a national banking cartel,[26] annexes Canada, conquers Mexico, invites European nations to participate in world government, and ushers in a glorious new age of collectivism. This was not just a fictional story for entertainment. House described this book as an expression of his own "ethical and political faith."[27]

The reason this is important is that the ethical and political faith of Col. House now is the ethical and political faith of American leadership – and it started with Woodrow Wilson.

---

24 *Philip Dru, Administrator* (New York: Angriff Press, 1912) p. 45.

25 *Ibid*., pp. 199, 200.

26 It must be remembered that *Philip Dru* was published in 1912. The U.S. income tax and Federal Reserve System were then in the drafting stages and being promoted by House, Wilson, J.P. Morgan, and other collectivists in Washington. The income tax and Federal Reserve were passed into law the following year, 1913.

27 "The Historical Significance of the House Diary," by Arthur Walworth, Yale University Library, www.library.yale.edu/un/house/hist_sig.htm. Also "An Internationalist Primer," by Wlliam Grigg, *The New American*, September 16, 1996, www.thenewamerican.com/tna/1996/v012n019/v012n019_cfr.htm.

In his memoirs, President Wilson said: "Mr. House is my second personality. He is my independent self. His thoughts and mine are one."[28]

George Viereck was an admiring biographer of Colonel House and approved of almost everything he did. This is what Viereck said:

> For seven long years, Colonel House was Woodrow Wilson's other self. For six long years he shared with him everything but the title of Chief Magistracy of the Republic. For six years, two rooms were at his disposal in the north wing of the White House. It was House who made the slate for the Cabinet, formulated the first policies of the Administration, and practically directed the foreign affairs of the United States. We had, indeed, two presidents for one! ... He was the pilot who guided the ship.[29]

The War To Make The World Safe For Democracy

As we contemplate a member of the Rhodes secret society, occupying two rooms in the White House, virtually in control of American foreign policy, our time machine finally brings us to World War I. Since our main topic today is war, we must prepare now to comprehend the events we are about to see in terms of the strategy for using war to smash the world to bits and then remold it closer to the hearts desire.

The sinking of the *Lusitania* was the event that, more than any other, motivated the American people to accept the necessity and the morality of getting into World War I. Prior to that time, there was great reluctance to participate in a war that had little to do with American interests. However, when the *Lusitania* left New York Harbor on May 1, 1915, with 196 Americans on board and was sunk six days later off the coast of Ireland, it became the *cause celebre* that moved the American consciousness into a war mood against Germany. Americans were outraged at a nation that could viciously and cold-heartedly attack a peaceful passenger ship.

28 Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House* (New York: Houghton Miffflin Co., 1926), Vol. 1, p.114.

29 George Sylvester Viereck, *The Strangest Friendship in History: Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House* (new York: Liveright Publishers, 1932), p. 4.

What is not well known about that piece of history is the role played by J.P. Morgan. As you recall, the CFR was described by Professor Quigley as a front for J.P. Morgan and Company. We must remember that Morgan was, not only a founding member of the CFR, he was also a member of the Round Table, the inner group directing it, so how does *Morgan* fit into this?

During World War I, the Morgan Bank was the subscription agent for war loans to England and France. These countries had exhausted their financial resources to continue the war against Germany. So they came to the United States and asked J.P. Morgan – who was culturally closer to Britain than to America – to be their agent for selling war bonds. The House of Morgan was happy to do that, and it floated approximately1.5 billion in war bonds on behalf of England and, to a lesser extent, for France.

Morgan was also the contract agent for these countries when they purchased materials and supplies from American firms. That means he had a wonderfully profitable revolving door in which he received a piece of the action as the money went *out* of the country as loans and again, when it came back *into* the country, for the purchase of materials.

As the war progressed, Britain and France were facing the increasing possibility of defeat. The Germans had unleashed a surprise weapon – the submarine – that was new to warfare in those days, and they were sinking the ships that carried food and other necessities to the British Isles. The Germans were literally starving the British into submission who, by their own estimate, at one point said they had only about seven weeks of food left.

For the British, there was only one salvation, and that was to have the Americans come into the war to help them. But on the American side, there was a different agenda. What would happen to that1.5 billion in war loans if Britain and France lost the war? The only time war loans are repaid is when the nation borrowing the money wins the war. Losers don't pay off their bonds. So Morgan was in a terrible fix. Not only were his friends in England in dire danger, he and all his investors were about to lose1.5 billion! A very serious situation, indeed.

The U.S. Ambassador to England at that time was Walter Page. Page was more than just an ambassador. Among other things, he was a trustee to Rockefeller's General Education Board. It was in that capacity that he played a role in shaping educational policies to promote collectivism in America.

Page sent a telegram to the State Department, and this is what he said,

> The pressure of this approaching crisis, I am certain, has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan financial agency for the British and French Governments....
>
> The only way of maintaining our present preeminent trade position and averting a panic is by declaring war on Germany.[30]

Money was not the only motivator for bringing the United States into war. We must not forget that the American players in this drama dreamed of world government based on the model of collectivism, and they saw war as a great motivator to move society in that direction. They looked forward to the creation of the League of Nations when the fighting was over and knew that the only way for the United States to play a dominant role in shaping that world body was to be a combatant. The only ones who divide the spoils of war are the victors who *fight* the war, and it was that reality that fired the imaginations of House, Wilson, and even J.P. Morgan.

The Strategy To Get The U.S. Into War

And so, there were different motivations and different agendas for pushing the United States into war. Colonel House became the coordinator for all of them. He went back and forth across the Atlantic and consulted with the Round Tables in both England and America. He arranged a secret treaty on behalf of President Wilson to bring the United States into the War. The reason for secrecy was that the Senate would never have approved it. There was still strong public opposition to war and, had it been revealed that Wilson was engaging in a secret – and unconstitutional – treaty to get the U.S. *into* war, it would have been politically disastrous to his Administration.

George Viereck, in his book, *The Strangest Friendship in History – Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House*, said this:

30 Burton J. Hendrick, *The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1923), p. 11 (Internet edition), www.lib.byu.edu/~rdh/wwi/memoir/Page/Page 14.htm.

> Ten months before the election, which returned Wilson to the White House because he 'kept us out of war,' Colonel House negotiated a secret agreement with England and France on behalf of Wilson, which pledged the United States to intervene on behalf of the Allies. If an inkling of the conversation between Colonel House and the leaders of England and France had reached the American people before the election, it might have caused incalculable reverberations in public opinion.[31]

How did they do it? How did these wolves in sheep's clothing maneuver the United States into war? It was not easy, and it came about only after extensive planning. The first plan was to offer the United State as a negotiator between both sides of the conflict. They would position the U.S. as the great peacemaker. But the goal was just the opposite of peace. They would make an offer to both sides that they knew would not be acceptable to Germany. Then, when the Germans rejected the offer, they would be portrayed in the press as the bad guys, the ones who wanted to continue the war. This is how the plan was described by Ambassador Page in his memoirs. He said:

> Colonel House arrived ... full of the idea of American intervention. First his plan was that he and I and a group of the British cabinet ... should at once work out a minimum programme of peace—the least that the Allies would accept, *which he assumed would be unacceptable to the Germans; and that the President would take* this programme and present it to both sides; the side that declined would be responsible for continuing the war.... Of course the fatal moral weakness of the foregoing scheme is that we should plunge into the War, not on the merits of the *cause, but by a carefully sprung trick*.[32]

Aggrevate, Insulate, Facilitate

The trick eventually evolved into something far more dramatic than peace negotiations. It called for three strategies in one. They were: *aggravate*, *insulate*, and *facilitate*.

The first stage was to *aggravate* the Germans into an attack, literally to goad them until they had no choice but to strike back. Much of this was implemented from the British side.

---

31 Viereck, pp. 106–108. This matter is discussed in *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan* Vol. II. pp. 404–406.

32 Quoted by Viereck, pp. 112–113.

Churchill established the policy of ramming German submarines. Prior to that, there was a code of naval warfare called the Cruiser Rules requiring that, when a warship challenged an unarmed merchant ship, it would fire a shot across its bow. The merchant ship would be expected to stop its engines and it would be given time for the crew to get into lifeboats before the ship was sunk. It was a small humanitarian gesture in the middle of warfare. That is the way it was done until Churchill, as Lord of the Admiralty, ordered all merchant ships, regardless of circumstances, to steam full speed directly toward German submarines in an attempt to ram and sink them. This eliminated the distinction between merchant ships and war ships. From then on, all merchant ships had to be considered as war ships, and Germany abandoned the policy of firing warning shots.

When that happened, those seeking to bring the United States in the war had a heyday. Editorializing through the British and American press, they said: "See how evil these Germans are? They sink unarmed ships and don't even give the crews a chance to get off! It is our moral duty to fight against such evil."

Churchill ordered British ships to remove their names from the hulls and to fly the flags of neutral nations, especially the American flag, so the submarine captains couldn't tell what nationality the ships really were. He wanted Germans to torpedo American ships by accident. It was his strategy to do whatever possible to bring the United States into war, and the sinking of an American ship would be an excellent way of doing so.[33]

There was plenty of goading from the America side as well. The United States government consistently violated its own neutrality laws by allowing war materials to be sent to Britain and France. Munitions and all kinds of military-related supplies were blatantly shipped on a regular basis. In fact, the *Lusitania*, on the day it was sunk, was loaded with military arsenal. The Germans knew all along that this was going on. The people in Washington knew it as well. By openly violating their own neutrality laws, they were doing everything possible to *aggravate* Germany into an attack.

33 Churchill wrote in his memoirs: "The first British countermove, made on my responsibility, ... was to deter the Germans from surface attack. The submerged U-boat had to rely increasingly on underwater attack and thus ran the greater risk of mistaking neutral for British ships and of drowning neutral crews and thus embroiling Germany with other Great Powers." Winston Churchill, *The World Crisis* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1949), p. 300. This appears on page 464 of the Barnes & Noble 1993 reprint.

The second prong of the strategy was to *insulate*. That means to insulate the victims from information that would have allowed them to protect themselves. You can't have a surprise attack if you warn the victims in advance. It was important not to let any of the *Lusitania* passengers know that the ship was carrying war materials and was likely to be sunk. They could not be allowed to know that several of its decks, normally assigned to passenger quarters, had been cleared out and loaded with military-related supplies, including ammunition and explosive primers. They could not be informed that they would be riding on a floating ammunition depot.

The German embassy tried to warn American civilians not to book passage on that ship. They placed an advertisement in fifty newspapers, mostly along the eastern seaboard, warning that the *Lusitania* would be in danger, that it was heading into hostile waters, and that Americans should not be on board. The U.S. State Department contacted all fifty of those newspapers and strongly requested them not to publish the ad, implying that there would be dire consequences if they did. Several papers defied the government and published the ad anyway – which is why we know about it today. Most passengers never saw it.

Sink The Lusitania!

The third prong of the strategy was to *facilitate*. That means to make it easy for the enemy to strike and be successful. On the morning of the sinking of the *Lusitania*, Colonel House was in Britain and recorded in his diaries that he spoke with Sr. Edward Gray and King George. They calmly discussed what they thought the reaction of the American people would be if the *Lusitania* were to be "accidentally" sunk. This is what Colonel House wrote: "I told Sir Gray if this were done, a flame of indignation would sweep America which would in itself carry us into the war."

Four hours after that conversation, the *Lusitania* entered the war zone where German submarines were known to be active. Designed and built by the British to be converted into a ship of war, if necessary, she had four boilers, was very fast, and could outrun a submarine. That means she was vulnerable only to subs that were ahead of her path, not those to the side or behind. This greatly improved her chances for survival, especially with a military escort running ahead. However, this was not to be her destiny. On this voyage she had been ordered to turn off one of her boilers. She was running on three turbines instead of four. At only 75% speed, she was now vulnerable to attack from all sides.

The *Juno* was a British destroyer that had been assigned to escort her through those dangerous waters. At the last minute, the *Juno* was called back by the British Admiralty and never made its rendezvous.

Inevitably, the *Lusitania*, running at reduced speed, and without protection, pulled into the periscope view of the U-20 German submarine. One torpedo was fired directly mid center. There was a mighty explosion. As the Germans were preparing for the second torpedo, much to their surprise, there was a second explosion, and the whole bottom of the ship blew out. Exploration of the wreckage in later years shows that it was an outward explosion. Something inside blew up with a tremendous force, and the great ship sank in less than eighteen minutes.

The strategists finally had their cause. This was the dastardly deed of those warmongering Germans who were sinking passenger ships with innocent civilians on board. The flame of indignation *was* ignited and eventually it *did* sweep America into war on April 16, 1917. Eight days later, Congress authorized1 billion of taxpayer money to be sent to Britain and France to assist in the war effort. The next day, the first200 million was sent to Britain and immediately applied to the Morgan debt. A few days later,100 million was sent to France, and the same thing happened. It was applied to the Morgan debt. By the end of the war,9.5 billion had been sent to the Allies and applied to the Morgan Debt. We must add to that the infinitely higher cost of American blood sacrificed on the alter of collectivism in a war supposedly to make the world "safe for democracy."

It's a twist of irony that the world really *was* made safe for democracy – when one realizes that the word democracy is a synonym for one of the pillars of collectivism. It is the embodiment of the concept that the group is more important than the individual, and it is that rationale that allowed Round Table members on both sides of the Atlantic to plot the death of innocent civilians as a small price to pay for the greater good of the greater number.

World War II

We are back in our time machine now and find ourselves at the beginning of World War II. The parallels to World War I are striking. Britain, again, was losing the war with Germany. The president of the United States, again, was a collectivist surrounded by Fabians and Leninists. The primary difference was that the center of gravity in the CFR was swinging away from the Morgan

group and toward the Rockefeller group. Other than that, things were pretty much the same. Colonel House was still a presidential advisor, but his rooms at the White House now were occupied by Harry Hopkins. Hopkins was not a collectivist agent of the Fabians; he was a collectivist agent of the Soviets. The American people were still opposed to war; and, once again, there were secret arrangements at the highest levels of government to maneuver the United States into war without the voters suspecting it. The strategy was to get the Axis powers to strike first, all the while convincing the American people that their leaders were opposed to war. It was almost an exact repeat of the ploy used in World War I.

On October 30, 1941, in a campaign speech in Boston, FDR made this amazing statement: "And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I will give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." FDR repeated that pledge many times, all the while working behind the scenes to get the United States *into* war.

The President's speechwriter at that time was Robert Sherwood, who later became a famous author and playwright. On this topic, Sherwood said: "Unfortunately for my own conscience, I happened at the time to be one of those who urged him to go the limit on this, feeling as I did, that any risk of future embarrassment was negligible as compared to the risk of losing the election." Sherwood said that, while they were discussing the contradiction between the President's words and his deeds, Roosevelt replied: "Of course, we'll fight if we're attacked. If someone attacks us, then it isn't a foreign war, is it?"[34] There, in a single sentence, was the basic strategy. If the United States could become the victim of an attack, then the American people would respond to patriotic instincts and clamor for war. The only question remaining was how to bring this about.

Orchestrating events to create the appearance of being the victim of an unprovoked attack is a common ploy of collectivists, regardless of whether they are Fabians, Communists, or Fascists. Hermann Goering was the second-in-command of the Nazi regime in Germany, reporting only to Hitler himself. At the end of World War II, he was among those who were imprisoned and sentenced to death at the Nuremberg Trials for war crimes.

34 Robert E. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins* (New York: Bantam Books, 1948, 1950), Vol.1, pp. 235, 247.

The prison psychologist was Gustave Gilbert, a German-speaking intelligence officer in the U.S. military. In his book, *Nuremberg Diary,* Gilbert describes a conversation with Goering in which he explained this classic hallmark of collectivism:

> Sweating in his cell in the evening, Goering was defensive and defeated and not very happy over the turn the trial was taking. ... We got around to the subject of war again and I said that, contrary to his attitude, I did not think that the common people are very thankful for leaders who bring them war and destruction.
>
> "Why, of course, the people don't want war," Goering shrugged. "Why would some poor slob on a farm want to risk his life in a war when the best that he can get out of it is to come back to his farm in one piece. Naturally, the common people don't want war; neither in Russia, nor in England nor in America, nor for that matter in Germany. That is understood. But, after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy, and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy or a fascist dictatorship or a Parliament or a Communist dictatorship."
>
> "There is one difference," I pointed out. "In a democracy the people have some say in the matter through their elected representatives, and in the United States, only Congress can declare war."

"Oh, that is well and good, but voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country."[35]

As FDR was deceiving the voters about his war plans, the American and British military staffs were meeting secretly in Washington D.C., working out the details of a joint strategy. They planned, not only how to get the United States into the war, but how to conduct the war afterward. The resulting agreement was called the ABC-1. It was incorporated into a Navy war plan and given the code name Rainbow Number Five. We now have a great deal of information on this plan although, at the time, it was highly secret.

35 G.M. Gilbert, *Nuremberg Diary* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1947), pp. 278, 279.

The key for getting into the war was to maneuver the Axis powers to strike first to make it look like the U.S. was an innocent victim. Their first hope was that Germany would attack. If that didn't work, the fallback plan was to provoke Japan.

This policy was summarized in a memorandum to FDR by Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations. He said:

> It would be very desirable to enter the war under circumstances in which Germany were the aggressor and in which case Japan might then be able to remain neutral. However, on the whole, it is my opinion that the United States should enter the war against Germany as soon as possible, even if hostilities with Japan must be accepted... The sooner we get in the better.[36]

In an effort to provoke an attack from Germany, FDR sent U.S. Naval ships to escort British convoys carrying war supplies, knowing that they would be targets for German submarine attack. When Germany refused to take the bait, he ordered U.S. ships to actually get into the middle of sea battles between British and German war ships. The strategy was simple. If you walk into the middle of a barroom brawl, the chances of getting slugged are pretty good.[37]

On October 17, 1941, an American destroyer, the *USS Kearny*, rushed to assist a British convoy near Iceland that was under attack by German submarines. It took a torpedo hit and was badly damaged. Ten days later, FDR delivered his annual Navy Day speech in Washington and said:

> We have wished to avoid shooting, but the shooting has started, and history has recorded who has fired the first shot. In the long run, however, all that will matter is who fired the last shot. America has been attacked. The U.S.S. Kearny is not just a Navy ship. She belongs to every man, woman, and child in this nation...Hitler's torpedo was directed at every American.[38]

When it became known that the *Kearny* had aggressively sought combat, the public lost interest, and FDR dropped the rhetoric. It was time to involve Japan, and it was clear that the drama had to involve more than one ship.

---

36 Sherwood, Vol. 1, p. 461.

37 T.R. Fehrenbach, *F.D.R.'s Undeclared War 1939 to 1941* (New York: David McKay Company, 1967), pp. 252–259.

38 Charles Callan Tansill, *Back Door to War* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952), p. 613

Maneuvering The Japanese Into Firing The First Shot

The Secretary of War at that time was Henry Stimson, a member of the CFR. In his diaries he said:

> In spite of the risk involved, however, in letting the Japanese fire the first shot, we realized that, in order to have the full support of the American people, it was desirable to make sure that the Japanese be the ones to do this so that there could be no doubt in anyone's mind as to who were the aggressors.... The question was, how we should maneuver them into firing the first shot without allowing too much damage to ourselves. It was a difficult proposition.[39]

How was it done? It was accomplished exactly as in World War I: *aggravate, facilitate, insulate*. Aggravate the enemy into an attack. Facilitate his attack to make it easy with no opposition. Insulate the victims from any knowledge that would allow them to escape their fate.

For many years, the government denied any knowledge of the impending Japanese attack. But, gradually, the pieces of the puzzle began to bubble up out of the mire of secrecy and, one by one, they have been assembled into a clear picture of the most monstrous cover-up one can possibly imagine. The smoking gun was discovered in 1995. Author Robert Stinnett found a memo in the Navy Archives written by Lt. Commander Arthur McCollum, who was assigned to Naval Intelligence. The memo was dated October 7, 1940. It was directed to two of FDR's top naval advisors: Captain Dudley Knox and Capt. Walter Anderson, who was head of Naval Intelligence. This memo was approved by both men and forwarded to FDR for action. The full text is now public information, and a photo of it appears in Stinnett's book, *Day of Deceit; The Truth about FDR and Peal Harbor*.[40]

The McCollum memorandum contained an eight-point plan of action to implement a two-point strategy. The two points were: (1) Aggravate Japan into a military strike as a matter of economic necessity and national honor on her part; and (2) Facilitate the

39 *Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, Congress of the United States, Seventy-Ninth Congress* (Washington, D.C., 1946), Part 11. p. 5421, as cited by Prang. The reference is Part 11, p. 5433, as quoted by Kimmel, p. 1. Also quoted by Stinnett but with no reference, p. 179.

40 Robert B. Stinnett, *Day of Deceit; The Truth about FDR and Peal Harbor* (New York: Touchstone/Simon and Schuster, 2000). The McCollum memorandum is on pp. 272–277.

attack by not interfering with Japan's preparations and by making the target as vulnerable as possible. At the conclusion of the last point of strategy, the memorandum said: "If by these means Japan could be led to commit an overt act of war, so much the better."[41]

The necessity to insulate the victims from any foreknowledge of the attack was not mentioned in the memorandum, but it was not necessary to do so. Obviously, this plan could not succeed if the targeted victims were warned in advance. So, once again, there was the familiar strategy: aggravate, facilitate, and insulate.

Was Japan *aggravated* into an attack? Consider these facts. The sale of critical goods from the United States to Japan was suddenly embargoed; commerce was brought to a standstill; Japan's access to oil from the Dutch East Indies was crippled by U.S. diplomatic pressure on the Dutch government; the U.S. closed off the Panama Canal to Japanese ships; and Japan's major assets in the United States were seized by the government. In other words, the strategy advanced by Lt. Commander McCollum was followed in every detail. There was a deliberate assault against Japan's economy and an insult to her national honor. A military response was predictable. The only question was when.

This is not to suggest that the Japanese imperial government was blameless in this matter or that it was an innocent victim of circumstances. It was, after all, in Asia and the Pacific, engaged in a massive, regional war of aggression and territorial expansion. This was the logical consequence of its ideology of barbarism in which might makes right. However, we must not lose sight of the role played by American leaders embracing the ideology of collectivism. It was a case of one totalitarian ideology goading another totalitarian ideology into a war that supposedly would lead to the greater good of the greater number.

Making Pearl Harbor An Easy Target

Was Japan *facilitated* in the attack? There is massive evidence to support that conclusion, but we have time here for only a few examples. A Japanese spy by the name of Tadashi Morimura was sent to Pearl Harbor under the cover of a phony political assignment at the Japanese embassy. The FBI knew that his real name was Takeo Yoshikawa and that he had been trained as a military officer.

41 Stinnett, p. 275.

He had no political experience, so they knew his assignment to a political post was a cover. They photographed him as he came off the ship. They tracked him everywhere he went. They bugged his telephone. They knew what he was doing every minute of the day. Often he would take a car to the top of a hill overlooking the harbor and photograph the location of ships. Then he would use a clandestine radio to send coded messages to Japan giving the exact grid locations for all the ships, the times of their movements, how many soldiers and sailors were on duty, what time they reported, and what time they left the base. All of this information was clearly of military importance and pointed to the possibility of a surprise attack. The FBI wanted to arrest Yoshikawa and send him home, but the Office of Naval Intelligence intervened, with White House approval, saying: Leave this guy alone. He is our responsibility. We'll handle it. J. Edgar Hoover, who was head of the FBI at that time, objected strongly, and it almost erupted into a contest of inter-agency authority between the FBI and Naval Intelligence. In the end, Naval Intelligence had its way, and Yoshikawa was allowed to continue his mission without even knowing he was being watched.[42]

Just four days before the attack, U.S. Navy Intelligence intercepted this message from Yoshikawa: "NO CHANGE OBSERVED BY AFTERNOON OF 2 DECEMBER. SO FAR THEY DO NOT SEEM TO HAVE BEEN ALERTED. SHORE LEAVE AS USUAL." On December 6, just *one* day before the attack, this message was intercepted: "THERE ARE NO BARRAGE BALLOONS AT THESE PLACES – AND CONSIDERABLE OPPORTUNITY IS LEFT FOR A SURPRISE ATTACK."[43]

It was bizarre. Here was an enemy agent gathering strategic information in preparation for a surprise attack on American forces, and people at the highest levels of the United States government were protecting him. They deliberately allowed the flow of information to continue so the Japanese would be successful in their mission.

42 For the complete story, see Stinnett, pp. 83–118. Also John Toland, *Infamy* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1982), pp. 59, 60.

43 Stinnett, pp. 85, 109. Also Toland, p. 300.

Vacant Seas Policy

Another example of facilitating the attack on Pearl Harbor is what was called the Vacant Seas Policy. For many months, the Navy had known from what direction the Japanese were likely to approach, what sea corridor they would use to launch their attack. They even had conducted maneuvers simulating it themselves. One was called Exercise 191 and the other OPORD1. Because of weather patterns, sea currents, location of commercial ship lanes, demand on fuel supplies, and other factors, they knew that the Japanese would approach from the North Pacific Ocean in an operational area between 157 and 158 degrees west longitude.[44]

This presented a special challenge. If the crew of any ship had seen a Japanese armada steaming toward Hawaii, they undoubtedly would have used the radio to send word ahead. They would have said: "Hey, there's something going on here. There's a fleet of aircraft carriers and destroyers heading your way." That, of course, would have spoiled everything. Also, if the Japanese knew that their approach had been detected, they would have lost the advantage of surprise and might have aborted their plan.

American intelligence was well aware of every stage of Japanese preparations. It was already known that Admiral Nagumo was outfitting his carrier strike force at Hitokappu Bay on the Japanese island of Etorofu. His progress was monitored closely, and daily reports were sent to Washington. His ships departed from Japan and headed for Pearl Harbor on November 25.[45]

Within hours, Navy headquarters in Washington initiated the Vacant Seas directive that all military and commercial ships must now stay out of the North Pacific corridor. They were diverted hundreds of miles on a trans-Pacific route through the Torres Straits so there would be no encounter that might alert the intended victims or cause the Japanese to abort their mission.[46]

The next stage in the strategy was to bring the ships of the 7th Fleet home from sea duty and bottle them up inside Pearl Harbor. That would make them easy targets because they couldn't maneuver. To accomplish this over the strong objection of Admiral Kimmel, who was in charge of the Fleet, his superiors in Washington cut back on deliveries of fuel.

44 Stinnett, p. 146.

45 Stinnett, pp.43–59.

46 Stinnett, pp. 44, 144, 145.

Without fuel, Kimmel had no choice. He had to curtail training exercises at sea and bring his ships back into port. In his memoirs, published in 1955, he said:

> Shortly after I organized the Fleet in three major task forces, I attempted to keep two of the three forces at sea and only one at Peal Harbor. I quickly found that fuel deliveries were falling behind consumption. The reserves were being depleted at a time when it was imperative to increase them. It was this fact, and this alone, which made it necessary to have two task forces simultaneously in Pearl Harbor.[47]

A Congressional investigation in 1946 revealed that, just a few days before the attack, Navy headquarters in Washington ordered twenty-one of the most modern ships in the 7th Fleet to leave Pearl Harbor and deploy at Wake and Midway Islands. The aircraft carriers, *Lexington* and *Enterprise* were among those ships. This not only left the remaining Fleet with drastically reduced protection, it also meant that the ships anchored in the harbor were primarily old relics from World War I, many of which were already slated to be scrapped. As Secretary of War Stimson had stated in his diaries: "The question was, how we should maneuver them into firing the first shot *without allowing too much damage to ourselves*." Sacrificing only the old and marginally useful ships was the solution to that problem.[48]

Intercepted Coded Messages

Were the victims at Pear Harbor *insulated* from information that might have allowed them to protect themselves? Could those thousands of Americans who lost their lives been alerted in time to take defensive action? Or were they deliberately sacrificed because their deaths were needed to create the emotional drama to justify going to war? The answer to that question is not a pleasant one.

Throughout this time, the Japanese were using a combination of military and diplomatic codes. U.S. intelligence agencies had cracked all of them.[49] According to Homer Kisner, who was Chief of the Pacific Fleet's Radio-Intercept team, his men intercepted and

47 *Admiral Kimmel's Story*, p. 28.

48 Stinnett, pp. 152, 153.

49 John Toland, *Infamy* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1982), pp. 57, 58. Also Stinnett, pp. 21–23.

decoded more than a million of those messages.[50] For three months prior to the allegedly surprise attack, Navy Intelligence knew everything in minute detail. Yet, not one of those messages was ever sent to the commanders at Pearl Harbor.[51] In his memoirs, Admiral Kimmel said:

> At Pearl Harbor, General Short and I knew only a small part of the political story behind the Japanese attack. Care was taken not to send us the intercepted Japanese messages, which told in great detail each step in the Japanese program.... For three months prior to the attack on the fleet a wealth of vital information received in Washington was withheld from the commanders in Hawaii.
>
> The information received during the ten days preceding the attack clearly pointed to the fleet at Pearl Harbor as the Japanese objective, yet not one word of warning and none of this information was given to the Hawaii commanders.[52]

The most important intercept of the Japanese coded messages was obtained on the night before the attack. That message made clear even the exact hour that the strike would come. It was to be 1:00 PM Washington time. The intercept was decoded 6½ hours before that. It was rushed to President Roosevelt and his top military advisors for immediate action. Their response was to do absolutely nothing. They sat on it and deliberately let the clock run out.[53]

The military Chief of Staff at that time was General George Marshall, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Marshall claimed that he was on horseback that morning, riding in the park. The reason he did not take immediate action, he said, was that he didn't know about the intercept until he arrived at his office at 11:25 A.M.

---

50 Stinnett, p. 58.

51 There was a serious disagreement between Admiral Richard Turner and his staff over this very issue. When Captain Alan Kirk, Chief of Naval Intelligence, objected to withholding the intercepted messages from Kim-mel and Short, he was relieved of his command. See Toland, pp. 57–60.

52 Kimmel, pp. 2,3.

53 The man who personally delivered the final message to FDR in the White House was Captain Beardall, the President's Naval Attaché. According to Beardall, FDR read the intercept and, in spite of the 1 P.M. deadline, showed no alarm. (See Hearings on Pearl Harbor Attack, Part 11, p. 5287 ff. as cited by Stinnett, p. 233.) This was a foretaste of President Bush's lack of alarm when he received information that the second plane had crashed into the Twin Towers on 9/11.

However, even then he still had 1½ hours before the attack. He could have picked up the telephone and spoken to the Hawaii commanders directly. He could have used any one of several military radio systems designed for exactly such kinds of urgent communications, but he did none of those things. According to witnesses, he read and re-read the intercept and shuffled the paper from one side of his desk to the other while another half hour ticked away. Then, at 11:52, he finally sent a warning to the commanders at Pearl Harbor. The method? It was a commercial telegram sent through Western Union! It arrived six hours after the attack![54]

An Act Of Statesmanship

For many years after World War II, Roosevelt's admirers denied that neither he nor anyone in his administration had prior knowledge; but the evidence now is so clear that he even *facilitated* the attack, no one tries to deny it anymore. The new line of defense is that he was *justified* in doing so. It was an act of great statesmanship, you see, because, otherwise, Europe would have been overrun by Hitler and, eventually, even the United States might have been attacked. Furthermore, we had a moral obligation to come to the aid of our British and French brethren.[55]

It took great courage and wisdom, they say, for Roosevelt to foresee this and confront totalitarianism before it became stronger. The American people were too stupid to realize how important it was. They were too ignorant to understand. They were too isolationist in their thinking to realize they must accept a leadership role in the affairs of the world. So, what is a collectivist to do? You can't leave it to the ignorant voters to decide such important matters. There was no choice but to lie, to deceive the American people, and ruin the careers of loyal military officers by making them scapegoats. We *had* to violate our Constitution and our laws.[56]

---

54 Stinnett, pp. 225–237. Also Toland, pp. 10, 11.

55 That part is true, but it was an *individual* moral obligation, not a *group* obligation. In other words, anyone who felt deeply about this was perfectly free to go to Europe and volunteer for the British or French armies or to organize a volunteer American brigade, but no one had the right to use force of law to conscript others into the American armed services and send them into battle for that purpose. It is important to note that none of the master planners of this infamy ever felt a moral obligation to put themselves into combat. That honor was reserved for others.

56 Unfortunately, it is sometimes necessary to ignore laws in time of war,

It was statesmanship to kill thousands of Americans in order to bring the stupid voters to the correct point of view. Don't you see? The only way to stop totalitarianism in *Europe* was to establish totalitarianism in *America*.

Even Robert Stinnett, the man who found the McCollum memorandum, succumbed to this insane argument. In the preface of his book, he wrote: "As a veteran of the Pacific War, I felt a sense of outrage as I uncovered secrets that had been hidden from Americans for more than fifty years.

But I understood the agonizing dilemma faced by President Roosevelt. He was forced to find circuitous means to persuade an isolationist America to join in a fight for freedom."[57]

One of the men who made sure that Admiral Kimmel and General Short never knew about the decoded Japanese messages was Lieutenant Commander Joseph Rochefort, head of the Navy's Mid-Pacific Radio Intelligence Network. Rochefort got right to the point. He said: "It was a pretty cheap price to pay for unifying the country."[58]

---

especially in the heat of battle, but the purpose of these deeds was not to win a war, it was to get *into* a war. The difference is as night unto day.

57 Stinnett, p. xiii. It is undoubtedly because of this message that Stinnett's book was accepted for publication by Simon and Schuster and given wide distribution. Readers of the author's book, *The Creature from Jekyll Island; A Second Look at the Federal Reserve,* will recall a parallel situation in which Simon and Schuster published *Secrets of the Temple*, by William Greider. Greider did an excellent job of critiquing the Federal Reserve but, when it came to offering a solution, his message basically was to relax and forget about it. The Fed, he said, had made plenty of mistakes in the past, but no sweeping reforms are needed. All we need, he said, are wiser men to run it. It makes no difference if you expose a corrupt monetary system if your solution is to do nothing about it. And it makes no difference if you expose the infamy at Pearl Harbor if your conclusion is that it was an act of statesmanship. Collectivists do not care about how much the public knows if they have no realistic plan of action to bring about change. That is why they offer false leaders (including authors) who will point with alarm at the problems of collectivism but then lead exactly nowhere.

58 *The Reminiscences of Captain Joseph J. Rochefort* (US Naval Institute Oral History Division, 1970), p. 163, as quoted by Stennett, p. 203.

Listen well, Ladies and Gentlemen. That is the voice of collectivism: 2,388 people killed, another 1,178 wounded[59] – mostly Americans –and it's a pretty cheap price to pay for unifying the country. *Anything* can be justified merely by claiming that it is the greater good for the greater number.[60]

As it was in WWI, the American leaders in World War II were focused far beyond the war itself. Even before Pearl Harbor, Fabians and Leninists were drafting the structure for a world government. It was to be called the United Nations; and, at the end of the conflict, it would be offered to a war-weary world as "our last best hope for peace." Most of this work was done in the State Department Post-War Foreign Policy Planning Division, under the direction of Alger Hiss, who actually was in both camps at the same time. Not only was he an advisor to FDR and a former President of the Carnegie Endowment Fund (which puts him squarely in the Fabian camp), he also was an undercover agent for the Soviets. Hiss was the man who personally delivered the newly drafted UN Charter to the founding meeting of the United Nations in San Francisco, and he became the first Secretary General of that organization. If you are wondering about the significance of these facts, it is this: After smashing the world to bits in world war for the second time, the UN became the collectivist blueprint for remolding it to the heart's desire.

A surface view of World War II is that it was a struggle for freedom against totalitarianism. A deeper and more realistic view is that it was a war between three branches of collectivism fighting for global dominance.

---

59 Determining the Facts, Chart 1: December 7, 1941 losses, www.cr.nps.gov/nr/twhp/wwwlps/lessons/18arizona/18charts1.htm

60 A significant portion of the financial support for Nazi industry, including military production, came from Wall Street investment houses controlled by CFR members and others who shared their collectivist mindset. For this part of the history, see the author's *World without Cancer; The Story of Vitamin B17*, Part II (available from www.realityzone.com). When it is realized how those collectivists in the United States who were beating the war drums against Hitler were also heavily investing in the Nazi war machine, it becomes even more clear that the war was not about stopping Hitler. It was about smashing the world to bits so it could be remolded to the heart's desire. It is sad to realize that hundreds of thousands of Americans gave their lives in this war thinking they were fighting for freedom; but they were betrayed by their leaders. The purpose of the war had nothing to do with freedom. It was a contest to determine which group of collectivists would dominate the world. Soldiers were pawns on the global chessboard. Their patriotism was used against them. They eagerly rushed into battle to defeat Nazism and Fascism, never suspecting they were fighting on the side of Fabianism and Leninism, forces that are essentially the same as those they fought.

The Fabians and Leninists teamed up against the Fascists (with the Japanese Imperialists as a tactical secondary target). The Fascist branch of collectivism was defeated. Ever since then, the world has been in the grip of a struggle between the two remaining branches. It is not a battle for freedom against totalitarianism. It is a contest to see which branch of collectivism will rule the world. While that may have been difficult to see in the early stages of conflict, it is painfully obvious today.

Operation Mongoose

In a moment, our time machine will deliver us to the year 2002 and the War on Terrorism; but along the way, we must make a short stop at the year 1962. The exact date is August 8. It is sixteen months after the Kennedy Administration had been embarrassed by a botched invasion of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs. We find ourselves now at the Pentagon, in the offices of General Lyman Lemnitzer who is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We are watching as the general signs a top-secret document destined for the Secretary of Defense who, at this time is Robert McNamara, a member of the CFR. The most important part of this document is contained in the Appendix to Enclosure A, and the subject line of that section reads: Justification for US Military Intervention in Cuba.

In the eight pages that follow, there is a detailed proposal for a covert military action called "Operation Mongoose." Its purpose is to create an acceptable justification for the United States to invade Cuba. The preferred scenario is to convince the Cuban government that it is about to be attacked and, thereby, goad it into some kind of military action, which then could be pointed to as aggression against the U.S. It is the old, familiar strategy to AGGRAVATE an opponent into a first strike. If that should fail, the secondary scenario is to stage phony attacks against the American base in Guantanamo and against civilian commercial aircraft, making it look like the work of the Cuban military. The strategy also calls for a U.S. fighter pilot to fake being attacked by Cuban MIGs and to radio that he has been hit and is going down. Then he is to fly to a secret installation where the tail number of his plane will be changed so the plane genuinely will be missing from the roster. Meanwhile, a U.S. submarine is to disperse aircraft parts and a parachute into the waters near Cuba where they will eventually be found by search and rescue teams.

In addition to these phony attacks, covert agents are to launch real terrorist attacks against civilians in Miami and Washington DC – with genuine casualties. The plan is to make the U.S. appear to be a victim of unprovoked attacks by a ruthless enemy, and this will prepare world opinion to accept an all-out invasion of Cuba as justified retaliation.

As we stand here listening to the details of this plan, we would find it impossible to believe that such treachery is actually being contemplated by high-ranking U.S. military officers – were it not for the fact that we are looking at the document with our own eyes. By the way, Operation Mongoose has since been de-classified as a result of the Freedom-of-Information Act and, if you want to read it for yourself, it can be downloaded from the National Archives web site.[61] Here are a few excerpts taken from that document:

> This plan ... should be developed to focus all efforts on a specific ultimate objective which would provide adequate justification for US military intervention. Such a plan would enable a logical build-up of incidents to be combined with other seemingly unrelated events to camouflage the ultimate objective and create the necessary impression of Cuban rashness and irresponsibility on a large scale, directed at other countries as well as the United States.... The desired resultant from the execution of this plan would be to place the United States in the apparent position of suffering defensible grievances from a rash and irresponsible government of Cuba and to develop an international image of a Cuban threat to peace in the Western Hemisphere....

1. Since it would seem desirable to use legitimate provocation as the basis for US military intervention in Cuba, a cover and deception plan ... could be executed as an initial effort to provoke Cuban reactions. Harassment plus deceptive actions to convince the Cubans of imminent invasion would be emphasized....

2. A series of well coordinated incidents will be planned to take place in and around Guantanamo to give genuine appearance of being done by hostile Cuban forces.

61 This document can be downloaded from www.archives.gov. Click on "Research Room," then on "Archival Research Catalog (ARC)," then on the ARC SEARCH button, then type in "Northwoods" in the search box, then click on "Digital Copy" on entry #1. The key information will be found on images 136 through 142.

a. Incidents to establish a credible attack (not in chronological order):

1 Start rumors (many). Use clandestine radio.
2 Land friendly Cubans in uniform "over-the-fence" to stage attack on base.
3 Capture Cuban (friendly) saboteurs inside the base.
4 Stage riots near the base main gate (friendly Cubans).
5 Blow up ammunition inside the base; start fires.
6 Burn aircraft on air base (sabotage).
7 Lob mortar shells from outside of base into base. Some damage to installation.
8 Capture assault teams approaching from the sea or vicinity of Guantanamo City.
9 Capture militia group which storms the base.
10 Sabotage ship in harbor; large fires – napathalene.
11 Sink ship near harbor entrance. Conduct funerals for mock-victims….

3. A "Remember the Main" incident could be arranged in several forms:
   a. We could blow up a US ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame Cuba.
   b. We could blow up a drone (unmanned) vessel anywhere in the Cuban waters. … The presence of Cuban planes or ships merely investigating the intent of the vessel could be fairly compelling evidence that the ship was taken under attack…. The US could follow up with an air/sea rescue operation covered by US fighters to "evacuate" remaining members of the non-existent crew. Casualty lists in US newspapers would cause a helpful wave of national indignation.

4. We could develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington. The terror campaign could be pointed at Cuban refugees seeking haven in the United States. We could sink a boatload of Cubans enroute to Florida (real or simulated). We could foster attempts on lives of Cuban refugees in the United States even to the extent of wounding in instances to be widely publicized….

5. Use of MIG type aircraft by US pilots could provide additional provocation. Harassment of civil air, attacks on surface shipping and destruction of US military drone aircraft by MIG type planes would be useful as complementary actions. An F86 properly painted would convince air passengers that they saw a Cuban MIG, especially if the pilot of the transport were to announce such fact...

In action item number eight, Operation Mongoose proposed an incident designed to convince the world that Cuban MIGs had shot down a civilian commercial aircraft as it flew near Cuba on its way from the United States to someplace in South America. It was to be a chartered flight utilizing one of the air services in the Miami area that are secretly operated by the CIA.

An aircraft at Elgin Air Force Base was to be painted and numbered as an exact replica of the commercial craft. The duplicate would be substituted for the original and loaded with passengers who were carefully selected government operatives using false names. The original aircraft would be converted to a drone and flown by remote control. Both planes would rendezvous south of Florida. The document continues:

> From the rendezvous point the passenger-carrying aircraft will descend to minimum altitude and go directly into an auxiliary field at Elgin AFB where arrangements will have been made to evacuate the passengers and return the aircraft to its original status. The drone aircraft meanwhile will continue to fly the filed flight plan. When over Cuba, the drone will be transmitting on the international distress frequency a "MAY DAY" message stating he is under attack by Cuban MIG aircraft. The transmission will be interrupted by destruction of the aircraft which will be triggered by radio signal. This will allow ICAO radio stations in the Western Hemisphere to tell the US what has happened to the aircraft instead of the US trying to "sell" the incident.

The blueprint for Operation MONGOOSE is much too long to quote in its entirety, but I think this gives you a pretty good idea of its nature. Even though the plan was never put into action, the fact that it was even theorized and sent to the Secretary of Defense with a recommendation for consideration is highly significant. Some will say that plans like this should be of no concern to us. They are just paper war games, and military people are expected to dream up all sorts of scenarios to cover every conceivable event so as to have a prepared response ahead of time no matter what happens. That may be true, but Operation Mongoose is not in that category. It is not a plan to react to an aggressive move by a potential enemy.

It is a plan to *be* the aggressor, and to conceal that fact from the world. It undoubtedly was justified by the argument that Communist Cuba is a threat to the security of the American people, and whatever it takes to eliminate that threat is acceptable. It is a classic example of collectivist morality, a philosophy that declares anything to be ethical so long as it can be said to be for the greater good of the greater number.

Communism in Cuba or anywhere else should be opposed because it is the embodiment of collectivism. However, if we oppose the Cuban brand of collectivism by accepting an American brand of collectivism, we will lose the war for freedom, and we will do it to ourselves. We will not be conquered by enemies from abroad but we will be enslaved by enemies from within.

– End of Part 3 –

6 The War on Terrorism - The Future Is Calling (Part Four)

The War On Terrorism

Finally we come to the end of our travel through time and arrive at the present. Again, we must consider the question stated at the beginning of our journey. Is the War on Terrorism a repeat of history? To answer that question, first, let's consider the parallels. The leaders of the War on Terrorism, as in the past, are members of the Round Table and the Council on Foreign Relations. They advocate a world union of nations built on the model of collectivism. As before, they seek to change the social and political structure of the free world to accommodate that goal. Every move they make in this war results in strengthening the United Nations. Even when there is apparent disunity at the UN, a closer examination reveals that, as always, there is no disagreement over the goal of world government, it is only a squabble between Fabians and Leninists over who will dominate. Both sides in the contest continue to call for more and more power to the UN.

The Leninist Game Plan

The Leninist faction publicly pretends to oppose terrorism; but, covertly, they are the primary *sponsors* of terrorism, which they use as a weapon against the Fabian faction. Their game plan is to exhaust the United States and her Fabian allies in nuclear or biochemical war with puppet regimes so that Russia and China can emerge, unscathed, as the dominant world power. No one should underestimate the capacity of the Leninist network to implement that scenario. It would be foolhardy to take comfort in the thought that Communism is dead. Communism is only a word. The people who put Communism on the map seldom called themselves Communists. They always referred to themselves as Leninists, and they still do. Don't be fooled by the word game. Communism may or may not be dead, but Leninism *lives* and is stronger than ever.

The Fabian Game Plan

The Fabian game plan is to become the preeminent force in the world through economic and military dominance, particularly in the Middle East where that region's vast oil reserves constitutes an extra prize. The plans for military occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq were drafted long before the terrorist attacks of 9-11. All they needed was a dramatic justification that would be acceptable to world opinion.[62]

The Fabian strategy has been described in numerous books and reports written by CFR members. One of the most explicit carried the innocent-sounding title of *Rebuilding America's Defenses* and was released in September of 2000 by a think-tank group called The Project for The New American Century. One third of the participants were members of the Council on Foreign Relations. The ninety-page document is too long to quote, so I have prepared a summary. You're not going to like it, and you may think that I have distorted or exaggerated its meaning. Please be assured that I have been very careful not to do that. The document really says everything you're going to hear – including the mention of Pearl Harbor. For those who want to check the accuracy for themselves, the complete text is available from a link at the Freedom Force web site.[63] *This* is the Fabian game plan:

> The United States is the strongest nation in the world with little fear of opposition. This is a wonderful opportunity for the American government to dominate the world for the betterment of mankind. It is our destiny and our obligation to usher in an American Peace, a Pax Americana similar to the Pax Romana of the Roman Empire. It is our destiny to do so, and we must not shrink from the challenge. We must establish our military presence in every part of the world as the visible expression of our power. Such bold action will be costly and may require the sacrifice of lives, but that is the necessary price for world leadership.

62 "U.S. planned for attack on Al-Qaeda; White House given strategy two days before Sept. 11," MSNBC, May 16, 2002, MSNBC. (Article in Internet archive.)

63 The link is www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf

> Our military must develop new technology, which, unfortunately, may be slow to develop due to public resistance to the large expenditure required. However, this transformation could be accelerated to our advantage if an enemy should attack us, as happened at Pear Harbor. In the Middle East, the presence of Saddam Hussein is justification for maintaining a military presence in the region, but even if Hussein did not exist, we should be there anyway to maintain the Pax Americana.

That same theme was expressed even more succinctly by another Fabian theorist, Fareed Zakaria. When he wrote the following words, Zakaria was Managing Editor of *Foreign Affairs*, the official magazine of the CFR. He said:

> Maintaining a long-term American presence in the gulf would be difficult in the absence of a regional threat.... If Saddam Hussein did not exist, we would have to invent him. He is the linchpin of American policy in the Mideast. Without him, Washington would be stumbling in the dessert sands.... If not for Saddam, would the Saudi royal family, terrified of being seen as an American protectorate (which in a sense it is), allow American troops on their soil? Would Kuwait house more than 30,000 pieces of American combat hardware, kept in readiness should the need arise? Would the king of Jordan, the political weather vane of the region, allow the Marines to conduct exercises within his borders? ... The end of Saddam Hussein would be the end of the anti-Saddam coalition. Nothing destroys an alliance like the disappearance of the enemy.[64]

CFR member, Charles Krauthammer, wrote an editorial in the March 5, 2001, issue of *Time* Magazine that explained the new doctrine this way:

> America is no mere international citizen. It is the dominant power in the world, more dominant than any since Rome. Accordingly, America is in a position to reshape norms, alter expectations and create new realities. How? By unapologetic and implacable demonstrations of will.[65]

One of the founders of the group that drafted the proposal for a Pax American, is Richard Perle, a member of the CFR.

---

64 "Thank Goodness for A Villain," by Fareed Zakaria, *Newsweek*, Sept. 16, 1996, p. 43. (Article in Internet archive.)

65 "The Bush Doctrine," by Charles Krauthammer, *Time*, Mar.5, 2001. (Article in Internet archive.)

Perle was interviewed by journalist, John Pilger; and, when the topic turned to the war on terrorism, he said: "This is total war. We are fighting a variety of enemies. There are lots of them out there. All this talk about first we are going to do Afghanistan, then we will do Iraq, ... this is entirely the wrong way to go about it. If we just let our vision of the world go forth, and we embrace it entirely and we don't try to piece together clever diplomacy but just wage a total war...our children will sing great songs about us in years from now."[66]

That, Ladies and Gentlemen, *is* the Fabian game plan. It should make you tremble for the future. It's not about bin Ladin or Hussein; it's not about terrorism; it's about total war and global power.

Aggravate

With that background in mind, let us now consider the evidence that the Fabians, once again, have followed a strategy to *aggravate, facilitate, and insulate*. Let's take *aggravate* first.

In the historic conflict between Israelis and Arabs, the Fabians have consistently directed the United States government to take sides with Israel, even to the extent of supplying military equipment used against Palestinian civilians. This long predates 9-11. It should come as no surprise that, when you choose sides in a war, the other side will consider you as an enemy.

Since 1991, the United States, under the control of Fabians, has routinely bombed Iraq and blocked the importation of food and medical supplies. This led to the death of a half-million children through malnutrition and lack of medication.

In 1996, CBS reporter Lesley Stahl interviewed the American ambassador to the UN, Madeline Albright (a member of the CFR). In the course of the interview, Stahl asked this question: "We have heard that a half million children have died [as a result of this policy]. Is the price worth it?"

Albright replied: "We think the price is worth it."

That interview was widely circulated in the Middle East. It was not merely an unfortunate choice of words. It was a forthright statement of collectivist morality: The sacrifice of a half million children *is* acceptable because of the greater good of supposedly de-stabilizing Hussein's regime, the greater good of world peace, the greater good of the New World Order.

66 "A New Pearl Harbor," by John Pilger, Dec. 12, 2002, pilger.carlton.com/print/124759.

Remember, in the collectivist mind, anything can be justified by theorizing a greater good for a greater number, and a half million children is a small number compared to the population of the world. In any event, these policies are well designed to aggravate whole populations into becoming enemies of America, and some of them will be willing to sacrifice their lives in revenge.

At the time of the 9-11 attacks, the United States government, under the tight control of Fabians, had a quarter of a million soldiers in 141 countries. Since World War II, they have launched military strikes against Panama, Kosovo, Albania, Bosnia, Serbia, Iraq, Kuwait, Sudan, Haiti, Granada, Somalia, and Afghanistan – supposedly in pursuit of stopping drugs, defending freedom, or resisting Communism. In most cases, these objectives were *not* achieved. The single, most consistent result has been hostility toward America.

I am reminded of the story of a young man in medieval times who wanted to become a knight. He obtained an audience with the king and offered his services, explaining that he was an excellent swordsman. The king told him that the realm was at peace, and there was no need for a knight. Nevertheless, the young man insisted that he be allowed to serve. To put an end to the discussion, the king finally agreed and knighted him on the spot. Several months later, the young knight returned to the castle and requested another audience. When he entered the throne room, he bowed in respect and then reported that he had been very busy. He explained that he had killed thirty of the king's enemies in the North and forty-five of them in the South. The king looked puzzled for a moment and said, "But I don't *have* any enemies." To which the knight replied, "You do *now*, Sire."

Facilitate

The evidence that terrorists have been *facilitated* in their attacks is so plentiful that it's difficult to know where to begin. Most of it has received extensive exposure in the press, but it has been invisible to the average person. Because we find it inconceivable that anyone in our own government would deliberately facilitate terrorism, because we cannot imagine a *motive* that would lead them to do that, we look right at the evidence and see it only as well-intentioned mistakes, inefficiency, or blundering. Now that we have identified a possible motive, let's take the blinders off and re-examine the facts.

Since the early 1980s, the United States government, under the control of Fabians, has provided covert funding and training for just about every terrorist regime in the world. Bin Ladin and Hussein are prominent on the list, but they are not alone. The list is very long. We are told that this was a well-intentioned policy to create opposition to the Soviets, particularly in Afghanistan but that, somehow, it backfired on us. That's called the blowback theory. It is, of course, a smokescreen. How do we know that? Because the aid to terrorist regimes did not stop when the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan. It continues to this day. It is no longer covert; it's right out in the open. The Fabians currently are sending technology, money, and trade to Russia and China, countries that, by now, everyone knows are suppliers of the very terrorist regimes we are fighting, and that includes weapons of mass destruction. One can only shudder at what the so-called blowback of that policy will be in the future.

Russian Support Of Terrorism Under Putin

In November of 2006, the world was shocked by the news that Alexander Litvinenko, a former lieutenant colonel in the Soviet KGB, had been murdered in London by radio-active poisoning. Litvinenko had defected to the West and became an outspoken critic of corruption within the Russian government. He had accused Vladimir Putin of being a paedophile, working closely with organized crime, and ordering the assassination of dissident Russian journalist, Ana Polikovskaya; but more important to our topic of terrorism, he said that the Russian government, under the direction of Putin himself, had orchestrated the 1999 apartment-building bombings in Moscow that killed more than 300 people. They did this so the blame could be put on Chechan seperatists, knowing that public outrage would create popular support for a military operation against Chechnya, which was a high agenda item for the Russian government.

He claimed that other terrorist incidents also were orchestrated by the Russian government. The *Wikipedia* on-line encyclopedia says:

> Litvinenko stated in a June 2003 interview, with the Australian SBS television programme *Dateline*, that two of the Chechen terrorists involved in the 2002 Moscow theatre hostage crisis – whom he named as "Abdul the Bloody" and Abu Bakar" – were working for the FSB [formerly the KGB], and that the agency manipulated the rebels into staging the attack. Litvenko said: "When they tried to find [Abdul the Bloody and Abu Bakar] among the dead terrorists, they weren't there. The FSB got its agents out. So the FSB agents among Chechens organized the whole thing on FSB orders, and those agents were released." The story about FSB connections with the hostage takers was confirmed by Mikhail Trepashkin.

When the Russian government proudly carried the banner of Communism, it was well known for its deep involvement in sponsoring, training, and supplying international terrorists. This was an important part of the Leninist strategy for conquest called "wars of national liberation." When Leninists changed their banner to Democracy, they did not abandon this strategy, but they did take care to keep it hidden from view. When Litvenko was with the FSB, one of his assignments was counter-terrorist activities. He saw with his own eyes that terrorism was viewed by the government as necessary for manipulating public opinion into uncritical support of its leaders. Once again quoting *Wikipedia*:

> Litvenko said that "all the bloodiest terrorists of the world" were connected to FSB-KGB, including Carlos Ramfrez the "Jackal", Yassir Arafat, Saddam Hussein, Abdullah Öcalan, Wadie Haddad of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, George Hawi who led the Communist Party of Lebanon, Ezekias Papaioannou from Cypres, and Sean Garland from Ireland. He said that the "terrorism infection creeps away worldwide from the cabinets of the Lubyanka Square and the Kremlin." These claims are supported by the Mitrokhin archive.

In a 2005 interview with the Polish newspaper *Rzeczpospolita*, Litvenko said that the number-two man in the Al Qaeda terrorist network, Ayman al-Zawahiri, was trained by the Russian FSB before being sent to Afghanistan, where he became Osama bin Laden's next-in-command.[67]

67 "Bin Laden aide had KGB link," Gulf Times, p. 1, July 17, 2005. www.gulf-times.com/site/topics/article.asp?cu_no=2&item_no=44835&version=1&template_id=57&parent_id=56.

China's Support Of Terrorism

The Chinese government, under the control of Leninists, still classifies the United States as, what it calls, "Number One Enemy." In 1999, the Chinese People's Liberation Army published a document entitled *Unrestricted Warfare*. The main theme of that study was how to defeat the United Sates. It said that a new type of unrestricted war against America could be launched by "an intrusion of [Internet] hackers, a major explosion at the World Trade Center, or a bombing attack by bin Ladin." That was two years before 9-11.[68]

Soon after that prediction was fulfilled and two thousand Americans lost their lives in the rubble, the London *Telegraph* published this report:

> The Chinese state-run propaganda machine is cashing in on the terrorist attacks ... producing books, films, and video games glorifying the attacks as a humbling blow against an arrogant nation.[69]

Beijing Television produced a documentary entitled *Attack America*. As the video shows jets crashing into the Twin Towers, the narrator says: "This is the America the whole world has wanted to see."[70]

In spite of easy access to this information, the Fabians within the United States government pretend they don't know any of this and continue sending technology, money, and trade to China – and Russia – on the pretext that doing so will encourage them to change their ways. At least that's the official explanation. But before we rush to conclude that they are just making another well-intentioned mistake, we must consider the possibility that they are *not* making a mistake at all, that they have a hidden agenda. The agenda is to sustain terrorism as a credible threat so the unsuspecting public will be frightened into acceptance of a collectivist police state in exchange for safety. The reality is that terrorist regimes and their Russian and Soviet sponsors could not exist today without the continuing support of the U.S. government and CFR-controlled corporations. These regimes are the best enemies money can buy.

---

68 Liang, Qiao and Xiangeui, Wang, *Unrestricted Warfare* (Panama City, Panama: Pan American Publishing Co., 2002), p. 122.

69 "Beijing produces videos glorifying terrorist attacks on 'arrogant' US," by Damien McElroy, London *Telegraph*, April 11, 2002, (Article in Internet archive).

70 *Ibid.*

There was a joke making the rounds in the days leading up to the U.S invasion of Iraq in April of 2003. A newspaper reporter asks the President if there is any proof that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction. "Of course," is the reply. "We saved the receipts." Unfortunately, this is too close to the truth to be funny.

Welcome Mat For Terrorists

It is now clear that terrorism was greatly facilitated by policies of the U.S. Immigration Service, policies that are so lax as to be ludicrous. In her book, *Invasion*,[71] Michelle Malkin documents how Immigration officials stretched the rules in order to make it easy to enter the United States from hostile countries at the very time alerts were being circulated that terrorists were expected to be making entry. Instead of tightening security, they loosened it.

Michael Springman was the former head of the U.S. Visa Bureau in Jeddah, Egypt. In June of 2001 (three months *before* the attack on the World Trade Center) he was interviewed on BBC News. This is what he said:

> In Saudi Arabia I was repeatedly ordered by high-level State Dept officials to issue visas to unqualified applicants. These were, essentially, people who had no ties either to Saudi Arabia or to their own country. I complained bitterly at the time there. I returned to the US, I complained to the State Dept here, to the General Accounting Office, to the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, and to the Inspector General's office. I was met with silence.... What I was protesting was, in reality, an effort to bring recruits, rounded up by Osama bin Ladin, to the US for terrorist training by the CIA.[72]

The time frame for this action was during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, and so this policy is defended as having been necessary to oppose the Soviets. It's the blowback theory, again.

But, long after the Soviets left Afghanistan, and long after U.S. intelligence agencies knew that the Al-Qaeda terrorist network was planning an attack inside the United States, the pattern did not change.

---

71 Michelle Malkin, *Invasion* (Washington, DC, Regnery Publishing, 2002)

72 Has someone been sitting on the FBI?" an interview by Greg Palast, *BBC News*, June 11, 2001, (Article in Internet archive).

Fifteen of the nineteen hijackers obtained their visas from U.S authorities in Saudi Arabia. After 9-11, their visa applications were reviewed, and this is what was found: One of the hijackers said he was a teacher but couldn't spell the word. One said he was going to school but didn't know where. Another said he was married but didn't give the name of his spouse. One of them listed as his destination: "Hotel." In each of the applications, there was important information incorrectly entered or missing altogether. Not one of them was filled out properly, yet they all were approved.[73]

One of the organizers of the terrorist cell that carried out the first bombing of the World Trade Towers in 1993, was Sheik Omar Abdel-Rahman. During the 1980s, Rahman had traveled throughout the Middle East calling for Jihad, or "Holy War," against America. Because of that, he was on the State Department "watch list" of suspected terrorists who were not to be allowed into the U.S. Yet, there he was, and he had entered the country under his real name. How did that happen? It happened because, in July of 1990, a CIA agent, posing as an embassy official, gave him a visa. Then, when his visa was revoked four months later, the Immigration Service located him and, instead of expelling him from the country, granted him a work permit! That is how he was able to plan and direct the first bombing of the World Trade Towers.[74] It was the same kind of protection that had been given to Takeo Yoshikawa at Pearl Harbor fifty-two years earlier.

The pattern of facilitating terrorists' entry into the United States has continued unabated after 9/11. Thousands of illegal aliens enter the country across unprotected borders every year, and it is known that a substantial number of them are from Middle Eastern countries. Yet, the federal government does nothing about it. Field agents with the Border Patrol repeatedly have complained about being hampered in their job by their own agency, but the response from their superiors has been public denial of any problem and disciplinary action against the whistleblowers.

---

73 "Sneaking into America," by Martha Raddarz, *ABC News*, Oct. 23, abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/DailyNews/ hijack_visas021023.html. Also see "Series of red flags missed before Sept. 11, panel says," by Mimi Hall, *USA Today*, Jan. 27, 2004, p. 2A.

74 Bin "Laden's 'Logistical Mastermind'," *New York Newsday*, Sept. 21, 2001, www.nynewsday.com/nywodoc212376902sep21,0,7718988.story. Also "Behind the Terror Network," by William Grigg, *The New American*, Nov. 5, 2001, pp. 5, 6. Also "Powell defends department, admits visa errors occurred," by Cassio Furtado, *The Miami Herald*, July 12, 2002, posted to www.usbc.org/info/everything2002/0702powelldefends.htm.

In June of 2004, a small-town newspaper in Arizona, the *Tombstone Tumbleweed*, reported that local Border Patrol agents had encountered at least seventy-five illegal aliens who were of middle-eastern descent. One agent told the newspaper: "We discovered they spoke poor English with middle-eastern accent; then we caught them speaking to each other in Arabic. This is ridiculous that we don't take this more seriously, and we're told not to say a thing to the media, but I have to." Andy Adame, the spokesman for the Border Patrol, responded with a flat-out denial. He said that all of those in question were Mexicans. However, Adame did admit that, from October 2003 though June 2004, Border Patrol agents just in the Tucson, Arizona, area had apprehended 5,510 illegals from countries *other* than Mexico or other Central or South American countries. He was careful not to reveal that any of them were from the middle east.[75]

In spite of denials by the government, it was becoming increasingly known to the public that there was a *big* security problem along our borders, including the Canadian border and the vast unprotected beaches of the Pacific Northwest. In December of 2004, Congress passed the National Intelligence Reform Act, which vastly expanded the power of the government to control the lives of American citizens – all in the name of weeding out terrorists. Part of the veneer that made this seem genuine was a provision to add 10,000 border patrol agents to the Immigration Service. Here was proof that our leaders were finally getting serious about this problem. However, when the law was passed through the filter of the President's annual budget, the number of new agents was slashed from 10,000 to only 210. The explanation was that the government lacked the money to hire and train these forces.[76]

75 "Terrorist Crossing: Cover-up on the U.S.-Mexico Border," *The New American*, Nov 29, 2004, p. 8, www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1288222/posts.

76 "Bush budget scraps 9,790 border patrol agents," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Feb 9, 2005, www.sfgate.com/cgibin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2005/02/09/MNGOKB837T1.DTL.

Bojinka

The official position of the Bush Administration on 9/11 is that it was impossible to predict that terrorists would use airplanes as weapons of attack, and that is the reason the government was not able to prevent it. On May 9, 2002, President Bush's national security advisor, Condoleezza Rice – a member of the CFR – faced reporters and said: "Nobody could have predicted that these people would take an airplane and slam it into the World Trade Center ... that they would try to use an airplane as a missile."[77] That's what she said. Please remember that statement as we now examine the record.

In 1995, a terrorist cell was uncovered in the Philippines. Its members were part of the bin Ladin network. An accidental fire in their bomb factory had aroused the curiosity of local officials and, when they arrived to investigate, Abdul Hakim Murad was arrested as he attempted to flee. Murad revealed that his group was planning to assassinate the Pope during his upcoming visit to Manila. But that isn't all. He said he had trained in New Bern, North Carolina, to fly commercial jets. Why? Because that was part of a plan called Project Bojinka, which is a Yugoslav term for big bang. The Bojinka was to blow up eleven airliners in the same day, fly others into landmark targets such as CIA headquarters, the Pentagon, the TransAmerica Building in San Francisco, the Sears Tower in Chicago, and the World Trade Center in New York. All of this information was passed on to U.S. intelligence agencies and also to the security service for the Vatican.[78] That was 6 yrs before 9-11.

In 1996, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed was indicted in the United States for a plot to blow up airliners and crash one of them into CIA headquarters. It was the Bonjinka plot.

The FBI put him on their most-wanted list of terrorists; so someone obviously took the plan seriously, which means the government was fully aware of the plan to use passenger planes as flying bombs at least 5 years before 9-11.[79]

---

77 "1999 Report Warned of Suicide Hijack," by John Solomon, Associated Press, *Yahoo News*, May 17, 2002.

78 "Could We Have Prevented the Attacks?" by William Grigg, *The New American*, November 5, 2001, pp. 29, 30. Grigg also cites the Sept. 23 edition of the *Washington Post*. Also see "Terror Trail," by William Jasper, *The New American*, July 1, 2002, p. 20

79 "Arrest of 9/11 suspect yields 'lots of names, information'," by Kevin Johnson, *USA Today*, March 3, 2003, pp. 1,2A, (Article in Internet archive).

During hearings before the Joint House-Senate Intelligence Committee to Investigate 9-11, Eleanor Hill, who was the committee Staff Director, testified that, in August of 1998, intelligence agencies learned that a group of Arabs planned to fly an explosive-laden plane into the World Trade Center. A few months later, she said, it was learned that groups connected with bin Ladin would target New York and Washington and seek an event that was "spectacular and traumatic." That was three years before 9-11.[80]

In September of 1999, the National Intelligence Council, which is attached to the CIA, issued a report entitled "Sociology and Psychology of Terrorism." It warned against the possibility of suicide hijackings of airlines by Al-Qaeda terrorists. The report went to the White House and was shared with federal agencies. It also was placed into the Library of Congress. That was 2 years before 9-11.[81]

In February of 2005, a report of the 9/11 Commission revealed that, in the months before the attack, federal aviation officials had received fifty-two intelligence reports warning of the possibility that Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda would launch terrorist attacks against the U.S., and some of those specifically warned of airline hijackings and suicide operations. According to *The New York Times*: "The Bush Administration had blocked the public release of the full, classified version of the report for more than five months, officials said, much to the frustration of former commission members."[82]

The Date Of The Attack Is Known

In the third week of June, 2001, Richard Clarke, who was National Coordinator for Counterterrorism in the White House, called together the major domestic security agencies and told them that a Bonjinka-style attack was imminent. The following report in the *New Yorker* magazine, dated January 14, 2002, tells it all:

---

80 "What Went Wrong." *Online News* PBS, Sept. 18, 2002, www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/terrorism/julydec02/bkgdfailures_9-18.html. Also "Burying the Truth," by Norman Grigg, *The New American*, Dec. 30, 2002, p. 18, www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2002/12-30-2002/vo18no26_burying.htm

81 "1999 Report Warned of Suicide Hijack," by John Solomon, Associated Press, May 17, 2002, starbulletin.com/ 2002/05/18/news/story1.html.

82 "9/11 Report Cites Many Warnings About Hijackings," by Eric Lichtblau *The New York Times,* Feb. 10, 2005, www.nytimes.com/2005/02/10/politics/10terror.html? th&oref=login.

> Intelligence had been streaming in concerning a likely Al-Qaeda attack. "It all came together in the third week in June," Clarke said. The C.I.A.'s view was that a major terrorist attack was coming in the next several weeks." On July 5th, Clarke summoned all the domestic security agencies – the Federal Aviation Administration, the Coast Guard, Customs, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the F.B.I. – and told them to increase their security in light of an impending attack.[83]

That was 10 weeks before 9-11.

A few weeks later, the CIA received a report from independent sources in Afghanistan. The report said: "Everyone is talking about an impending attack on the United States."[84] That was 8 weeks before 9-11.

On January 6, 2002, the *Orlando Sentinel* (in Orlando, Florida) reported that a prisoner in the local county jail had tipped off the FBI a month before September 11 that he had information about a pending terrorist attack in New York City and other targets. Walid Arkeh was an American citizen who had spent prison time in England where he became friendly with three Muslim inmates who had been involved in the 1998 bombing of the American embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Tanzania.

Arkeh told the FBI that the terrorists said something big was about to happen in New York. He thought the FBI would be eager to have this information, but such was not the case. The *Orlando Sentinel* reported that the FBI agents didn't appear impressed, and one stood with his hand in his pocket impatiently asking, "Is that all that you have? That's old news." After 9-11, the agents returned to Arkeh's cell and threatened that he could be charged with co-conspiracy if he told anyone that he knew about the attacks ahead of time. The impact this had on him is evident in the *Sentinel*'s report:

---

83 "The Counter Terrorist," by Lawrence Wright, *The New Yorker*, Jan. 14, 2002, www.newyorker.com/fact/content/?020114fa_FACT1.

84 "Warnings not passed down, 9/11 inquiry says," by Kathy Kiely, *USA Today*, Sept 18, 2002, www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2002-09-18-congress_x.htm. Also "Burying the Truth," by William Grigg, *The New American*, Dec. 30, 2002, p. 18, www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2002/12-30-2002/vo18no26_burying.htm

> When pressed by the *Sentinel* about whether he knew about the Sept. 11 hijacking and targets ahead of time, Arkeh, a compact and muscular man, paused a long time and looked down at the ground. Then he raised his head and smiled: "No. If I did, that would make me a co-conspirator."[85]

Arkeh's tip off to the FBI was four weeks before 9-11.

Incidentally, shortly after that, he was moved to an undisclosed location. His name, his photograph, and all traces of his presence in the system disappeared from the Department of Corrections web site. To the outside world, he ceased to exist.[86]

Between September 6 and 10, Wall Street was hit with a massive wave of short-selling shares of United Airlines and American Airlines stock. Short selling is a bet that the value of a stock will decline. When the value of those stocks plummeted after the attack, those who had done this stood to make a gain of eight-hundred percent.[87] It was obvious that someone had inside knowledge. The CIA routinely monitors stock market movements and, by Sept 8, the agency was aware that something very unhealthy was planned for the airlines. That was 3 days before 9-11.

For many weeks prior to the September attacks, The National Security Agency had monitored transcontinental conversations between bin Ladin and his Al-Qaeda members.

On Sept 10, they intercepted such remarks as: "Good things are coming," "Watch the news," and "Tomorrow will be a great day for us." That was 1 day before 9-11. Yes, they knew the exact date.[88]

---

85 "Inmate says he told FBI about danger to New York," by Doris Bloodsworth, *Orlando Sentinel*, Jan. 6, 2002, www.orlandosentinel.com/news/local/seminole/orlasecterror06010602jan06.story?coll=orl%2Dhome%2Dheadlines. I have a hard copy of this report as it originally appeared on the Internet; but, when the FBI protested this article, it was withdrawn from the newspaper's web site. I will scan it and make it available from the Reality Zone site. Meanwhile, a copy of the article is available on the Internet at the following site: www.unansweredquestions.org/timeline/2002/orlandosentinel010602.html

86 George Orwell, in his book, *1984*, describes such individuals as becoming "unpersons".

87 "Suspiciously timed bets against airlines expire today," by Greg Farrell, *USA Today*, Oct. 19, 2001, p. 1B. Also "Burying the Truth," by Grigg, *op. cit.*

88 "U.S. had agents inside Al-Qaeda," by John Diamond, *USA Today*, June 4, 2002, p. 1A, www.orlandosentinel.com/news/local/seminole/orlasecterror06010602jan06.story?coll=orl%2Dhome%2Dheadlines.

Flight Schools

The FBI had been collecting evidence that terrorists were anxious to learn how to fly jumbo jets since at least 1995.[89] At first, the reports were vague; but, by 2001, the information was very specific. It involved names, dates, and places. For example, two months before the fateful attack against the Twin Towers and the Pentagon, Kenneth Williams, who was a counter-terrorism agent in the Phoenix office of the FBI, requested permission from his superiors to canvass flight schools in the U.S. to see if any of their students fit the profile of potential terrorists. Williams included a list of eight Arabs who then were taking flight training at the Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Prescott, Arizona. He reported that one of them had a picture of bin Ladin on his wall, while another had been in telephone contact with a known Al-Qaeda supporter. In view of the flood of information about terrorists planning to use planes as bombs, Williams felt this was a sensible precaution. His request was turned down.[90]

On August 13 of 2001 – just four weeks before the attack on 9-11, the Pan Am International Flight Academy, located in Eagan, Minnesota, called the FBI to report that one of its students was acting suspiciously. They said that Zacarias Moussaoui claimed to be from France but, when French was spoken to him, he declined to speak the language. He had requested Boeing-747 flight simulator training but only wanted to know how to steer the plane, not how to take off or land.[91] It was quickly determined that Moussaoui was in the country illegally, so the next day he was arrested and held for deportation.[92] So far so good, but that is where the matter stopped.

---

89 That was when Abdul Hakim Murad, arrested in the Philippines, revealed the Bojinka plot.

90 Williams submitted his testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 21, 2002. See "FBI Memo's Details Raise New Questions." By Dan Eggen and Bill Miller, *Washington Post*, May 19, 2002, p. A01. Also "FBI Pigonholed Agent's Request," by Dan Eggen, *Washington Post*, May 22, 2002, p. A01, www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wpdyn/A53054- 2002May21?language=printer.

91 "Eagan flight trainer wouldn't let unease about Moussaoui rest," by Greg Gordon, Minneapolis *Star Tribune*, Dec. 21, 2001, www.startribune.com /stories/1576/913687.html. Also "Did We Know What Was Coming?" by William Grigg, *The New American*, March 11, 2002, www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2002/03-11002/vo18no05_didweknow_print.htm.

92 "France opened Moussaoui file in '94," by Jim Boulden, CNN, Dec. 11, 2001, www.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/europe/12/06/gen.moussaoui.background

When FBI agents of the local counter-terrorism team requested permission to investigate Moussaoui's activities and his associates, their request was denied from Washington. They were also denied permission to search his computer or even his apartment.[93]

According to the January 27 issue of the *Washington Post*, when Moussaoui was arrested, the FBI already had a five-inch thick file on him.[94] Much of that probably came from the French government, but that means they already knew everything about him, what his intentions were, and who his friends were. In other words, they already had the information they needed to deport him but they ignored it until they were forced into action by the fact that the flight school had reported his bizarre behavior.

Moussaoui was not the only terrorist at that flight school. Another was Hani Hanjour, who became one of the hijackers on September 11. Officials at the school had raised questions about Hanjour's inability to speak English, the international language of aviation. When they shared this concern with the Federal Aviation Agency, instead of disqualifying Hanjour from training, the FAA sent a representative to sit in on a class to observe him and then requested school officials to find a translator to help him with his English.[95]

The FBI Is Paralized By Its Own Leaders

After all this effort on the part of local FBI agents to be allowed to investigate what certainly looked like potential terrorists in flight schools, and after continually being denied permission to do so by headquarters, FBI Director Robert Mueller faced the press on September 15, 2002, and, with a straight face, said: "The fact that there were a number of individuals that happened to have received training at flight schools here is news, quite obviously.

---

93 "Justice had denied Minneapolis FBI request on suspected terrorist," by Greg Gordon, Minneapolis *Star Tribune*, Oct. 3, 2001, www.startribune.com/stories/843/730512.html. Also "Unheeded Warnings," *Newsweek*, May 20, 2002, www.msnbc.com/news/751100. asp?cpl=1. (This web page is no longer functioning. I will check to see if I have saved a copy to disk. If not, a copy is available at www.bulatlat.com/news/2-16/2-16-readerNEWSWEEK.html.)

94 "America's Chaotic Road to War," by Dan Balz and Bob Woodward, *Washington Post*, January 27, 2002; Page A01, www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A42754-2002Jan26.

95 "Eagan flight trainer," by Greg Gordon, *Star Tribune*, *op. cit.* Also Grigg, *The New American*, March 11, 2002, *op. cit.*

If we had understood that to be the case, we would have – perhaps one could have averted this."[96]

The truth, of course, is quite different. The FBI had filing cabinets full of information about probable terrorists receiving flight training. The refusal of headquarters to allow local counter-terrorism agents to do their job at first baffled them and, eventually, drove them to desperation. One of them was Special Agent, Coleen Rowley, from the Minneapolis office. She became so upset after 9-11 that she risked her career by sending a scathing letter to Mr. Mueller. She said that her application for a warrant to search Moussaoui's computer had been deliberately altered by her superior in Washington so it would not pass the necessary legal review. Then she said:

> [Headquarters] personnel whose jobs it was to assist and coordinate with field division agents ... continued to almost inexplicably throw up roadblocks and undermine Minneapolis' by now desperate efforts to obtain a FISA[97] search warrant.... HQ personnel brought up almost ridiculous questions in their apparent efforts to undermine [the request].... Why would FBI agents deliberately sabotage a case? I know I shouldn't be flippant about this, but jokes were actually made that the key FBI HQ personnel had to be spies or moles, like Robert Hansen, who were actually working for Osama bin Ladin.[98]

The man who personally blocked the search warrants for these hijackers was Michael Maltbie. One would think that he would have been fired on the spot or at least demoted. Not so. After 9-11, he was moved up to a position of even greater responsibility.[99]

Maltbie was part of a national security unit headed by "Spike" Bowman, and it is certain that Bowman approved, if not directed, everything Maltbie did. On December 4, 2002, at a ceremony in Des Moines, Iowa, Bowman received a framed certificate for distinguished service, signed by President Bush, and a cash bonus equal to one-third of his salary.

---

96 "Agent Claims FBI Supervisor Thwarted Probe," by Dan Eggen, *Washington Post*, May 27, 2002, p. A01, www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A53054-2002May21?language=printer.

97 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act

98 "Coleen Rowley's Memo to FBI Director Robert Mueller," *Time Magazine*, May 21, 2002, www.time.com/time/covers/1101020603/memo.html

99 *"Has FBI promoted 9-11 ball-dropper?"* by Paul Sperry, *WorldNetDaily News*, June 7, 2002, www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=27876.

People are not rewarded for failure. Maltbie and Bowman were rewarded, not because they failed their mission, but because they succeeded.[100]

Standard Operational Procedure

Perhaps the most compelling evidence of all that the attacks on 9-11 were facilitated comes from analyzing the breakdown of standard operational procedures for responding to aircraft emergencies. The FAA requires all pilots to file a flight plan before they take off. It includes the destination and fixed points along the way. If radar shows that the plane deviates more than a few miles or degrees from the plan, the first response is for an FAA controller to attempt radio contact with the pilot. If that fails, the next step is to send up a military interceptor to visually make an assessment. Usually that results in leading the off-course plane back to its flight plan or to an emergency landing. The interceptor pilot has a required routine. First, he will rotate his wings or fly from side to side in front of the plane to catch the pilot's attention. If that fails, he fires a tracer across the path of the plane. If that fails, he asks his commander at home base for instructions. If a plane is identified as enemy aircraft or if it is a civilian plane threatening other planes or headed on a crash course into a populated area, high-level military commanders have the authority to give the order to shoot it down. This is all established procedure that was in place long before 9-11.[101]

The military has its own radar system called NORAD (The North American Aerospace Defense Command). It integrates civilian flight data from the FFA, but its primary role is to be on the lookout for enemy craft and missiles. NORAD makes an independent evaluation of any situation involving national security. It does not have to wait for directions from the FAA.

There are numerous air force bases around the country where crews are on alert twenty-four hours a day. Planes are fueled and armed. Pilots are quartered in buildings just a few yards away ready to scramble at a moment's notice. Under normal conditions,

100 "Bogus bonus rewards FBI failure," by Gene Collier, Pittsburgh *Post Gazette*, www.postgazette.com/columnists/20030108gene4.asp. Also "9-11: FBI Futility and Failure," by William Grigg, *The New American*, January 27, 2003. (I have the printed magazine version of this article but it is not on line. I will see if I can get it from TNA. Otherwise, we will scan it.)

101 The pertinent FAA and military procedures are posted at www.standdown.net/FAAstandardinterceptprocedures.htm

aircraft are launched within five minutes of request. Under combat-alert conditions, they are in the air within less than three minutes.[102] Please note that this is an *automatic* response. It may require higher authority to shoot down a plane, but not to get those interceptors into the air.

The December, 1999, issue of *Airman* magazine gives us a glimpse into the daily routine at these air bases:

> Day or night, 24-7, a pair of pilots and two crew chiefs stand alert in a secure compound on Homestead [Air Force Reserve base near Miami, Florida], the base Hurricane Andrew nearly razed in August 1992. Within minutes, the crew chiefs can launch the pilots and send them on their way to intercept "unknown riders," whether they're Cuban MIGs, drug traffickers, smugglers, hijackers, novice pilots who've filed faulty flight plans or crippled aircraft limping in on a wing and a prayer.
>
> "If needed, we could be killing things in five minutes or less," said Capt. "Pickle" Herring, a full-time alert pilot....
>
> "I've been scrambled at every conceivable, inopportune time – eating supper, sleeping at 3 a.m., but the worst is the shower. I just jump out soaking wet, wipe the soap off my neck and go," said Herring, a 33-year-old Air Force Academy graduate. "We go full speed when that klaxon sounds, and people know not to get in front of us, because we take scrambles very seriously."...
>
> The pilots and crew chiefs form a tight bond because of the close quarters. They live together in a two-storey blockhouse with a kitchen, dining room, briefing room, separate bedrooms and a community dayroom boasting a big screen television and four recliners. Another building offers a gym and library. Some of the men found similarities between their jobs and a firefighter's.
>
> "We're like coiled springs waiting for the alarm to go off," said Master Sgt. Jerry Leach, a crew chief from Cutler Ridge, Fla. "I only wish we had a fire pole to slide down." ...

102 "Newspaper Article Contains Inaccuracies," NORAD News Release #00-16, Nov. 1, 2000, 216.239.33.100/ search?q=cache:5yQis-6rHkYJ:www.norad.mil/rel0016.htm+%22Air+Force%22+%22response+time%22+scramble%22&hl=en&ie=UTF-8.

> The Air National Guard exclusively performs the air soveregnty mission in the continental United States, and those units fall under the control of the 1st Air Force based at Tyndall [Florida]. The Guard maintains seven alert sites with 14 fighters and pilots on call around the clock. Besides Homestead, alert birds also sit armed and ready at Tyndall; Langley AFB, Va.; Otis Air National Guard Base, Mass.; Portland International Airport, Ore.; March AFB, Calif.; and Ellington Field, Texas.[103]

The Procedure Is Suspended On 9-11

Now, let's compare that standard response with what happened on 9-11. On that morning, all four commercial planes involved in the attack took off within a forty-threeminute period, between 7:59 and 8:42 A.M.

- At 8:20, FAA flight controllers knew that the first plane, American Airlines Flight 11, had been hijacked. According to news reports, the pilot had engaged the radio transmitter button on the steering yoke, and the controllers on the ground could hear the hijackers shouting orders.
- At 8:28, radar showed that Flight 11 had turned around and was headed for Manhattan Island.
- At 8:38, NORAD was notified to take appropriate action. Why it took eighteen minutes after knowledge of hijacking to place that call is anyone's guess, but the President would have been informed immediately after that.
- At 8:43, ground controllers knew that the second plane, United Airlines Flight 175, had been hijacked and also was headed for New York.
- At 8:45, Flight 11 slammed into the North Tower.
- At 8:50, FAA controllers knew that the third plane, American Airlines Flight 77, had turned around and was headed for Washington DC.
- At 9:03, Flight 175 smashed into the South Tower.
- At 9:40, Flight 77 hit the Pentagon.
- At about 10:06, Flight 93 plunged into the ground in an open field in Pennsylvania.

---

103 "FANGs Bared; Florida's Eagles stand sentry over southern skies," by Master Sgt. Pat McKenna, *Airman*, Dec. 1999, www.af.mil/news/airman/1299/home.htm.

The total elapsed time for Project Bojinka was one hour and forty-six minutes. The Air Force can scramble its interceptors in less than three minutes. Yet, on 9-11, there was no scramble until *after* the Pentagon was hit, which means that after NORAD had been notified, the response time was more than one hour and two minutes.

The government now denies this; so let's take a look at the facts. On the morning of September 11, General Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was on Capital Hill in Washington attending a meeting with Senator Max Cleland.[104] This is how *The American Forces Press Services* reported the general's description of what happened that day:

> While in an outer office, he said, he saw a television report that a plane had hit the World Trade Center. "They thought it was a small plane or something like that," Myers said. So the two men went ahead with the office call. Meanwhile, the second World Trade Center tower was hit by another jet. "Nobody informed us of that," Myers said. "But when we came out, that was obvious. Then, right at that time, somebody said the Pentagon had been hit."
>
> Sombody thrust a cell phone in Myer's hand. Gen. Ralph Eberhart, commander of U.S. Space Command and the North American Aerospace Defense Command [NORAD] was on the other end of the line "talking about what was happening and the actions he was going to take."[105]

Let's see if we have this right: The top military officer in the country didn't know about the first attack until he saw it on television, which means the TV networks were better informed than he was; and no one informed him of the second attack, either. He didn't learn about that until after he finished his meeting with the Senator. Then, *after* the Pentagon was hit, someone thrust a cell phone into his hands, and General Eberhart told him of "the actions he was *going* to take." That means, when the Pentagon was hit, the actions had not yet been taken.

---

104 Myers' official rank was Vice-Chairman but, since the Chairman, General Hugh Shelton, was out of the country on that day, Myers was the *Acting* Chairman. The purpose of his visit to Senator Cleland was to discuss his pending appointment to replace General Shelton, which happened shortly thereafter.

105 "We Hadn't Thought about This," By Kathleen Rhem, American Forces Information Services, Oct. 23, 2001, www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct2001/n10232001_200110236.html. Also Ahmed, pp 164, 165.

This was consistent with the general's testimony two days after 9-11 to the Senate Armed Services Committee. He was asked when the scramble order was given, and his reply was: "That order, to the best of my knowledge, was after the Pentagon was struck."[106]

On that same day, the *Boston Globe* printed an interview with a NORAD spokesman who confirmed that fact. The article said: "The command did not immediately scramble any fighters.... The [NORAD] spokesman [Major Mike Snyder] said the fighters remained on the ground until after the Pentagon was hit."[107]

The Story Is Revised

When the significance of these statements became obvious, there was no way to explain why it took one hour and two minutes to scramble. So, rather than explain, they simply changed their story. By the next week, everyone was in agreement that they *did* scramble *immediately* after being notified by NORAD. The General and the Major apparently just had bad memories.

But that's not the end of it. The speed of response is not the only factor. How close you are when you *do* respond is also important. The closest interceptors were located at McGuire Air Force Base, just 71 miles from New York City. They could have been on the scene in a few minutes. But they didn't scramble from McGuire. Instead, they chose the Otis Air National Guard Base at Cape Cod, Massachusetts, 188 miles away.[108]

If this revised story is true, it would provide a plausible excuse for being too late for the first impact, but there still would have been ample time to intercept the others, especially at the Pentagon,

---

106 General Richard B. Myers Senate Confirmation Hearing, Senate Armed Services Committee, Sept. 13, 2001. A copy of the original report is posted at: 216.239.33.100/search?q=cache:CCxvkuSStbkJ:www.attackonamerica.net/genrichardbmyerssenateconfirmationhearing9132001.htm+%22Senate+Armed+Services+Committee%22+%22confirmation%22+%22Myers%22+%22response%22&hl=en&ie=UTF-8.

107 "Otis Fighter Jets Scrambled Too Late To Halt The Attacks," by Glen Johnson, *The Boston Globe*, Sept. 15, 2001. A copy of this article was purchased at: nl.newsbank.com/nlsearch/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=0EE9B623D90937D6&p_docnum=1&s_accountid=AC01030522233544 06931&s_orderid=NB010305222352306879&s_dlid=DL01030522233616069 94&s_username=gedwardgriffin.

108 "Fighter jets were sent to intercept airliner," *The Province Journal*, September 18, 2002, cfapps.bouldernews.com/printpage/index.cfm. (This is the original page but it no longer works.) A copy is still available at web.dailycamera.com/news/terror/sept01/18anor.html.

which wasn't hit until more than an hour after the revised scramble time. F-16s can travel at 2½ times the speed of sound, which is about thirty-one miles per minute. That means they would have taken six minutes to scramble, one minute to climb to altitude, eleven minutes to travel from Cape Cod to Washington DC, and could have arrived in about seventeen minutes after receiving the order. And yet they missed a one-hour deadline at the Pentagon.

It is obvious we still are not being told the truth.[109]

---

109 There is evidence, although far from conclusive at the time of this writing, that the fourth plane, United Flight 93 that crashed in a field in Pennsylvania, *was* shot down. It has been speculated that when its flight path headed for the White House, decisive action was taken. If this turns out to be true, it will be doubly painful in view of the legendary "let's roll" heroism of the passengers. Of course, even if the plane was shot down, that would not detract from the passengers' heroism, nor would it mean that whoever issued the order acted improperly. It would merely be another gut-grinding example of how important facts are often hidden from the public by collectivists who believe the common man needs to know only those things that create confidence in his leaders.

At first glance, it may seem that authorizing the destruction of Flight 93 would be inconsistent with the principles of individualism, which state that individuals may not be sacrificed for the so-called greater good of the greater number. However, such action *is* consistent with individualism when viewed in context of protecting life. As stated in Part One (*The Chasm*), we are justified in taking the life of another to protect our own lives, but that justification does not arise from the superiority of our numbers. It arises from each of us separately. This airline episode complicates the issue, because the decision to take the lives of a planeload of innocent passengers was made by people whose lives were not threatened at the moment. This leads to the related question of whether we are justified in using deadly force to protect the lives of *others* as well as ourselves. The answer is not as clear-cut as with self-defense, but most people would say yes. In fact, they would say it is not only justifiable; it is obligatory. However, we sometimes are faced with a deadly conflict between two people or two groups – such as in war – and we may feel compelled to choose sides. This is where numbers may actually make a difference – or perhaps some other criteria may come into play, such as the seriousness of the threat and the perceived merit of those to be saved. However, while it is true that the *decision* may be based on numeric superiority or some other logic, the *justification* is not. The justification comes from our individual obligation to defend the lives of others. Therefore, if Woodrow Wilson or FDR truly believed that a sacrifice of two thousand American citizens was necessary to protect the lives or liberty of the American people at large, their actions would have been consistent with the principles of individualism. But if they merely feigned this concern as an excuse for other agendas, such as the expansion of economic and political power or building a New World Order "closer to the hearts desire," then they were following the ethics of collectivism. Were such agendas their primary motivation? The historical record strongly suggests that they were, but each of us will have to make that judgment for ourselves.

Boston Air Traffic Controller Says It Was An Inside Job

On December13, 2006, a former Boston Center air traffic controller consented to a telephone interview by Pilots for 911 Truth, an organization of pilots and others in the aircraft industry who have challenged the government's official version of 9/11. Robin Hordon, with eleven years of experience in air traffic control and emergency procedures, said that 9/11 was an inside job and that Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, at the Pentagon, tracked three of the four flights every minute of their journey right up to the instant of impact. He said that air traffic controllers have been ignored or silenced to protect the true perpetrators within the government.

Hordon said that only a small part of the radio transmissions between air traffic controllers has been released to the public, and some have even been shredded. That is what happened to the recordings of conversation between six Air Route Traffic Control Center controllers in New York. Otherwise, they would clearly show who was really behind the attack. He said:

> They cherry picked transmissions, communication, and statements made on these four flights that were able to paint and write a story that the public would look at and say: Oh wow! This really happened; but it wasn't factual. It was just a story and it did not tell anything other than what the high perps [perpetrators] wanted the public to hear.[110]

The President Takes Charge

What was the President doing at this time? On the morning of 9-11, President Bush was scheduled for a publicity appearance at the Emma E. Booker Elementary School in Sarasota, Florida. His mission was to be photographed listening to children read. When he left his hotel that morning, the first plane had already struck.

A reporter asked if he knew what was going on in New York. Bush answered yes but said he would give a statement later.[111]

Let's freeze that frame. The President knew that the nation was under attack by terrorists, but he didn't let that interfere with business as usual.

---

110 To hear a recording of the entire interview, go to: www.pilotsfor911truth.org.

111 Special Report, "Planes Crash into World Trade Center," ABC News, Sept. 11, 2001. Copy of report is archived at www.unansweredquestions.net/timeline/2001/abcnews091101.html.

Americans might have expected their president and commander-in-chief to become a human dynamo, to return immediately to Air Force One to take command. We might have expected him to be concerned for the safety of himself, his entourage, and especially the school children who might become collateral victims of a possible strike against the President, but none of that happened. His top priority at that critical moment was to be photographed listening to children read.

By now, almost everyone has seen the photos and video of the moment President Bush was informed of the impact of the second plane. His Chief-of-Staff Andrew Card whispered the news into his ear; a somber look came across his face; but there was absolutely no sign of shock or surprise.

Now that the second plane had struck, did the President *then* leap out of his chair, contact his commanders, and initiate counter measures? No. He just continued to sit there listening to children read about a pet goat. Then he gave a short speech, and didn't leave the school until another half-hour had passed.[112]

This reaction or, more precisely, *lack* of reaction, speaks volumes and it leads to three conclusions:

1. The President did not appear surprised because he *wasn't* surprised. Why should he be? The government had been expecting Bonjinka for six years, and they even knew the exact date on which it would be executed.
2. He was not concerned about his safety because he knew the probable targets. Please notice that *he* was not in the White House on that day. And we might be excused for noticing that General Myers was not at the Pentagon, either. Neither was his former superior, General Shelton, who was somewhere over the Atlantic on his way to Europe.[113]
3. He did not leap into action to direct counter measures, because there was a prior decision to "standown" and allow the attacks to succeed. In other words, it was a decision to *facilitate*.

In military terms, *standown* means to deliberately refrain from defense as a strategic move to implement some higher objective.

---

112 The second impact occurred at 9:03 A.M. The President began his speech at 9:30 and left shortly thereafter. See "Remarks by President Bush after two planes crash into World Trade Center," White House Press Release, www.azcentral.com/news/specials/sept11/key-911schoolstatement.html.

113 "We Hadn't Thought about This," by Kathleen Rhem, *op. cit.*

For example, military commanders might deliberately allow enemy forces to advance into an area where, at a later time, they could be surrounded and easily defeated. Allowing terrorist attacks to succeed is a classic standown strategy to implement a goal that has a higher priority than merely protecting the lives of a few thousand American citizens. That goal, as we have seen, is to create justification for establishing a Pax American on the road to world government based on the model of collectivism.

Insulate

We come now to the third prong of the strategy. Is there any evidence of an effort to *insulate* the victims of 9-11 from knowledge that might have allowed them to escape their fate? The answer is: the evidence is everywhere.

While those at the top echelons of government were being inundated with memos, reports, and briefings, none of that information was ever passed to the intended victims. Government agencies were told to increase security for their own top personnel, but not the tenants of the buildings targeted for attack, and that includes the Pentagon, itself.

The airlines were given no information that was specific enough to suggest increasing security measures either at airports or within cockpits. Even after the date of September 11 was known with a high degree of certainty, they were still not warned to increase security. But there was no such inefficiency when it came to warning high-ranking government officials. For example, seven weeks before the attack on 9-11, Attorney-General John Ashcroft stopped using commercial airlines and began flying in a private jet leased by the Justice Department – at a cost to taxpayers, incidentally, of1600 per hour. When asked by reporters why he changed his routine, he replied that it was in response to a "threat assessment" received from the FBI.[114] San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown told reporters that, eight hours prior to the 9-11 attacks, he had been warned by his airport security staff that his scheduled flight to New York that day was not advisable,[115] and *Newsweek* magazine reported that, on the day before the attack:

114 "Ashcroft Flying High," CBS News, July 26, 2001, www.cbsnews.com/stories/2001/07/26/national/ main303601.shtml.

115 "Willie Brown got low-key early warning about air travel," by Phillip Matier and Andrew Ross, *San Francisco Chronicle*, Sept. 12, 2001, www.sfgate.com/today/0912_chron_mnreport.shtml.

> ... a group of top Pentagon officials suddenly cancelled travel plans for the next morning, apparently because of security concerns.[116]... Why that same information was not available to the 266 who died aboard the four hijacked commercial aircraft may become a hot topic on the Hill.[117]

Unfortunately, it never did become a hot topic on the Hill, because an inquiry would certainly have exposed the fact that the victims had been carefully *insulated* from any knowledge of the pending attack – which means that some Americans had sacrificed the lives of other Americans for what they think is the greater good for the greater number.

Then And Now

The final piece of evidence I would like to offer today is perhaps the most compelling of all. It is simply to look at what has happened to our way of life. Forget all the theories and the plausible explanations and the good excuses. Just look at where we were – and where we are today. I am speaking, now, primarily to Americans. Prior to the Wilson Administration, America was the envy of the world. Although it was far from perfect, it was abundant with freedom and opportunity, which is why hundreds of thousands of immigrants flocked to her shores.

That began to change when she was led into World War I by Col. House and his Fabian associates. The ethic of collectivism was planted, not only into political life, but also into academic life where it was destined to grow and propagate into the minds of future generations. Laws that were contrary to the principles of the Constitution began to appear and finally were accepted as virtuous. A banking cartel, called the Federal Reserve, was created. An income tax was passed; and, along with that, tax-exempt foundations came into being with a mission of controlling education in the guise of philanthropy. Government agencies began to proliferate. Government projects and programs appeared everywhere: public works, Social Security, welfare, farm subsidies; the New Deal was a huge political success as voters eagerly exchanged precious pieces of freedom for economic benefits. The floodgate was open.

---

116 "Bush: 'We're at War'," by Wvan Thomas and Mark Hoseball, *Newsweek*, Sept. 24, 2001www.msnbc.com/news/629606.asp

117 "'We've Hit the Targets'," by Michael Hirsh, *Newsweek*, Sept. 13, 2001, propagandamatrix.com/weve_hit_the_targets.html

By the time of World War II, collectivism was already becoming the new religion. We were so focused on the horrors of war and the evil deeds of our enemies that we failed to notice we were becoming like them. Thousands of wartime emergency measures were calmly accepted as a reasonable and necessary price for victory in time of war; and when most of those measures continued after the peace, we accepted them without complaint.

Now we are engaged in a war on terrorism, and the process has been accelerated. Congress uncritically passes just about any measure to restrict personal freedom so long as, somewhere in the text, it says that it is needed to fight terrorism. The so-called Patriot Acts, bills creating a Homeland Security Agency, and the Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 are notable examples. The provisions of these measures were drafted long before September 11. Their origin is a series of reports issued by a group created in 1998 called The United States Commission on National Security/21st Century – often referred to as the Hart-Rudman Commission because its co-chairmen were former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman.[118]

To the casual observer, this appeared to be a government study group but, in fact, it was a front for the Council on Foreign Relations. The Commission was sponsored by Congressman Newt Gingrich, a member of the CFR. Both Hart and Rudman were members of the CFR. The Commission based its findings on the work of futurist author, Alvin Toffler, a member of the CFR. Executive Director Charles Boyde and Study Group Director, Lynn Davis, were members of the CFR. Commissioners Lee Hamilton and James Schlesinger were members of the CFR. One of the better-known commissioners was Leslie Gelb, who was *president* of the CFR.[119]

As a result of new laws based on the recommendations of this group, state National Guard units have been consolidated into a national police force; local law enforcement is under control of the federal government; state laws have been "harmonized," as they put it, into compliance with federal laws; personal property may be searched and seized without a court order; citizens may be arrested without a warrant and imprisoned without trial; public surveillance

118 These reports can be found at the organization's web site: www.nssg.gov/reports.htm.

119 "Building Big Brother," by Steve Bonta, *The New American*, Nov. 5, 2001, p. 37,www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2001/11-05-2001/vo17no23_bigbrother.htm. Also "Rise of the Garrison State," by William Jasper, *The New American*, July 15, 2002, www.jbs.org/visitor/congress/alerts/homeland/garrison.htm.

cameras are appearing everywhere; the government has implemented a national identification and bio-recognition system; and the FBI places wiretaps on telephones without a court order. In December of 2001, the FBI revealed an operation called "Magic Lantern" that allows it to use the Internet to secretly plant a program in anyone's computer so that every stroke made on the keyboard will be reported back. That means the government now can capture a record of everything you create on your computer, including passwords, encrypted files, and even deleted files.[120]

More Secrecy In Government

While the government clamors to prevent citizens from having any secrets whatsoever, it moves in the opposite direction for itself. In November of 2001, President Bush issued an executive order that forbids public access to presidential papers, even those belonging to previous administrations. The only researchers who now have access to these important sources of historical data are those who are deemed to have a "need to know" – which means only those who support the CFR spin on important issues.[121]

During a press conference at the White House on March 13, 2002, President Bush was asked why the newly appointed Director of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, had refused to testify before a bipartisan group of Congress. The President's reply revealed the new face of American government. It no longer has three branches, each to check and balance the power of the others. It is a throwback to the Old World concept of supreme power in the hands of one man. The purpose of Congress now is merely to give advice to the President and to approve funding for his programs. This is what the President said:

120 "FBI confirms "Magic Lantern" exists," MSNBC, Dec. 12, 2001, www.msnbc.com/news/671981.asp.

121 "Bush Clamping Down on Presidential Papers," by George Lardner, Jr., *Washington Post*, Nov. 1, 2001, www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A20731-2001Oct31.

> He doesn't have to testify. He's part of my staff. And that's part of the prerogative of the executive branch of government, and we hold that very dear.... We consult with Congress all the time. I've had meaningful breakfasts with the leadership in the House and the Senate. I break bread with both Republicans and Democrats right back here in the Oval Office and have a good, honest discussion about plans, objectives, what's taking place, what's not taking place.... We understand the role of Congress. We must justify budgets to Congress.... [But] I'm not going to let Congress erode the power of the executive branch."[122]

The Triumph Of Collectivism

We have come a long way since 1912 when Col. House wrote *Philip Dru Administrator*. His vision has come to pass, not just in America, but everywhere. The so-called free world no longer exists. What few freedoms we have left are now subject to restriction or cancellation at any time the government says it's necessary for fighting crime, drugs, terrorism, pornography, discrimination, or any other bugaboo that supposedly stands in the way of the greater good for the greater number. Collectivism has triumphed everywhere in the world. There is no longer any barrier to having the United States comfortably merged with the Soviet Union – or any of its clones, including modern Russia and China. The dream of Cecil Rhodes is now in the final stages of becoming a reality.

Shortly after World War II, giant tax-exempt foundations such as the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Guggenheim Foundation set about to change the social and political fabric of America to embrace world government based on the model of collectivism. They said that the most reliable means to accomplish that was war. When people are fearful for their personal safety and national security, they will meekly accept totalitarian measures from their own government and offer no resistance to the surrender of national sovereignty.

This strategy continues to be applied today. The environmental group called Friends of the Earth, which promotes the CFR drive for more government and abandonment of national sovereignty, expresses it this way:

---

122 "Transcript of Bush press conference," March 13, 2002, www.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/03/13/bush.transcript/index.html.

> "What price would most people be willing to pay for a more durable kind of human organization–more taxes, giving up national flags, perhaps the sacrifice of some of our hard-won liberties?"[123]

"The sacrifice of some of our hard-won liberties" is a gentle way of describing it. A more graphic explanation was provided by General Tommy Franks, the U.S. Commander in the first Persian Gulf War and, later, in Afghanistan and Iraq. Franks said:

> The western world, the free world, loses what it cherishes most, and that is freedom and liberty.... What does that mean? It means the potential of a weapon of mass destruction and a terrorist, massive casualty-producing event somewhere in the western world –it may be in the United Sates of America– that causes our population to question our own Constitution and to begin to militarize our country in order to avoid a repeat of another mass-casualty producing event. Which, in fact, then begins to potentially unravel the fabric of our Constitution.[124]

123 Garrett de Bell, ed., *The Environmental Handbook* (New York: Ballentine / Friends of the Earth, 1970), p. 138.

124 "General Tommy Franks," *Cigar Afficionado*, December, 2003, p.90.

Behold The Grand Deception

At the beginning of this presentation, I told you what I was going to tell you. Now that I have finished telling you, it is time to tell you what I told you. Behold the grand deception: What is unfolding today is, not a war on terrorism to defend freedom. It is a war on freedom that requires the defense of terrorism. It is the final thrust to push what is left of the free world into global government based on the model of collectivism.

Its purpose is to frighten us into abandoning our freedoms and traditions in exchange for protection from a hated and dangerous enemy. This ploy has been used many times before, two of which have been described in this narrative. Each time it moved us closer to the final goal, but was not sufficient to achieve it in full.

This time it is expected to be the final blow.

We have allowed this to happen because we have been denied the knowledge of our own history, and so it seems we are doomed to repeat it. But all of that can be changed. In the twilight zone from which we came, it is said that knowledge is power. But in the reality zone, we know that is a myth.

Men with great knowledge are easily enslaved if they do nothing to defend their freedom. Knowledge by itself is *not* power, but it holds the potential for power if we have the courage to use it as such, and therein lies our hope for the future. If we *act* upon this knowledge, it is an opportunity, not just to know about history, but actually to change its course.

The big question I leave with you is "how?" Is there anything we can do, especially at this late date, to change the course of history? My answer is a resounding "YES!" Is anyone interested? That will be the topic of my next presentation.

In the words of Victor Hugo, it is an idea whose time has come.

"Capital must protect itself in every possible way, both by combination and legislation. Debts must be collected, mortgages foreclosed as rapidly as possible.

When through the process of law the common people lose their homes, they will become more docile and more easily governed through the strong arm of government applied by a central power of wealth under leading financiers.

These truths are well known among our principal men who are now engaged in forming an imperialism to govern the world.

By dividing the voter through the political party system we can get them to expend their energies in fighting for questions of no importance.

It is thus by discreet action we can secure for ourselves that which has been so well planned and so successfully accomplished."

—1924, US Banker's Association Magazine

"I have unwittingly ruined my country."

—Woodrow Wilson, upon passage
of Federal Reserve Act, 1913

"It (the Great Depression) was not accidental; it was a carefully contrived occurrence. The international Bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they might emerge as rulers of us all."

—Louis McFadden

"It is well enough that the people of this nation do not understand our banking and monetary system, for if they did, I believe there would be a revolution before tomorrow morning."

—Henry Ford

Colofon

Printed on C5 16.20cm x 22.90cm standard book size in Georgia and Arial font type faces.

This book has been set up in order to be printed thru the Lulu.com printing on demand website.

The document has been created in OpenOffice 2.3 under SuSE Open Linux 10.3 64bit and exported to PDF level 5.

Pages:	*130*	Paragraphs:	*891*
Words:	*47837*	Characters:	*282790*
Embeds:	*0*	Graphics:	*1*

The Future Is Calling