Secret Organizations and Hidden Agendas

The Future Is Calling (Part Two)

Revised 2004 November 10

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 Verrrucosus, 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."[1]

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.[2] 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.

---

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

[2] 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.

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.

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 accepted 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. When the Bolsheviks came to power in Russia, landowners and shopkeepers were slaughtered by the tens of thousands.

This brutality offended the sensibilities of the more genteel Fabians. It's not that Fabians are opposed to force and violence to accomplish their goals, it's just that they prefer 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 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 they hadn't been offended by 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[1] and then by the Russian Revolution in its early days had died down, those "rebel Fabians" who had not joined the Communist Party (and the many who having initially joined it, left in all haste), together with G.D.H. Cole's connections in the working-class education movement and his young disciples from Oxford of the 'twenties, found no mental difficulty in entering the revived Fabian Society of 1939 – nor did the surviving faithful find any difficulty with collaborating with them.[2]

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. 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 read 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 under the skin, 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?

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

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

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? Ladies and Gentlemen, it is collectivism.

THE SECRET SOCIETY CREATED BY CECIL RHODES

From the vantage point of our time machine, now we flash back to the classroom where John Ruskin is extolling the virtues of collectivism, and we notice that one of the 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. 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 promote the theories of John Ruskin.

One of the best authorities on the Fabian Society is Carroll Quigley, a highly respected professor at Georgetown University. One of Quigley's former students was President Clinton. At a press conference shortly after he was elected, Clinton mentioned Quigley by name and acknowledged that he was indebted to him for what he had learned. What Quigley was teaching was similar to what John Ruskin had taught and, like Rhodes before him, Clinton took those lectures very seriously. Incidentally, it should not go unnoticed that Clinton was a Rhodes Scholar.

In his book *The Anglo-American Establishment,* Quigley says this:

> 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. 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.[1]

One of the leaders and organizers of this secret society was W.T. Stead who wrote a book about the wills of Cecil Rhodes. In that book, Stead 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….[2]

The structure of the secret society was formed along classical, conspiratorial lines. Most of the better-known conspiracies of history have been structured as rings within rings. Generally there's a leader or a small group of two or three people at the center. They form a ring of supporters around them of perhaps ten or twelve, and those people think they are the total organization. They are not aware that two or three of their group are in control. And then the twelve create a larger ring around them of perhaps a hundred people who all think they are the total organization, not realizing there are twelve who are really directing it. 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.

The Rhodes organization was set up exactly along those lines. 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).[3]

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 British banking and politics.[4] 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 collectivism. They were quickly placed into important positions in government and other power centers to promote the hidden agenda of the secret society. Eventually, this Association of Helpers became the

---

[1] 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.

[2] Quoted by Quigley, *Ibid*., p. 36.

[3] 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.

[4] 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.

inner rings of larger groups, which expanded throughout the British Empire and into the United States. This is what Quigley says:

> 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.[1]

At last we come to that obscure 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 created by Cecil Rhodes – which still exists today, that originally it was a front for J.P. Morgan and Company, and that its primary purpose is to promote world government based on the model of collectivism.

THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

So who are the members of the Council on Foreign Relations? I'm going to take more time than I really want to spare in order to present these names to you but, otherwise, you may think this organization and its members are not important.

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. I might add that 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.

Current Presidential candidate, Senator John Kerry.

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, and Colin Powell.

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.

---

[1] Quigley, *Tragedy*, pp. 132, 951-52.

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, and George Tenet.

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 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, Forbes, Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy, Dow Jones News Service, USA Today, Wall Street Journal, Los Angeles Times, New York Post, New York Times, San Diego Union-Tribune, Times Mirror, Random House, W.W. Norton & Co., Warner Books, Atlantic, Harper's, Industry Week, Naval War College Review, Farm Journal, Financial World, Insight, Washington Times, Medical Tribune, National Geographic, National Review, New Republic, New Yorker, New York Review of Books, Newsday, News Max, Newsweek, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Political Science Quarterly, The Progressive, Public Interest, Reader's Digest, Rolling Stone, Scientific American, Time-Warner, Time, U.S. News & World Report, Washington Post, The Washingtonian, Weekly Standard, World Policy Journal, Worldwatch, 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.[1]

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,[2] Aspen Institute, Atlantic Council, Bilderberg Group, Brookings Institute,

---

[1] Peter Jennings and Bill Moyer, although not members of the CFR, are members of the Bilderberg Group, which has the same ideological orientation 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.

[2]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 approximately $90 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 catastrophy. 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

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.

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.

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 Needletrades, 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. For the most part, they 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 have all been carefully screened for suitability.

---

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 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.*

Only collectivists are invited, and so they have the necessary mindset to be good functionaries within the New World Order.

Undoubtedly you noticed from the list of CFR members that both major American political parties are well represented. This is not a partisan organization. Voters are led to believe that, by choosing between the Democratic and Republican parties, they have a choice. They actually 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 not so different 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.[1]

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 Fabian Network, not because these people are members of the Fabian Society, for most of them are not. It is because they share the Fabian ideology of global collectivism and the Fabian strategy of patient gradualism.

Is this reality? If I were in your position, being exposed to all of this for the first time, I probably would think, "Oh come on! This can't be true! If it were, I would have read about it in the newspaper." Well, before you dismiss it as just another conspiracy theory, I'd like to refer you one more time to Professor Quigley. He said this:

> 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.[2]

---

[1] Quigley, *Tragedy*, pp. 1247–1248.

[2] Quigley, *Tragedy*, p. 326.

Yes! Ladies and Gentlemen, this *is* reality!

- End of Part Two -

SEND THIS REPORT TO YOUR FRIENDS. You can print this as a handout or send it as an email attachment. To send as an attachment, bring it on screen in Adobe Acrobat and select FILE > SEND MAIL > PAGE BY EMAIL. From the box that appears, you can send to more than one person at a time. Include a brief personal message and sign off with your name so recipients will know it is not spam. Then click on SEND. If spell check appears, select IGNORE ALL. An optional method is to copy this file to a disk and process it as you would any other email attachment.