

On The Threshold of History

Jack Kane

September 2011 - January 2012

Contents

Preface	iii
0.1 On the purpose and scope of this work	iii
0.2 On the structure of this book	iii
0.3 On the Author and His Political Views	iv
0.4 Acknowledgements	iv
1 Brainwashing	1
1.1 School	1
1.1.1 Structure of the School System	2
1.1.2 Brief History of the School System	6
1.1.3 Conclusions Regarding Compulsory Schooling	10
1.1.4 The Colleges and the Universities	11
1.1.5 Graduate School	14
1.1.6 On the Education of the Oligarchs	15
1.2 Mass Media	17
1.2.1 Overall Structure of the Mass Media	17
1.2.2 Television	21
1.2.3 A Brief History of the Mass Media	22
2 Smoking Guns	25
2.1 9/11	25
2.1.1 <i>Casus Belli</i> in American History	25
2.1.2 The Post-Communist Programme	29
2.1.3 The Rotten Stench of 9/11	33
2.1.4 The Consequences of 9/11	38
2.2 2008 Economic Meltdown	39
2.2.1 The 2008 Crash	40
2.2.2 Real and Imaginary Problems of the World Economy	43
2.2.3 Inflation and Deflation	57
2.2.4 The Way Out	63
3 The Big Plan	71
3.1 Utopianism Through the Ages	71
3.1.1 Plato	71
3.1.2 Aristotle	75
3.1.3 Machiavelli	78
3.1.4 Thomas More	81
3.1.5 Jean Calvin	84
3.1.6 Tommaso Campanella	86
3.1.7 Francis Bacon	87
3.1.8 Thomas Hobbes	89
3.1.9 Benedict Spinoza	93

3.1.10	Jeremy Bentham	96
3.1.11	Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels	100
3.1.12	H.G. Wells	104
3.1.13	Other utopianist literature	106
3.2	The Big Plan Today	107
3.3	Malthusianism	109
3.3.1	Thomas Malthus	110
3.3.2	Darwin and Galton	112
3.3.3	Into the 20th Century	115
3.3.4	Bertrand Russell, the Huxleys, and C.G. Darwin	118
3.3.5	<i>NSM200</i> and Club of Rome	132
3.3.6	<i>Agenda 21</i> and Other Recent Developments	138
3.3.7	<i>The Legacy of Malthus</i>	146
3.4	Leaks From the Inside	152
3.4.1	1938 RIIA Meeting	152
3.4.2	Foundation X	155
3.4.3	Lindsey Williams	157
3.4.4	<i>New Order of Barbarians</i>	159
4	Oligarchy	167
4.1	In History	167
4.2	Outlook	172
4.3	Psychopathy	176
4.3.1	Human Nature	176
4.3.2	Psychopathy	181
4.4	Methods of Oligarchy	187
5	Secret Societies	191
5.1	Structure	192
5.2	RIIA	196
5.3	CFR	206
5.4	Skull and Bones	208
5.5	Bilderberg Group	213
5.6	Bohemian Grove	215
5.7	Freemasonry	218
5.8	Illuminati	228
5.8.1	Structure and Doctrine	229
5.8.2	The French Revolution	235
5.9	Mazzini & Co	241
5.9.1	Fraternité	245
5.9.2	Égalité	249
5.9.3	Currents of Socialism	255
5.10	Communists	259
5.10.1	1905	259
5.10.2	1917	262
5.10.3	1920-1990	271
5.11	Jews	279
5.12	Mormons	313
5.13	Knights of Malta	316
5.13.1	History	316
5.13.2	January 2011 Seymour Hersh Findings	318
5.13.3	Members	321

5.14	And So On	322
5.14.1	Knights of Columbus	322
5.14.2	Society of the Cincinnati	323
5.14.3	Theosophical Society	323
5.14.4	Rosicrucianism	326
5.14.5	Golden Dawn	326
5.14.6	Order of St Joachim	326
5.14.7	Martinists & Synarchism	327
5.14.8	Aristotelian Society	327
5.14.9	Society for Psychical Research	327
5.14.10	Fabian Society	328
5.14.11	X Club	329
5.15	Conclusions	329
6	The Foundations	331
6.1	Origins	331
6.1.1	Carnegie	331
6.1.2	Rockefeller	333
6.1.3	Ford	334
6.1.4	And a Few Others	334
6.2	History and Effects	335
6.3	Color-Coups	341
7	Concepts	347
7.1	Tribalism	347
7.2	Revolutions	355
7.3	The State	363
8	History	373
8.1	The American Founding Fathers	373
8.2	The American Civil War	375
8.3	The Extension of World War I	379
8.4	The Kingfish	383
8.5	Wall Street and FDR	406
8.6	Wall Street Und Adolf	413
8.7	Some Notes on WWII	421
8.7.1	A Few Words on the Appeasement	421
8.7.2	Red Symphony and the Unholy Alliance	424
8.7.3	The English Plan to "Invade" Norway and "Aid" Finland	434
8.7.4	Debacle and Miracle at Dunkirk	437
8.7.5	Hitler Loses His Head and Bombs London	437
8.7.6	Stalin Almost Throws Away the War	438
8.7.7	The Empire of the Sun Wants a Place Under It	442
8.7.8	Churchill Bungles Away	444
8.8	After the War: American Empire	453
8.9	The International Drug Trade	454
8.9.1	The British Invent the Opium Trade	454
8.9.2	Acid	458
8.9.3	The War on Drugs	468
8.10	Masons in the Vatican	469

9 Creeds	485
9.1 A Few Words on Religion	485
9.2 Secular Humanism	488
9.3 Behaviorism	495
9.4 Free Market Fundamentalism	502
9.4.1 Consumerism	515
9.4.2 "Objectivism" (Ayn Rand)	518
9.5 Multiculturalism	523
9.6 The Cult of Productivity	529
9.7 The Peak Oil Cult	532
9.8 Anthropogenic Global Warming	542
9.9 The New Age Religion	556
9.10 Darwinism	575
10 Problems	613
10.1 The Mass Perversion of Society	613
10.1.1 Maddog Kinsey	613
10.1.2 The Fallout	621
10.2 The Poisoning of the World	634
10.3 The Food Crisis	655
10.4 Vaccines	658
10.4.1 Fun Facts About Vaccines	661
10.4.2 Dr Tenpenny's <i>Fowl!</i>	677
10.5 Psycho-pharma-genocide	683
10.5.1 Depression and its fellow horsemen	683
10.5.2 The Evidence	696
10.6 Modern Medicine	717
10.6.1 Some Data	719
10.7 The Demographic Collapse	723
10.7.1 Causes and Effects	724
11 What Do We Do?	727
11.1 A Summary of the Problems We Face	727
11.2 Where Things Are Going	727
11.3 So What Do We Do?	734
11.4 General Principles	734
11.5 The Wizards of Oz and Exponential Growth	738
11.6 Concluding Thoughts	742
Bibliography	747

Preface

0.1 On the purpose and scope of this work

Humanity is in a state of acute crisis. War tears the Middle East asunder. An economic calamity of murky origins threatens the superstructure of the world economy. Culture everywhere decays as people abandon all restraint and seek to escape a hideous reality through legal and illegal drugs, thoughtless sex and perversity, and monotonous degrading pseudo-entertainment. The old religions are collapsing into a rubble of nihilism and fanatic chauvinistic false orthodoxy.

What is going on?

This book seeks to explain the true nature of the problems we face. The conclusions presented here are unpalatable and contradictory to mainstream thought. The available evidence, however, is overwhelming and undeniable.

I challenge the reader to examine my sources and to draw his own conclusions. The sources are an assortment of legendary philosophers, master historians, reputable journalists (including Pulitzer winners and nominees), high-ranking officers, university academics, first-hand witnesses of events, independent scholars, insider whistle-blowers, and semi-anonymous authors of official documents. Some of the matters I examine are controversial. I do not seek controversy; quite the contrary. However, I feel I must include all material relevant to my thesis.

Because of the immensity of the matter under examinations, this work limits itself to a general overview of the current scene of the global theatre. Each of the chapters of this book is a topic worth of multi-volume book-length examinations; indeed, such exist and will be referenced to.

There exist books similar to this one. I try to connect the ideas of others while contributing thoughts of my own. Finally, I admit that one of the major reasons for producing this work is my desire to compose and order the knowledge I have recently acquired, a process best done through writing.

I seek to establish my case gradually. The reader can find the overall conclusions at the end of the book.

0.2 On the structure of this book

When examining a particular issue, I adopt a two-pronged approach:

- Structural Analysis
- Historical Analysis

A structural analysis is necessary given phenomena of unclear origins. Likewise, when the structure of our subject is too oblique, we must look at its history. Ideally, the two analyses synergize to reinforce a common conclusion.

In regard to referencing: I reference major works within the text. I prefer that approach to the use of endnotes, because 1) I want to encourage the reader to consult the original sources; 2) I want to stress that (most of) my sources are eminently credible; and 3) in my experience, it is easier to remember sources when the author references them directly rather than through endnotes.

Facts that one can trivially check will not be referenced.

In regard to quotations - some chapters rely on those extensively. The reality is that on a number of critical issues, there exist very few useful sources. For example, Quigley's *Anglo-American Establishment* is the definitive work on the Rhodes Trust. There is nothing else like it. Wormser's book on the foundations is also unique. Whitaker's expose on psychotropic drugs is without parallel. Billington's work on 19th century ideologies is an amazing piece of scholarship. These authors make some statements, which are scarcely unbelievable to the lay reader - and therefore, I prefer to quote such statements in full, rather than to reword and integrate them in my own flow of thoughts. Let me note that in principle, finding an appropriate quote can consume more time and it would take to write a few of paragraphs of equivalent length.

The reader will notice that in many of my references, I eschew page numbers. This is because I only have electronic copies of the bulk of the books I use, and the page numbers in those copies do not always correspond to the page numbers of the printed originals.

A word on the use of Wikipedia - in the past few years, Wikipedia has become a solid source for factual data. If one wants to know a certain date or a certain figure, Wikipedia serves. At the same time, the online encyclopedia has become a paragon of political correctness. Its views are the official views. Hence, it is unwise to regard any politically nuanced statement in Wikipedia, no matter how innocent, as true.

This work focuses on America for a number of reasons. First, I resided in America at the time of the writing. Second, America still is easily the most important nation on Earth. Third, since 1945, America has been, to a degree, the cultural center of the Western World. Developments in America tended to spread across the West, and in today's "globalized" era, tend to spread across the entire world. Thus, the non-American reader should be able to extrapolate the conclusions I make in regard to America to the context of his own environment. And fourth, frankly, I like America and find it fascinating.

0.3 On the Author and His Political Views

Whatever ideology I want to aspire to can be summarized in the following three principles:

- Treat others as you would like others to treat you.
- The search for Truth is a worthy ultimate goal in life.
- Self-preservation is not a right nor a privilege, but an axiom of existence.

0.4 Acknowledgements

Others have reached conclusions similar or identical to mine. This is inevitable, because reality is absolute. Wherever I consciously draw on others' works, I will acknowledge my intellectual debt. I must note that often I reached conclusions that I later saw vindicated in the research of like-minded thinkers.

I present a full list of references at the end of the book. Here I express my profound gratitude to the following three persons: the rambunctious teacher and lecturer John Taylor Gatto, the enigmatic musician and radio-host Alan Watt, and the late master historian Carroll Quigley. I also give due credit to the superior historian-economists Webster Tarpley and William Engdahl.

I also thank my family and my close friends, for everything and for nothing in particular.

Chapter 1

We Are All Victims of Brainwashing

The history of human civilization is the history of oligarchism. Throughout the ages in all societies a tiny self-perpetuating inbred class often possessed of a psychotic mentality has pulled the strings and tricked and goaded the herds of humanity into obedience and subservience. Let us not call these usurpers "Elites" - let us instead adopt the negative term "Oligarchs." I distinguish here between the general ruling classes, the small-'o' oligarchs, and the tiny powerful subclasses of rulers, who possess the majority of power - those, I call big-'O' Oligarchs. In some ages the rule of the Oligarchy was blatant. The medieval knights took their bounty at the point of the sword. In modern days, in our pseudo-democracies, the mechanisms of control are subtler and more insidious.

Today the richest 1% Americans control a third of America's net worth, two-fifths of the net wealth, and three-fifths of the business equities and the financial securities. Such wealth translates into the controlling interest of raw political and economic power. The figures are the official ones; the real extents of the wealth and influence of the top 1%, and the top 0.1% in particular, are far greater. Regardless, these figures are a blatant demonstration of the existence and preponderance of the Oligarchy.

One does not obtain and retain power by being nice and telling the truth. Power politics is the business of treachery, deceit, fraud, and murder - in short, of Machiavellianism.

The Oligarchs realize that they are few while the downtrodden are many. This is inevitable, because no right-minded Oligarch wants to share the spoils with too many fellow sharks. The masses must be neutralized somehow. There are two obvious ways of controlling a population: force and deceit. The Oligarchs use both methods; however, modern technological developments have rendered the adoption of deceitful modes of control both more practicable and more convenient.

It is ideas that drive men. Control a man's mind and you control his actions. The most powerful and pernicious technique of tyranny is the manipulation of the victim's mental processes. The appropriately ugly term for this phenomenon is *brainwashing*.

Clearly, the two most useful tools for brainwashing today are the schooling system and the mass media. Indeed, both structures are dedicated to the indoctrination of the public, as we endeavour to show in this chapter.

The realization that *we are all the victims of intense brainwashing* is an absolute pre-requisite for any realistic examination of the world.

1.1 School

The schooling system in all modern nations is a system for the indoctrination of the young. Some nations provide better education by focusing on the so-called classical educational methods - but indoctrination is ubiquitous across the world.

For references on the subject, we direct the reader to the works of authors John Taylor Gatto, Charlotte Iserbyt, Samuel Blumenfeld, Beverly Eakman, and Ivan Illich. In particular, the reader is advised to read Gatto's *Underground History of American Education* (2001), and Iserbyt's *The*

Deliberate Dumbing-Down of America (1999). Gatto (1935-) is a former New York teacher of the year at both the state and city levels. Iserbyt (1930-) was born into the Eastcoast Establishment and has extensive insider experience within the US government. Her father and grandfather were members of the powerful Skull and Bones secret society, which we examine later in this work.

1.1.1 Structure of the School System

Public schools operate in the following manner: the students are required by law to attend and the citizens are required by law to pay for the schools. Inside the schools, the students must obey the authority figures of the professional teachers, who have had training in "teaching," but often have not seriously studied the subjects they are supposed to teach.

School-days usually last from morning to mid-afternoon. Homework extends the domain of school into the students' bedrooms.

The students have no real choice in the selection of material or the composition of their timetables. So the pupils study something for an hour or less, and then, willy-nilly, switch to another subject. Some schools require the students to move from room to room and to mingle with new groups of people every hour or so.

The teachers evaluate their students via multiple-choice tests, which test, simply, how well the students take multiple choice tests. There are a few tricks to such tests; the rest is rote. Standardized tests demolish any independence teachers have, because standardized tests necessarily channel all classwork into preparation for the testing. In effect, this preparation amounts to the memorization of the answers to the various questions that may appear on the standard exam.

Schools tend to be hideous. The high school that I attended in Canada looked like a bunker. There was not a window in the whole place. The school was the largest high school in a provincial capital. The four-five other schools in my neighbourhood were also built in the bunker style. The situation in America is no better. The recent documentary *The War on Kids* (2009) makes the point that American schools increasingly resemble jails.

One of the poorly understood properties of the school system is its segregational tendency. Forget black and white segregation; schools cut off all children from the rest of society. Worse, school divides children into castes, so that often the 10 year olds do not talk to the 11 year olds; and the 14 year olds are not even in the same building. A favourite argument of the proponents of schools is that schools allow children to "socialize." As if children would not talk to anyone if it were not for the schools, in which, incidentally, children are supposed to study in silence.

How does such a system affect a young person's psychology?

The inevitable outcome of mandatory school attendance and mandatory deference to the teacher authority figure is the inculcation of *a habit of obedience* into the child's mindset. Obedient children grow up to become obedient workers, soldiers, patients, and consumers. What better way to perpetuate an Oligarchy than to train the public to **obey**?

Forcing children into herds leads to the development of *collectivist mentalities* that work on the basis of hiveminds. As Alan Watt remarks, it is no coincidence that school-buses are black-and-yellow - the colours of the bee. This extinction of individuality is dear to the controllers of society, for it is easier to control a mob than to control an individual. Collectivism for the many is in fact one of the long-term goals of the Oligarchs, as we will see in subsequent chapters.

School-bells come straight out of the works of Pavlov, Watson, and Skinner, and the purpose of school-bells is the same as in the works of those great luminaries. Pavlov enjoyed working with dogs, Thorndike opted for chickens, Skinner preferred mice and (the likely specious story goes) his own daughter, and today the schools operate on all our daughters and sons. Bells train children in *blind adherence to schedules*, and in *habitual reaction to simple stimuli*. The connection between such training, Taylorism ("Scientific Management"), and factories (or cubicled offices), is obvious.

The incessant shuffling that characterizes school life contributes to the *annihilation of the ability to concentrate* in students. Computer programmers have a term for absolute concentration - "the

zone". When inside the zone, the programmer solves hard problems quickly and easily. Ideas and thoughts spring forth from the recesses of his consciousness. How does one enter the zone? The two key ingredients are solitude and time. One needs to be alone to concentrate, and one needs some time to accelerate and focus one's mental processes. The zone is almost unobtainable in school, because classes change every hour, and because the teacher and one's fellow students rarely shut up. I must admit that occasionally, when papers had to be graded, my teachers announced what they termed "work periods." We, the students, were supposed to quietly sit and read. Sitting and reading is great and best accomplished at home or in the park or in the library.

Television finishes off whatever ability to concentrate the students manage to preserve.

The segregation of students from the rest of society contributes to mob thinking, *diminishes trust in the family* and in the older members of society in general, and insulates the students from the wisdom of experience of their elders. School divides and the Oligarchs conquer.

Moreover, the herding of students into classes creates *clannishness and the division into castes*. Thus, from an early age, the students are taught that there is an unreachable superclass of managers somewhere high above (the school administrators), then a visible class of managers (the teachers), and then classes of lower gradations which vary in rigour from school to school. In Japan, for example, the eight-graders boss around the seventh-graders, and the ninth-graders boss around all the younger pupils. The hierarchy is total. Then there is the problem of bullying. Bullying is inherent to schools. Hierarchically minded societies passively permit bullying - because it fits into the overall structure. The anti-human environments prevalent in most schools *directly suppress the vivacity of children*. How can one possibly enjoy sitting in a window-less room crammed with uncomfortable desks and human flesh? Throw a window or two into the picture if you like; it still looks ugly. The day-long sitting worsens the damage. Of course, the training in sitting prepares the students for a lifetime of cubicles and TV. There is a method to the madness. Things do not happen in this world for no reason.

Studying under the strict instructions of others, writing essays on topics set by others, and evaluating one's worth through the opinions of arbitrary authorities, leads to the *surgical removal of creativity* from the victims of schooling. Such clandestine operations are necessary, because the last thing an oligarchy wants from its thralls is the ability to surprise.

The endless grading that takes place in the schools *renders children incapable of self-evaluation*. In its travesty, the school system insists that the only real measure of worth is one's test score. The real damage caused by this obscene absurdity is conspicuous and ubiquitous. If the reader has had any experience with teaching, he may remember minor tragedies of various kinds: the over-achieving girl crying for receiving a meaningless failing grade; the timid boy agonizing over his ineptitude for a subject he detests but has to take; the angry kid who storms into class, writes a perfect paper, and storms out before the bell has rung - the list is long and rich in third-rate misery.

The packing of tons of fresh adolescent meat into tight sterile spaces leads to a *compulsive obsession with sex* in the minds of the young. Some yearning for sex is natural and in fact necessary for the perpetuation of life. However, pre-occupation with sex diverts people from more important endeavours. Sex is necessary, but not overly important.

One of the worst crimes of standardized schooling is its *insistence on uniformity*. The pupils must study the same topics, from the same books, in the same buildings. Some places even force children to dress uniformly. This unnatural universal standardization is a crime against common sense. People are different. They can be tall, short, blue-eyed, black-eyed, curly, bald, white-skinned, strong, male, female, garrulous, silent, bubbly, serious, and so on. People are different, they have different interests, they have different abilities - so why should we subject them to a process of mass standardization? Who besides the factory owners, the generals, the ad-men, and the demagogues could possibly benefit from such an arrangement?

A subtler problem is the *infantilism* inherent in modern schooling. After twelve years of school and four more years of college, many people never grow up. Responsibility and self-sufficiency are conditions necessary for the attainment of maturity. School denies both. The good pupil's only responsibilities are his homeworks, and perhaps some domestic chores. Self-sufficiency is out of the

question - the spare change collected at the repugnant after-school MacJob barely suffices for the latest trendy gadgets and the occasional cinema ticket. Two hundred years ago a male of the age of thirteen was considered a grown man. Today, most twenty-three year olds have the mentality of children. Is not the sight of a roomfull of grown men and women sitting on tiny rainbow-colored desks ridiculous? They have to ask for permission to go to the loo, for goodness's sake! People who can get married, go to war, and drink themselves blind, have to ask for permission to go to the can! Welcome to grade twelve.

A standard argument in favor of forced schooling is that at least school develops the intelligence of its prisoners. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Perhaps, a century ago, the schools did teach something of use. Today, the schools are gigantic factories of intellectual debility.

Learning rests on the pillars of literacy, history, and mathematics. Literacy deals with reading, writing, and public speaking. The more languages one commands, the better. Without reading one can not tap into the whole depth of recorded human knowledge. Writing helps synthesize one's thoughts, and helps expose one's ideas to a large audience. Public speaking is the most powerful way of convincing others of one's views.

History examines what has been. It is impossible to understand the present without understanding the past - that is why Orwell said that he who controls the past controls the future, and he who controls the present controls the past. Furthermore, one can not study sociology, economics, psychology, or any of the related "soft" sciences without a good grounding in history.

Mathematics is the basis of all hard sciences. The denizen of the modern computerized world needs at least a modicum of mathematics to function coherently. Moreover, mathematics, in itself, is a mode of thinking. The mathematical way of thinking is what Plato termed the dialectical way of thinking. The mathematical way of thinking necessarily works with ideas rather than apparent objects - and therein its great power.

Today, the schools either misteach, or fail to teach, these three fundamental subjects.

For an overview of the fallout, try Mark Bauerlein's *The Dumbest Generation* (2008).

Here are some of the mechanics of the process of dumbing-down:

To make sure that children do not learn to read, the Oligarchs came up with the Dick and Jane scam. *Dick and Jane* was a basal reader that came along in the US in the 1930s. Until then, children had learned to read phonetically, by learning the sounds of the letters, and then associating the sounds of the whole words with the sounds of known words. This system had worked for millennia and still works. Enter Dick and Jane and scientific dumbing-down. The Dick-and-Jane method does not bother with phonetics and instead treats words as pictures. So instead of constructing the words letter by letter, the children memorize the entire words. While the phonetic memory requires little memorization and some creativity, the whole word method of learning to read exerts extreme weight on one's faculties of memorization. Learning to read via the whole word process is tiresome and boring. Dick and Jane makes many children hate reading, which of course is the whole point.

Gatto examines the ups and downs of American literacy in chapter 3 of his *History*. Also see Samuel Blumenfeld's speech *Are Public Schools Harming Your Kids?*

It is worth noting that societies endowed with logographic writing (a character for each word rather than an alphabet) have notoriously tended to be collectivistic, dictatorial, and obedient. China and Japan are perfect examples of this phenomenon. An illiterate population is obviously dependent on its literate classes for the creation and explanation of ideas. A small literate elite can control such a society with relative ease. Notice that by using the schools to teach the masses to read logographic characters, one can easily throw obedience training into the program. Six years of rote repetition under the scrutiny of the teacher authority figure installs a strong habit of subservience.

Another key point is that merely knowing how to read is not enough. To profit from reading, one must read serious reading matter. School prevents children from reading by wasting their time and by forcing them to read the approved, sanitized material prepared by the (often unwitting or duped)

agents of the Oligarchs.

In consequence, today, most people simply do not read, and those who read stick to the *New York Times* and to other controlled sources of information.

The misteaching of mathematics proceeds along similar lines. Mathematics requires creativity and abstract thinking. For example, any child can understand the formulation of the Pythagorean Theorem. Proving the theorem requires some invention; understanding one of the many standard proofs merely requires some abstract thinking.

So the Oligarchs and their agents came up with a curriculum that teaches mathematics in a way, which focuses on memorization and repetition. The teacher teaches a formula. The students memorize the formula and apply the formula 50 times. After a few years of this treatment, the students know no mathematics, because knowing a formula is like knowing how to pull a lever. Anyone can pull a lever. But the lever does not matter - what matters is the mechanism behind the lever. The students rarely realize what is happening to them and usually internalize their frustration in the form of hatred toward mathematics.

As a professional instructor in mathematics I can testify that the process I described above is today the reality in the classroom. There is little one can do with college students who have suffered twelve years of this type of indoctrination. To make sure that instructors are completely shackled, those in charge force specific curricula and textbooks on the teachers. Never mind if the curricula make no sense or if the textbooks are atrocious. The final instrument of control is the outside standardized exam. These exams test first of all one's ability to write exams. In effect, most teachers do not teach specific subjects - rather, they teach exam taking. There are smart ways of taking exams and stupid ways of taking exams. The stupidest, and most popular, way of preparing for exams is the memorization of the answers to all questions that may possible appear on the exam.

School misteaches history by selective omission. By now, schools practically omit the whole subject of history. Instead of history, we have "social studies," whatever that is. For a thorough overview of the subject, try James Loewen's *Lies My Teacher Told Me* (1995). An obvious example of selective omission is official history's failure to examine the role of the various secret societies in world history. For example, Freemasonry was instrumental in both the American and French revolution. Try to find this basic but critical fact in any mainstream textbook.

Or take the CFR (Council on Foreign Relations) - a brief look at the membership list of the CFR dispels any illusions one may hold about the existence of democracy in America in the post-WWI era. And yet only a few know of the CFR. Worse, the ignorant many refuse to look into the CFR, because they assume that the schools teach them all that they need to know.

The manipulation of history is a powerful tool in the hands of the controllers. To get a people to go to war all you need to do is to teach them clannishness and xenophobia. Erich Maria Remarque accented on this problem in his *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1929).

Another critical omission entails the failure to properly teach the "evolution" and influence of the ideas of Thomas Malthus et al. - which have given us Economic Liberalism, Darwinism, eugenicism, Social Darwinism, eco-fascism and more.

Today, people do not know history. To highlight the mass public's spectacular ignorance, we borrow a few examples from Chapter 1 of Bauerlein's *Dumbest Generation* book:

- 52% of people tested chose Germany, Japan, or Italy over the USSR as a US ally in WWII.
- 37% did not know that the 1962 US-Cuba dispute arose over missiles in Cuba.
- Only 29% knew what "reconstruction" (in American history) refers to.
- Only 41% could name the three branches of government.
- In 2006 only 26% of 20-somethings tested could identify Condoleezza Rice as Secretary of State, and only 15% knew Putin was the president of Russia.

The facts speak for themselves. The people's ignorance is monstrous in magnitude and dangerous in its implications. A people so ignorant lack the elementary knowledge one needs to make reasonable decisions. A people so ignorant are the prey to all demagogues, puppet masters and cult leaders. Cynics and elitist will argue that the people are to blame for their own ignorance. This is the view of the rapist who claims that the rape-victim was "asking for it."

If people emerge from twelve years of costly compulsory schooling stupid and ignorant, then we can only conclude that the purpose of schooling is the creation of stupid and ignorant people. Schools are not underfunded. They do exactly what they were designed to do.

It should be pointed out that *mass schooling is not free*. There is no such thing as "free schooling." The public pays for the schools through taxes. It does not matter if you have no school-aged children or if you disapprove of the school system - you still have to pay. The schools are not underfunded, in fact it is easy to check that the real amount of money spent annually per American pupil has been steadily rising. From the National Center for Education Statistics - per pupil spending in public elementary and secondary schools in 2008-2009 dollars: 1962 - 2,808; 1971 - 4,552; 1981 - 5,718; 1991 - 7,857; 2001 - 9,048; 2008 - 10,441.¹ Higher spending does not by itself lead to better education! Thus, apart from everything else, the schools are a black hole in the American economy.

In sum, compulsory schooling captures defenceless and gullible children and spits out herds of stupid, broken, timid, confused, impressionable, thoughtless, group-minded, dull people who are adults in name only. The results are the intended results. The school system is the product of careful, long-term, deliberate construction.

1.1.2 Brief History of the School System

The school system in its modern shape came to existence in the West in the 19th century for the following key purposes:

- First, to provide obedient troops for the great national armies of the post-Napoleonic era.
- Second, to provide obedient workers for the Industrial Revolution.

Appropriately enough, the modern schools appeared in the power-house of the 19th century - the Kingdom of Prussia, which later became the core of the German Reich. After Napoleon smashed the Prussian armies at Jena, the Prussian bosses got their act together, herded the kingdom's children into schools, and proceeded to construct an awesome war-machine which remained the best in the world until the combined might of the Americans and the Soviets finally brought Germany to its knees in 1945. The Prussians smashed Napoleon at Waterloo, demolished Austria in 1866, made short work of France in 1870, and beat Russia, France and England before succumbing to the supremacy of the Americans in the wane of World War I. People in high places took notice of Prussia's success.

The Japanese during the Meiji Restoration lifted the German constitution along with the German school system and enacted their own industrial and military expansions in the Far East.

The Japanese were not the only admirers of the wonderful Prussian school system. Prussia held a monopoly on the world's doctorate-giving universities by virtue of inventing the modern research university. Flocks of the young members of the American elite sailed to Prussia-Germany in the 19th century to study Hegelianism and Prussianism and to obtain PhDs. Enamoured with Prussia, and conscious of the advantages (to themselves in particular) of mass schooling, these noble Americans came back home and set to recreating the wonderful Prussian paradise on American soil. The Robber Barrons enthusiastically supported the projects, and set up massive foundations for the continual advancement of the indoctrination of the American people. Massachusetts instituted compulsory schooling in 1850. By 1918, compulsory schooling held sway in all states.

¹<http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=66>, accessed on 8 October 2011

France introduced compulsory schooling in 1882, after the humiliation of Sedan.

England adopted forced schooling in 1870.

The countries listed above, along with the moribund Ottoman and Habsburg empires, owned the world in the 19th century. The plethora of countries that came into existence between 1820 and 1960 modelled themselves on the few superpowers.

These dates are extremely important, because they tell the whole story. Imperial Germany, dominated by the Junker/landowner and industrial classes, was not a democracy. Meiji Japan was not a democracy. Late 19th century Britain was thoroughly oligarchical (the Representation of the People Act 1884 gave the vote to only about 30% of the population). Robber Baron America was oligarchical (men received a good deal of suffrage in 1870; women got the vote only in 1920; full enfranchisement only arrived in 1965). Did the ruling cliques of societies introduce compulsory schooling to *liberate* the masses? Of course not!

To drive the point home, observe that compulsory education hit Russia only *after* the Soviets came to power. It is easy and probably correct to argue that the pre-Bolshevik aristocracy wanted to keep the peasantry in a state of ignorance; but it would be absurd to argue that the Bolsheviks wanted to "educate" the masses for "freedom." And yet the Soviet educational system was not much different from the systems in the West.

It is worth noting that while the Soviets undeniably, and rather obviously, put the clamps down on the ideological disciplines, they managed to produce an excellent system of technical education. The Soviet mathematicians, physicists, and engineers were top class.

By 1900, the world was ripe and ready for the lunacy of the 20th century. Billions of people went to work in the factories and the mines and the clerk offices that came with the industrial revolution. Peasants had been exploited for centuries, but at least the peasant lives on the land, under the sun, in an organic community. The miners and the factory-workers and the clerks of the 20th century performed their mechanical tasks in inhuman conditions.

Then we have the wars. Before the French Revolution, wars tended to be isolated affairs. The armies were mercenary armies of limited size. The unholy alliance of mass schooling and the industrial manufacture of arms prepared the ground for the World Wars of the 20th century. And so the well-schooled Europeans obediently donned their uniforms and went to the mass slaughter of World War One. People had gone to war before for little good reason. But World War I, in its impersonal butchery, was something special.

The reader may be thinking to himself, "But surely all of this happened by mistake! The schools could not have been designed for such sinister purposes!"

Follow a selection of quotations from the gurus of mass schooling:

- From Gatto's *History*, Chapter 2:

...the 1934 edition of Ellwood P. Cubberleys *Public Education in the United States* is explicit about what happened and why. As Cubberley puts it:

It has come to be desirable that children should not engage in productive labor. On the contrary, all recent thinking...[is] opposed to their doing so. Both the interests of organized labor and the interests of the nation have set against child labor.

- From Gatto's *History*, Chapter 2:

...it will be useful for you to hear a few excerpts from the first mission statement of Rockefeller's General Education Board as they occur in a document called *Occasional Letter Number One (1906)*:

In our dreams...people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hands. The present educational conventions [intellectual and character

education] fade from our minds, and unhampered by tradition we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive folk. We shall not try to make these people or any of their children into philosophers or men of learning or men of science. We have not to raise up from among them authors, educators, poets or men of letters. We shall not search for embryo great artists, painters, musicians, nor lawyers, doctors, preachers, politicians, statesmen, of whom we have ample supply. The task we set before ourselves is very simple... we will organize children... and teach them to do in a perfect way the things their fathers and mothers are doing in an imperfect way.

- From Gatto's *History*, Chapter 5:

If you have a hard time believing that this revolution in the contract ordinary Americans had with their political state was intentionally provoked, it's time for you to meet William Torrey Harris, U.S. Commissioner of Education from 1889 to 1906. No one, other than Cubberley, who rose out of the ranks of professional pedagogues ever had as much influence as Harris. Harris both standardized and Germanized our schools. Listen to his voice from *The Philosophy of Education*, published in 1906:

Ninety-nine [students] out of a hundred are automata, careful to walk in prescribed paths, careful to follow the prescribed custom. This is not an accident but the result of substantial education, which, scientifically defined, is the subsumption of the individual.

The Philosophy of Education (1906)

The great purpose of school can be realized better in dark, airless, ugly places.... It is to master the physical self, to transcend the beauty of nature. School should develop the power to withdraw from the external world.

The Philosophy of Education (1906)

- From Iserbyt's *Dumbing Down*, chapter 2:

A DELIBERATE MATH "DUMB DOWN" WAS SERIOUSLY DISCUSSED IN 1928. A TEACHER NAMED O.A. Nelson, John Dewey, Edward Thorndike (who conducted early behavioral psychology experiments with chickens), and other Council on Foreign Relations members attended a Progressive Education Association meeting in 1928 at which O.A. Nelson was informed that the purpose of "new math" was to dumb down students. Nelson revealed in a later interview with Young Parents Alert that the Progressive Education Association was a communist front. According to the National Educator (July, 1979):

Mr. O.A. Nelson, retired educator, has supplied the vitally important documentation needed to support the link-up between the textbooks and the Council on Foreign Relations. His letter was first printed in "Young Parents Alert" (Lake Elmo, Minnesota). His story is self-explanatory.

I know from personal experience what I am talking about. In December 1928, I was asked to talk to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. On December 27th, nave and inexperienced, I agreed. I had done some special work in teaching functional physics in high school. That was to be my topic. The next day, the 28th, a Dr. Ziegler asked me if I would attend a special educational meeting in his room after the AAAS meeting. We met from 10 o'clock [p.m.] until after 2:30 a.m.

We were 13 at the meeting. Two things caused Dr. Ziegler, who was Chairman of the Educational Committee of the Council on Foreign

Relations, to ask me to attend... my talk on the teaching of functional physics in high school, and the fact that I was a member of a group known as the Progressive Educators of America, which was nothing but a Communist front. I thought the word "progressive" meant progress for better schools. Eleven of those attending the meeting were leaders in education. Drs. John Dewey and Edward Thorndike, from Columbia University, were there, and the others were of equal rank. I checked later and found that ALL were paid members of the Communist Party of Russia. I was classified as a member of the Party, but I did not know it at the time.

The sole work of the group was to destroy our schools! We spent one hour and forty-five minutes discussing the so-called "Modern Math." At one point I objected because there was too much memory work, and math is reasoning; not memory. Dr. Ziegler turned to me and said, "Nelson, wake up! That is what we want... a math that the pupils cannot apply to life situations when they get out of school!" That math was not introduced until much later, as those present thought it was too radical a change. A milder course by Dr. Breckner was substituted but it was also worthless, as far as understanding math was concerned. The radical change was introduced in 1952. It was the one we are using now. So, if pupils come out of high school now, not knowing any math, don't blame them. The results are supposed to be worthless.

We provide a final reference, to Alexander Inglis's *Principles of Secondary Education* (1918). Gatto discusses that work in Ch. 16 of *Underground History*. Inglis (1879-1924) was an influential "progressive" professor in education.

Alexander Inglis, author of *Principles of Secondary Education*, was of Aldrich's [the father of the Federal Reserve] class. He wrote that the new schools were being expressly created to serve a command economy and command society, one in which the controlling coalition would be drawn from important institutional stakeholders in the future. According to Inglis, the first function of schooling is *adjustive*, establishing fixed habits of reaction to authority. This prepares the young to accept whatever management dictates when they are grown. Second is the *diagnostic* function. School determines each student's "proper" social role, logging it mathematically on cumulative records to justify the next function, *sorting*. Individuals are to be trained only so far as their likely destination in the social machine, not one step beyond. *Conformity* is the fourth function. Kids are to be made alike, not from any passion for egalitarianism, but so future behavior will be predictable, in service to market and political research. Next is the *hygienic* function. This has nothing to do with individual health, only the health of the "race." This is polite code for saying that school should accelerate Darwinian natural selection by tagging the unfit so clearly they drop from the reproduction sweepstakes. And last is the *propaedeutic* function, a fancy word meaning that a small fraction of kids will slowly be trained to take over management of the system, guardians of a population deliberately dumbed down and rendered childlike in order that government and economic life can be managed with a minimum of hassle. And there you have the formula: adjustment, diagnosis, sorting, conformity, racial hygiene, and continuity. This is the man for whom an honor lecture in education at Harvard is named.

Inglis's work's copyright has expired, and so the book can be found on www.archive.org. The "functions" are on pages 375-376. So if you do not believe me so far, dear reader, by all means find the book and look up the reference.

The reader can find other similar quotations, and the details of the history of schooling in America and in the world, in the works of Gatto, Iserbyt and Blumenfeld.

Much more can be said about schooling. For example, it is worth reiterating that the foundational operating principle of modern schooling is the anti-human pseudo-scientific behaviorist theory of Wundt, Pavlov, Watson and Skinner. For a look at the clandestine psychological tests administered in the schools read Beverly Eakman's *Educating For the New World Order* (1991). The catastrophic waste that takes place at the schools is a subject of its own. The problems of school violence and bullying also merit exposition. Some of these issues, while interesting, are beyond the scope of this work. I urge the reader to conduct his own research along the lines that interest or concern him.

At the same time, we will continue to pick up the threads of the history of modern compulsory education as we tackle various other issues of interest.

1.1.3 Conclusions Regarding Compulsory Schooling

Modern schooling was designed to brainwash the majority of the world's population. The schools take healthy, curious children, and try to turn them into cretinous infantile obedient slobs.

Compulsory schooling is our foremost problem, because it enables all the other evils that plague us. A schooling is worse than pure ignorance, because school makes most people hate learning, and fills the heads of the "good" students with pabulum, drivel, and lies. The honest ignoramus understands his limitations and seeks to rectify his deficiencies. The "bad" student, on the other hand, hates himself for failing in school, and assumes that knowledge is worthless. The "good" student, in his delusion, thinks himself wise. Only a few emerge from the meatgrinder not wholly destroyed.

The schools are beyond salvation. To fix the current system, we must:

- Ban compulsory schooling. Only those who want to go to school should go to school.
- Reform school-related taxation and put the educational money to a serious purpose.
- Build school buildings that are worth visiting. No more bunkers!
- Rewrite the textbooks and reorganize the curricula.
- Cut out the trivia and teach useful things like real psychology, real economics, and real history.
- Ban standardized testing.
- Allow for the reintegration of children into adult society.
- Allow for the role of the parents in educating children.
- Move away from accreditation and toward practical competence.

Clearly, such changes would amount to the liquidation of the existent system.

We can not obtain the necessary reforms in the current political climate. The school system is sacrosanct. Too many people depend on the leviathan of indoctrination. The liberal parties of the various nations want to pour more money into the black hole of the school system. The pseudo-conservative factions would like to milk the public in another way - by privatizing the schools. But the schooling system itself is untouchable.

And anyway, one can not just fire all school employees overnight. Many school employees mean well, anyway - though always remember that thoughtless good intentions can lead to trouble. The system has to change gradually. In particular, a system, which focuses on classical education rather than on animal trainings, with teachers who have degrees in various subjects rather than degrees in

- animal training ("education"), and with a lighter administration bereft of psycho-police - would be at least functional, if not optimal.

So what can we do?

Our best strategy is to remove our children from the schools. Those who live in places that allow home-schooling should enjoy their privileges. Those in places that forbid home-schooling (like good old Germany) must protect their children as much as possible, and perhaps consider emigration. An alternative solution would be the establishment of local, neighborhood-based, "private" schools, in which the community pools to organize a formal private school for the education of its own children. I trust the inventiveness of the reader will have no bounds in seeking ways to alleviate the plight of his own children.

Last, let the reader be aware that the logic of the Oligarchical plan demands the eventual worldwide ban of home-schooling.

1.1.4 The Colleges and the Universities

In the 18th century there existed two types of universities. One was the Prussian/German type of research university, which provided research for the corporations and the government. The second type of university was the British-type. Universities of this second class provided a liberal/classical education to the upper class of the host country.

Today the Prussian-style university, replete with the PhD degree, dominates the landscape. Most major universities are research universities. The so-called "liberal arts" colleges lurk in the background and continue to educate the children of the elite, and those members of the lower classes obedient and subservient - or observant and bright - enough to go through the ritual of the acquisition of a professional degree. We will examine the liberal arts colleges in the next section.

The prosperity of the 20th century created the necessity for the opening up of the colleges to the lower classes. To accommodate for this development, the Oligarchs expanded the Prussian university system, the salient features of which are: over-specialization, apprenticeship, and hierarchical control.

Thus, the purpose of most degrees is the channelling of the student into a particular professional stream. Some students are made into engineers, others into journalists, the point being that because of the super-specialization very few receive a well-rounded, or complete, education. This is a form of brainwashing. The engineers scurry forth from the white citadel, proud of their degrees, and happily spend their lives in the service of the corporations and the military. They consider themselves educated, and, amazingly, for the most part never stop to consider the spectacular gaps in their knowledge bases - gaps in the political, historical, and aesthetic aspects.

One of the plagues of over-specialization is the absurd deluge of pseudo-academic papers that engulfs the bits of valuable knowledge that the universities occasionally generate. A professor's academic success is weighted in two ways: by number of publications and by the weight (in terms of subsequent references or journal prestige) of those publications. This forces the professoriate to spawn endless papers on all imaginable topics. One can come up with an infinity of objects of study. Unfortunately, only a few problems really matter. The academics justify their behaviour with the claim that one never knows if one's research may someday prove useful. This is disingenuous. The cumulative arrangement satisfies the Oligarchy. Let most self-styled thinkers waste their time with trivia. The Oligarchy quietly directs research into directions of its own choosing, and between the semi-private, semi-secret thinktanks, and the top universities, the Oligarchs obtain specific results. So, for example, now we have high-level biometric technology, for which there is only one use - the monitoring of the populace. Meanwhile, global poverty deteriorates.

Forced apprenticeship is another aspect of the mind control mechanism of the modern research university. We will examine apprenticeship when we look at graduate school.

Hierarchical control is an indispensable element of the control of the universities. At the top of each university, there is a board composed of the powerful members of the community. This board monitors the affairs of the university and makes sure to remove all elements that may prove inconvenient to the overall system. The illusion of the academic freedom of tenure exists because all tenured professors have jumped through all the loops and have proved themselves innocent of all anti-Oligarchical thought. The apparent paradox of the preponderance of Marxists in university positions will be examined later.

Note that the university is a hierarchical system. At the bottom you have the students, then the graduate students, then the post-docs, then the adjuncts, then those on the way to tenure, then the tenured, then the influential members of the the departments, then the heads of departments, then the deans, and on top sits the board, composed of the owners of society. The top level is semi-independent of the university. The board exercises veto power and acts as the ultimate monitor of control.

The university hierarchy ensures doctrinal compliance and instils the mentality of the hierarchical system into all the minions of the research university.

Even with all the safety catches built into the research university system, the danger of a large educated population was always accounted for. As the 20th century progressed, the Oligarchs (deliberately or through bungling) gradually watered-down the quality of university education. Today, a university education in any but the most technical sciences (mathematics, physics, chemistry) is largely worthless as an education - though the acquired credentials may land one a prestigious job. With the technical sciences, the knowledge comes at the high price of over-specialization.

The claim that the emasculation of the universities was done on purpose will startle some readers. In my view, anyone who has bothered to pay attention, has noticed the deterioration in the standards of the universities. The problem is well-understood and yet does not vanish. One can only adopt the obvious conclusion - namely, that things are as they are, because they were meant to be that way. Carroll Quigley lamented the "suicide" of his Georgetown University almost a half-century ago - see his 1967 article *Is Georgetown University Committing Suicide?* Herein I quote from Quigley's article *Obsolete Academic Disciplines* (written circa '67):

No education is worth much which does not help those who receive it to understand the world in which they live and to feel more at home and more confident in the world. For many years, the experience of Americans in their academic institutions has not been helping, but rather has hindered, that process. That experience has tended to be a kind of brainwashing, seeking, in most cases, to establish a bourgeois or (in recent years) a petty bourgeois outlook. On the higher levels of the system, this has been supplemented by a steadily narrowing of training for a place in the bureaucratic structures which now dominate American life, in business, in government, in education itself, in religion, the law, medicine, and the defense forces. This is reflected in earlier, and in more and more narrow, specialization and in the increasing pedantic nature of so much of the work done in all fields.

On one side, this leaves so-called educated people incapable of understanding the rapidly changing society in which we live and, as the opposite side of the same situation, leaves us facing gigantic problems to whose understanding and solution the existing educational structure has little to contribute (that is why they became gigantic). This can be seen most clearly by asking ourselves the simple question: "In which of our academic disciplines do these problems fall?" Or more concretely, "From which of the existing academic disciplines would we recruit someone to enlighten us on each of these problems?" However we word these questions, there is no answer, for the simple reason that the great problems of our day do not fall into any one academic discipline, and, indeed, cannot be dealt with by committees made up of persons from different academic specialties.

...

Today no great advances can be made, nor can the problems facing us be understood, by anyone who stays within the borders of one of the present academic disciplines. In each, the workers are smothered in overspecialization and pedantry. Yet in each the majority of members are very busy congratulating each other on the wonderful work they are all doing. That is self-deception, for the regular academic disciplines are now bankrupt, incapable of providing their explanations or solutions to problems.

...

If a young man today simply wants to make a very good living associated with freedom and variety, he can do it much better without a college education. Of course he must be educated, but real education today can be obtained much more easily (although it is never easy) in constant attendance at a good public library than at the so-called "best" universities (which are frequently the worst ones). Today, as almost never before, the way lies open to any enterprising young man to find something to do which is now being done badly or not done at all by our bureaucratized society. To do this the first task of the young man must be to dismiss as the myth it is what passes for truth in existing universities. There is a truth and it can be found; it has been found, to some degree, by men in the past, and by men in other societies. The task of finding it is lifelong, and probably continues after bodily death, and the greatest joy of living is the search for it. That is why we are here, but to find it in the accepted wisdom of the existing academic structure is to put oneself in an intellectual prison, which does not help.

Quigley's dirge is doubly pertinent today. The universities have abandoned reality. The U.S. National Center for Education Statistics informs us that ²

Of the 1,601,000 bachelors degrees conferred in 2008-09, the greatest numbers of degrees were conferred in the fields of business (348,000); social sciences and history (169,000); health sciences (120,000); and education (102,000).

So about 22% of all degrees are business degrees. What do the business programmes actually teach? Not much - the student gets a smattering of basic mathematics, some help with his writing, a bit of faulty economics, some marketing (i.e. whitewashed brainwashing), some false psychology; in short, a whole lot of nothing. Modern economics and psychology barely qualify as sciences, and marketing should not exist at all. The business programmes have little to do with academics; rather, the purpose of the business programs is the brainwashing of the student, and, in the top universities, the creation of the network of contacts that the future manager must possess.

One wonders how society can absorb so many "businessmen."

This is the state of university education today.

The second most popular stream, that of the social sciences and history, is a stream of total brainwashing, where little serious learning can occur.

People flock to the health sciences, because the bloated profit-driven medical systems in the Western World are awash with money.

The education major should not exist. One learns to teach through practice. People should not be studying "education" - they should rather study the subjects they desire to teach. The education major is and has been a brainwashing program for the creation of dependable teachers. Dependable, that is, from the reference point of the Oligarchy.

Today, we can observe the development of an additional sinister and nauseating aspect of university education - namely, the debt scam. The con works like this: the big players in the various industries require certification for every imaginable activity. The people conclude that the only way into the professional ("middle") class is the acquisition of a certificate, i.e., a university degree. Now, the

²<http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=37>, accessed on 8 October 2011

universities gradually increase their tuition rates. The students keep hearing that "a university degree is worth it," and so at the age of 18, clueless and idealistic, they sign their lives away by taking student loans. Notice that even bankruptcy does not wipe out the pernicious student loans. Student debt is an adamantine shackle. The scam is truly diabolical and can adequately be described as predatory usury and indentured servitude.

To appreciate the gravity of the problem, one must realize that recently the total student debt in the United States overtook the total credit card debt. The Wall Street Journal informed us in 2010 that the total student debt in the US is almost a trillion dollars.³ Such debt can not and will not be paid, which means that on top of the mortgage bubble and all the other bubbles we also have a student loan bubble.

Quigley commented that one can easily acquire a good education in any half-decent library. Today, all internet-users have the largest library in recorded history at their fingertips. Helpful websites abound. Top professors post their lectures on YouTube. Education is open to all.

In regard to the perceived importance of certification, I direct the reader to the Mssrs. Steve Jobs, Steve Wozniak, Michael Dell, Mark Zuckerberg, Bill Gates, Paul Allen, and Richard Branson. The list can be extended ad infinitum.

It should be admitted that attendance of the top university carries some perks: for example, connections with the current and future elite, access to high-tech labs, and sheer prestige.

If I could go back in time, I would give myself the following pieces of advice: Is college worth sinking in debt for? No. Is college worth visiting provided money is no issue? Only the top colleges, and only for special reasons. How does one obtain a true education? Develop the three key disciplines of literacy, mathematics, and history to the best of your ability (which, you will discover, is substantial). Aim for the top books in all subjects and avoid the low-level undergraduate textbooks. Finally, establish a clear long-term goal in life, establish a plan of action, and pursue your project with determination and zeal.

The reader may wonder why I attended college. The answer is - I did not know what I was getting into. Do I regret my past choices? Oh, no! Regret is useless; learn from your mistakes, and move on.

1.1.5 Graduate School

Two useful references on grad school are Wilfred Cude's *The Ph.D. Trap Revisited* (2000), and Jeff Schmidt's *Disciplined Minds* (2001).

Graduate school is an apprenticeship system for the induction of willing subjects into the professorial guild. The would-be entrant sacrifices five to twenty years of his life on the promise of a future job in the government, the industry, or the vaunted academic world itself. Along the way a subtle ideological sifting process takes place.

In purely political terms, people of heretical views are summarily kicked out the moment they display their true colours.

To instil obedience, graduate school awards the apprentice with a relentless bombardment of homeworks and exams. For the most part, these homeworks and exams have little to do with learning. The logic is plain: follow orders and you may continue. Fail to follow orders and depart. To ensure complete compliance, the structure of graduate school frowns on self-directed research. Each apprentice must find a master and follow the master's directions. The implications and consequences of this mechanism are obvious.

The apprentice naturally takes care of some of the more onerous duties of academic life, such as the grading of papers.

Since poverty and isolation are inherent to grad school, most PhDs tend to be compliant, timid yet ar-

³<http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2010/08/09/student-loan-debt-surpasses-credit-cards/>, accessed on 8 October 2011

rogant, socially segregated within the academic community, and idiosyncratic. These are people who gladly stay in labs for weeks in order to develop the latest gadget that the government/corporation wants - and to finally obtain the professoriat's blessing in the form of the holy Diploma.

Which brings us to the task that PhDs fulfil in society. The most basic task of the PhDs is to perpetuate their guild by the induction of new PhDs. Beyond this, the PhDs in the hard sciences develop all the guns and cell-phones and psychotropic drugs and biometric scanners that the corporations and the corporate states require. The PhDs in the soft sciences, on the other hand, exercise cultural control over society. The academic (as opposed to the professional, sometimes ironically labelled "amateur") historians set the tone in the study of history, the English Professors say which books merit reading, and so on. It must be understood that only a few influential professors in the top universities set the trends in all the "soft"-sciences. Clearly, all these top professors are either privy or (often unconsciously) amenable to the Oligarchs.

It should be understood that the academics either do not realize or refuse to realize the true nature of the academic system. The arduous road to PhDhood forces the apprentice to internalize the PhD system and its values. This is predictable - what art collector would admit that the painting he bought for a million is a nasty piece of junk?

In regard to their areas of specialization, academics tend to be truly knowledgeable. Unfortunately, most real-life problems require diverse know-how. Thus, one should take the "expert" opinions of learned professors with scepticism. Pertinent here is the issue of pseudo-science, or "scientism." We will examine the various pseudo-sciences later in this book.

1.1.6 On the Education of the Oligarchs

Why do the Oligarchs send their children to school?

The schools of Oligarchs are unlike the schools of the masses. The top private boarding schools, and there are few of those, do impart a true education.

But such an education can be acquired outside of school. The true purpose of the schools of the Oligarchy is the perpetuation of the Oligarchy. The symbol of the fasces has been with us at least since Rome and today graces the American House of Representatives. The fasces signify the principle of "in unity lies strength." So it is the role of the top private boarding schools to provide a unity in mindset among the children of the Oligarchs.

On the grade-school level, the famous elite schools are Harrow and Eton in England, and Groton, Andover, St. Paul's, and a few others in the US. One can add Gordonstoun of Scotland to the list. What curriculum do these schools follow? John Taylor Gatto has some recent (post-2008) talks on this subject.

The qualities of a sound education have been known since the Classical Period at the latest. On the academic side, the proper education focuses on the seven "liberal arts": grammar, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy (or astrology).

Grammar is the basis of all linguistic expression and thus must be the root of any serious education. One masters grammar by reading and writing.

Logic, also called *dialectics*, teaches one the basics of critical thinking and of abstract thought.

Rhetoric is indispensable for the elucidation of one's ideas, and, in general, for the manipulation of others. A master rhetorician will hold sway over the minds of mobs with terrifying ease.

Arithmetic and geometry form the basis of all hard sciences. Geometry also interplays with drawing, which develops the aesthetic sense and the strength of memory.

Music refines a person. Enunciation is integral to powerful rhetoric.

Astrology appears to be a bizarre addition to the quadrivium. For some curious reason, the members of the elite seem obsessed with astrology. The astrologer was an integral part of the court of the medieval noble. In our own age, at least a third of all American presidents have been Freemasons. Ronald Reagan obsessively adhered to the whims of his personal astrologer. The role of astrology throughout history is a complex subject. We will examine some of its aspects later.

The liberal arts education is an all round rather than specialized education. Ordinary school jails

the mind; but the proper liberal education liberates one's potential.

In addition to teaching a classical education, the top boarding schools teach the classics, i.e. the texts that have withstood the test of the ages. In effect, the classics teach practical politics. For example, Caesar's recount of the Gallic Wars is the classic textbook on the principle of "divide and conquer." Plato's *Republic* is the summary of the Big Plan, and an introduction to dialectical thinking. Aristotle talks about *Rhetoric* and a number of other things. The ordinary schools completely ignore the classics. Thus do the wealthy few govern the ignorant many through the use of a set of basic ancient tricks.

Outside of their academic endeavours, the children of the Oligarchs are encouraged to pursue sports. Physical activity develops the natural beauty of the human body. Physical beauty is a manifestation of so-called "breeding," an instrument of control, and a treasure of inherent value. Solo sports develop individuality and self-assurance. Team sports, on the other hand, promote the idea of cooperation within the group. Dangerous sports such as horseback-riding or sailing hold particular value, because those capable of risking life and limb for the thrill of personal accomplishment will travel far on the road to success.

The children of the Oligarchy are not treated like rats. Their playgrounds are not ratcages like the schools of the masses. The top private schools are luscious and beautiful, as are the small liberal arts colleges. The teachers treat their wards with dignity and respect.

John Gatto breaks the boarding school curriculum into the following fourteen points:

1. Theory of human nature - how to understand and if necessary manipulate people, from the study of history, philosophy, theology, literature and law.
2. Active literacy - writing and public speaking.
3. Insight into the major institutional forms - corporations, government, church, and so on.
4. Good manners - because good manners help establish and maintain courteous relationships.
5. Independent work - because such work is always more valuable than work under the direction of taskmasters.
6. Sports - to develop the presence of the human body and to learn to handle pain.
7. Theory of access - how to reach influential people or places.
8. Responsibility - because it comes with power, and because it develops independence and character.
9. The development of a personal code of standards.
10. Familiarity with the great works of art.
11. Accurate observation and recording.
12. The ability to deal with challenges - so that one can overcome one's weaknesses, and so that one acts coherently in times of crisis.
13. Habit of caution in reasoning to conclusions.
14. Development and testing of judgement - amounts to trying to predict the consequences of one's actions, and then evaluating one's judgement *ex post facto*.

As we mentioned earlier, there are few of these schools. Only the children of the very wealthiest families get in. The merely affluent families have the option of the liberal arts college. These colleges function like the elite boarding schools. See Mitchell L. Stevens's *Creating a Class* (2007).

Many of the top boarding schools have religious affiliations - for example, Groton and St. Paul's are "episcopalian." As Gatto wryly observes, the Oligarchs appear to find value in the religious instruction that they forbid in the schools of the commoners.

It is worth noting that in the old days, the main route into the CIA was Groton - Yale - CIA. In England, the ruling class hailed (and still hails) from Harrow-Eton and Oxford-Cambridge. The

pairing of institutions wards against decline by forcing the duo into competition. In the States, Harvard and Princeton accompany Yale, and Andover, Exeter, St. Paul's and a few others go along with Groton. Credentials from any of these places give you a ticket to Wall Street or to the top levels of any other important organization of your choice.

Groton was founded in 1884, Exeter in 1781, Andover in 1778, St. Paul's in 1856.

Eton dates from 1440, and Harrow from 1572.

That's how it goes, my dear reader. This has been going on since the start - and yet people babble about democracy. People get to pick between the cadres of Eton and Harrow, or between those of Exeter and Andover. A rich choice indeed.

1.2 Mass Media

After school, the second most powerful tool of indoctrination in the arsenal of our benevolent masters is the mass media. The mass media, the puerile, lying, vulgar creature that it is, owes its power to the schools. Without the background brainwashing the populace receives at the schools, the mass media would be far less potent. The other trump card the large media conglomerates enjoy is the power of monopoly. It takes big money to set up an influential newspaper or a television network. A few big players dominate the whole mass media. One can only expect that these private institutions will serve the needs of their august owners.

1.2.1 Overall Structure of the Mass Media

Here we draw on Michael Parenti's 1986 classic *Inventing Reality* (in its second 1993 edition), and Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky's 1989 work *Manufacturing Consent*.

For the original textbooks on the use of the media for the purposes of mind control, look into Edward Bernays's *Propaganda* (1928), and Walter Lippmann's *Public Opinion* (1922).

In the old Soviet bloc, the state owned all the news media, and the state lied viciously for the benefit of the Party. This is a well-understood phenomenon. Moving west, we find that in Britain a few wealthy interests control and have controlled the big newspapers, and the government owns the BBC and Channel 4, which, along with ITV, accounted for two-thirds of television viewership on the Albion as recently as in 1990. ITV is a commercial channel, now largely privately-owned, that was founded by the government as competition for the BBC in 1955. As the nomenclature ruled the USSR, so do a few sirs and lords and shadow bankers rule England. They control the government, they own the newspapers, and they lie.

In short, it is a truism that state-owned news outlets will lie to the citizens of the state for the benefit of the faction controlling the state. In the era of globalization, this principle has opened the doors to a remarkable new development - we now have Russian (RT) and Iranian (Press TV) English-language news channels, which often say the truth about the Western powers, because this is in the interest of Russia and Iran.

Let us focus our attention on the privately owned media, and let us restrict our context to the USA, which is the world's largest producer and consumer of media, and where private media outlets reign supreme.

We note that thanks to the first amendment, America does indeed enjoy the greatest freedom of speech in the world. One can say practically anything in America, the catch being that free speech does not matter if the free speaker can not reach a wide audience.

In principle, a system of privately owned news media provides everyone with the opportunity to speak out. Individuals can express their contrasting points of view. The people can then acquaint themselves with all available information and proceed to reach conclusions.

In practice, the wealthy interests control most of the media and dictate public opinion. The advertisement model of financing the news media goes further in tying the hands and tongues of those who write the news. Worse, in the context of globalization, once a country exposes its media to foreign ownership, the Oligarchy can swoop in and buy news agencies wholesale. Even if a government bans foreign ownership, the Oligarchy can obtain ownership through the mediacy of domestic agents. If the government attempts to defend itself against a foreign attack of this type, the international Oligarch-owned media protests against the supposed suppression of pseudo-free-speech. Without endorsing or damning the Chavez regime, we note that such events took place in Venezuela.

The problem with the advertisement model of financing news agencies is apparent. If a magazine's existence depends on the largess of advertisers, then the magazine can not criticize the advertisers or the advertisers' allies. Thus, in the context of our corporation-dominated world, most magazines must comply to the dominant paradigm, or fold. There are only two ways out of this conundrum. One is to operate at a loss. Only the relatively wealthy few can afford such an approach, and most such men understandably agree with the interests of the Oligarchy. Exceptions occur - for an example, the reader can look into the life and writings of Benjamin H. Freedman.

The other way out, and the only way open to penniless dissenters, is financing through subscriptions. Publishing via this model will always suffer in the face of the fierce antagonism of the advertisement-funded competitors, who can flood the news-stands with glossy trash. As the internet becomes the major vehicle of news delivery, and as people grow disillusioned with the increasingly transparent lies of the mainstream media, the subscriptions-model will gain ascendancy. Gerald Celente's *Trends Journal* is an inspiring example of a successful subscriptions-based magazine.

Foundation-funding should by and large be regarded as equivalent to advertisement-funding. All the big foundations are in the hands of the Oligarchs (we will discuss the foundations later). As long as a publisher depends on outside funding, he is thrall to outside forces, and thus incapable of full free expression.

For a list of instances of the exertion of pressure on the parts of advertisers, see Chapter 3 of Parenti's *Inventing Reality*.

Journalists in the mainstream of America's mass media quickly learn to self-censure. How could they not? If a journalist writes something mildly heretical, the editor will make corrections. If a journalist writes something moderately heretical, the article won't be published and the journalist will receive castigation. Repeat offenders and the authors of truly outrageous pieces enter blacklists and never work in the mainstream again.

This is the reality. At this point, one should ask a question along the following lines: Why, then, was Hunter S. Thompson allowed to publish his diatribes? The short answer is that Thompson had a role to fill in the plans of the Oligarchs. We will look into this later.

To prosper in the controlled environment of the mainstream media, journalists must adopt self-censure. Given thorough enough brainwashing in school and at university, most journalists never realize the true state of affairs. The more ambitions of those who see the problem shrug and play the game according to its rules. The few principled journalists gravitate to fringe publications or burn out.

Some slip through the cracks. Pulitzer-prize winner Gary Webb outed the CIA's cocaine peddling activities in his legendary 1996 *Dark Alliance* series, published in the *San Jose Mercury News*. With predictable viciousness, the big mainstream outlets lambasted Webb and his research. In 1998, the CIA quietly admitted to participation in the Iran-Contra drug trafficking affair. The *L.A. Times* printed something of an apology. In the end, unable to land a job at a major paper, Webb committed suicide in 2004 with two gunshots to the head.

In this way the Oligarchs control the news media. It is well understood that whoever controls the outflow of news can control to a large degree the formulation of ideas in the minds of the mem-

bers of the public. To form an opinion on a topic one needs information. Given corrupt information people will form ridiculous opinions. The naive, the ignorant, and the subservient are particularly vulnerable to programming, and, as we have already seen, the public schools are factories for the production of naifs, ignoramuses, and obedient subordinates.

The specific techniques of news manipulation are not hard to figure out. The most basic technique is outright lying. Bigger lies sell better than smaller lies. Here are two classic examples: the Gulf of Tonkin incident, and the weapons of mass destruction scam. In 2005, the NSA admitted that the Gulf of Tonkin incident never took place. The Iraq weapons of mass destruction scam needs no comment.

Another way of manipulating the news is selective omission. For example, in the '90s the Oligarchs wanted to smash Yugoslavia. The signal was given and the mass media painted the Serbs black. Milosevic was the new Hitler and the Serbs were the new Nazis. Meanwhile, the concurrent Turkish ethnic cleansing of the Kurds barely entered the news. The spirit of the "humanitarian intervention" excuse for murdering civilians would have demanded US action against the American NATO ally of Turkey. To make life easier, the big news agencies simply avoided the topic of Turkey, thus allowing the "liberal" supporters of the NATO destruction of Yugoslavia the luxury of justifying war on "moral" principles.

Language is a potent weapon - the dual meaning of the word "spell" speaks for itself. The Oligarchs and their media manipulate language to suit their needs. For example, a ruler inimical to the Oligarchy is a dictator, a strong-man, a monster, a second Hitler, a maniac, or an overlord. A ruler subservient to the Oligarchy is a leader, a president or prime minister (elected or not), or a head of state. Wars become "peacemaking missions" or "humanitarian interventions." The war criminal Barrack Obama recently labelled his unconstitutional Libyan war a "kinetic military action." Civilian casualties become "collateral damage." Puppet regimes become democratically elected governments. I trust the reader can come up with thousands of other examples. I will provide only one more. The late comedian George Carlin (1937-2008) loved to point out the Oligarchs' hypocritical use of language. Here is one of Carlin's better bits:

I don't like words that hide the truth. I don't like words that conceal reality. I don't like euphemisms, or euphemistic language. And American English is loaded with euphemisms. Cause Americans have a lot of trouble dealing with reality. Americans have trouble facing the truth, so they invent the kind of a soft language to protect themselves from it, and it gets worse with every generation. For some reason, it just keeps getting worse. I'll give you an example of that. There's a condition in combat. Most people know about it. It's when a fighting person's nervous system has been stressed to its absolute peak and maximum. Can't take anymore input. The nervous system has either (click) snapped or is about to snap. In the First World War, that condition was called shell shock. Simple, honest, direct language. Two syllables, shell shock. Almost sounds like the guns themselves. That was seventy years ago. Then a whole generation went by and the Second World War came along and the very same combat condition was called battle fatigue. Four syllables now. Takes a little longer to say. Doesn't seem to hurt as much. Fatigue is a nicer word than shock. Shell shock! Battle fatigue. Then we had the war in Korea, 1950. Madison avenue was riding high by that time, and the very same combat condition was called operational exhaustion. Hey, were up to eight syllables now! And the humanity has been squeezed completely out of the phrase. It's totally sterile now. Operational exhaustion. Sounds like something that might happen to your car. Then of course, came the war in Viet Nam, which has only been over for about sixteen or seventeen years, and thanks to the lies and deceits surrounding that war, I guess it's no surprise that the very same condition was called post-traumatic stress disorder. Still eight syllables, but we've added a hyphen! And the pain is completely buried under jargon. Post-traumatic stress disorder. I'll bet you if we'd of still been calling it shell shock, some

of those Viet Nam veterans might have gotten the attention they needed at the time. I'll betcha. I'll betcha.

A more advanced way of forcing opinion down people's throats is the technique of the false dichotomy. A dichotomy is a division in two. So a false dichotomy is a fake division in two. The trick here is to present two apparently contradictory notions regarding a given subject, and then let the audience pick their favourite option of the two. Of course, the unstated consequence of both choices will be the either the same, or, either way, amicable to the Oligarchical plans. The illusion of choice is a powerful drug. Democracy as we know it is a false dichotomy - the Democrats and the Republicans are the two arms of the same body, as anyone who examines the policies of the two parties will quickly discover. One only needs check the programs the various parties offer - the broad-strokes are all the same, across the globe.

Going back to the use of false dichotomies in the media: The way the scam works today is, after a major event, the talking-heads (or editorial-page pundits), purported experts the lot of them, get together and start yapping. They create the illusion of debate, while in reality every commentator follows a rigid party-line. Rendered incapable of rational thought by the school system, people watch these pseudo-debates, and unconsciously internalize one of the proffered views. This technique of mind-control is extremely effective. The reader is well advised to analyse his own opinions. How many of your views did you reach on your own? How much research did you do? Are you not merely repeating television soundbytes?

Make no mistake, reader. You have been brainwashed. I know from experience that I was brainwashed myself. Discovering your thoughts are not really yours is a pilgrimage of horror. Yet beyond the horror lies understanding and strength.

How does one know anything with certainty, then? I quote Bill Cooper's oft-repeated dictum:

Listen to everyone, read everything; believe absolutely nothing unless you can prove it in your own right!

One classic false dichotomy is Capitalism vs Communism. Both terms have been watered down to the point of meaninglessness. Back in the Cold War, whenever a ruler of a third world nation tried to combat corporate rule by nationalizing certain key industries, he was instantly labelled a communist and vilified as an enemy of humanity. Behind the so-called Iron Curtain, whenever a person objected to the party-line, he was called a capitalist and an enemy of humanity. In fact, corporate capitalism is not much different from state capitalism, or communism. In the first case, the corporations own the whole joint, including the government, while in the latter case the, state owns everything, including the corporations. In both cases a tiny cabal controls the entire society.

A more recent example can be found in George W. Bush's September 20th post 9-11 speech, in which he stated that "either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists." Apropos, Lenin said the same thing during the Bolshevik Revolution. In our time, "with us" translated into support for, or at least complaisance with, the criminal US invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. Of course, any sane person opposes both the terrorists and the war criminals.

The false division also allows the clandestine prodding of society into various directions. Suppose the Oligarchs want society to accept higher taxes. How do you that? Have the "left-wingers" demand a ridiculous tax increase. Then have the "right-wingers" protest and settle for a reasonable tax increase. Or take a war - the right-wingers scream "Let's nuke the bastards!", and the humanitarian left-wingers respond "No! Let's just bomb them with high-explosives!" In this way, by having one side take an extreme position, the controllers of the media can redefine normality.

One last example highlighting the above point: A few weeks ago at the time of this writing, in July 2011, we had the debt ceiling crisis. The republicans demanded no tax hikes for the rich and the emasculation of the social safety net. This set the context. Obama pretended to reason with the republicans, tried to be "moderate" and "reasonable," and finally capitulated. The debt ceiling should never have been an issue - Obama could have used the 14th amendment to unilaterally raise the ceiling.

For more examples of news distortion, refer to Parenti and Chomsky's books.

Of the mainstream news sources, television is completely useless and should be avoided. We examine television in detail in the next section. Among the newspapers, the big ones are thoroughly compromised, but once in a while useful raw facts slip through. With a few rare exceptions (Bob Herbert), the op-ed pages are poison. Most magazines are full of propaganda and trivia. The financial press is the cream of the mainstream press, because it contains useful facts and information. *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Financial Times*, and *The Economist* carry interesting articles along with the propaganda and the spin.

Local newspapers frequently report relevant local news. The far left and far right (libertarian-ish) magazines, like *The Nation*, *CounterPunch*, and *The New American*, sometimes print worthwhile stuff in between the doctrinaire drivel.

These days, the only reliable news sources lie in the work of individual researchers such as: Gerald Celente, Michael Rivero, James Corbett, Webster Tarpley, Michel Chossudovsky, William Engdahl, Alex Jones, and a few others. Reliable these people are, but we should nevertheless adhere to Cooper's rule. Follow references and check unbelievable statements for yourself.

1.2.2 Television

Ad-man Jerry Mander outed television in 1978 with his book *Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television*, on which we draw here.

Television is the conduit for the most sophisticated and powerful mind control mechanism devised yet. The TV literally hypnotizes its viewer. Television programming means the programming of you by television.

There are a number of problems inherent in the medium of television.

First, because of the cost of running a television station, only the government and a few big corporations can afford the entry-costs of the TV industry. This means that TV must necessarily rest in the control of a few people, who may (and, because of the nature of power, will) use the powerful medium for private gain.

Second, the visual and real-time nature of the medium imposes insurmountable restrictions on the content. The problem here is that it is impossible to properly examine a serious subject in, say, two hours of images. Furthermore, because some imagery photographs better than other, violence, sports, and other kinetic activities receive disproportionate TV time.

Third, television, literally, shoots images directly into one's brain. People watching television are in a state of semi-hypnosis. When a person reads or hears information, he naturally forms his own visual images. Television invades one's head and replaces one's own images. In short, television, by definition, literally constitutes "brainwashing."

Fourth, television naturally isolates and silences people. Let the reader try to talk to people in the presence of an active television set to verify the last statement.

Television may be shapeshifting because of the Internet, but make no mistake - YouTube and Hulu can be as destructive to the mind as old-style television.

Television does make you stupid because it was designed to make you stupid. People watching television look like zombies because they are not fully conscious. There is absolutely nothing to be gained by watching TV.

Brainwashing is part and parcel of television. The "entertainment" programs create culture and brainwash surreptitiously. For example, shows like *Law and Order* and *House* dictate respect and subservience toward the professional managers of society - the police, the lawyers, and the doctors. Pornographic "music videos" promote mindless promiscuity and deviant sexual behaviour. Obscenely

gory TV shows induct TV viewers into a mindset insensitive to violence. Endless trivia pollutes the minds of those who bother with television. Slimy news anchors stare at you from across the ether and tell you what to think. Pointless sports waste your precious time, time you could be spending outside, playing those same sports. Imbecilic celebrities live vicariously for you as you stare at the screen. Reality shows peddle degradation to the howling delight of the self-hating masses who are only too glad to project their own degeneration unto others. A society of TV-viewers! Three generations raised by the TV! No wonder we are in trouble.

1.2.3 A Brief History of the Mass Media

Before Gutenberg invented the printing press in the 15th century, keeping the populace in a state of illiteracy and superstition was an easy affair. The priests and the intellectual elements of the nobility held a monopoly on literacy. Printing alleviated the problem of illiteracy to an insufficient degree. Control of the printing presses by the tiny ruling clique remained possible. Since they were writing between themselves, the Oligarchs tended to be remarkably candid. This is why one is well advised to delve into pre-20th century historical documents and philosophical texts.

The 19th century finally brought major changes. Because of their insistence on reading the Bible, which is a complex text, the Protestant Americans developed high degrees of literacy. Industrial prosperity and the spread of the telegraph led to a boom in news printing. Two-bit newspapers appeared everywhere. Spirited newspapermen printed whatever came to their minds. To get an inkling of what was going on, read Mark Twain's short story *Journalism In Tennessee*. Note that the Oligarchs never really lost control of the major newspapers. Serial novels like those of Dumas and Dickens provided mass entertainment.

World War I saw the emergence of modern propaganda techniques. Bernays developed the theory of propaganda right in time for the appearance of the mass-produced radio set. The insanity of the 1930s and 1940s warn us of the terrific power of concentrated propaganda. In the 1950s, the television set entered the American household, and Madison Avenue came to age. The Internet took off in the mid-1990s. As with so many things, there is a gap between what the Internet could be and what it actually is. In principle, the Internet could be the greatest liberating force on the planet. In practice, three-quarters of the Internet is pornography, most of the rest is drivel, and the good stuff hides in do-it-yourself fringe websites.

Most people no longer bother to read. Just to be safe, the Oligarchs flood the shelves of the bookstores with acres of raw trash. Modern corporate bookstores overwhelm the visitor with an inundation of pseudo-spiritual New Age books, lurid "romance" and crime novels, silly fantasy epics, lying tomes of history, and lowest common denominator post-modernist attempts at literature. Those interested in serious reading material should turn to the second-hand bookstores, the online retailers, and the electronic copies of books floating around the Net.

Toward the end of the 20th century, the big corporations went into a merger spree, in consequence of which today five mega-corporations own most of the news media in America. Here are the names: GE, Walt Disney Company, News Corporation, Time Warner, Viacom, and CBS. This is six; to get five note that Viacom and CBS are both partially owned by the "private" (i.e. shadowy) National Amusements company. These monsters own the whole thing - papers, magazines, cinemas, radios - and much more besides.

Therefore, since corporations are rigidly hierarchical structures, a handful of people demonstrably control the media in the United States. Now suppose these people have common goals and a common mindset. Perhaps they would like to retain control of their vast wealth and even expand their holdings. Perhaps they want more than mere wealth. Or maybe they are generous "philanthropists" and Santa Claus will pay your mortgage for Christmas.

In Canada, the names of the private (not CBC) players are CTVglobemedia, Rogers, Shaw, Astral, Newcap, and Quebecor. There are barely any independently owned newspapers left in Canada.

In Italy, Silvio Berlusconi, who happens to be the prime minister (Note: he was ousted during the

writing of this book), owns a large share of the country's news media.

The German company Springer controls a large chunk of the newspaper publication business in Europe.

Smaller countries have suffered corporate colonization in all imaginable areas. For example, German and Swiss conglomerates own most of the Czech Republic's newspapers and magazines.

Conclusions

The road to understanding begins with the realization that almost all of us have been subjected to a scientific brainwashing program so thorough, so insidious, and so horrible, that most men and women live their lives in blissful ignorance and overarching self-delusion (or rather, as Thoreau put it, "quiet desperation"). Most of our beliefs and allegiances span from phantom bedrock. Often, the pre-requisite for introspection and honest self-examination is calamity - be it prolonged unemployment, a brutal divorce, a preventable death in the family, a conflict over principles, or an inexplicable mental breakdown. Pain warns us that things are going poorly. Perhaps no child can learn to beware fire without suffering a burn.

When tragedy strikes, some succumb to defeatism or apathy. Others examine the situation, identify the problem, and adopt solutions - to fix an ongoing issue or to prevent repeat instances of trouble. So let us examine the two major disasters of the last decade - 9/11, and the economic meltdown of 2008.

Chapter 2

The Two Smoking Guns

At the time of this writing, in the early days of the second decade of the 21st century, humanity faces a collection of real and imaginary calamities. Let us examine the roots of two of our great problems: the global war, and the economic crisis.

The global war of the early 21st century arrived in the aftermath of the 9/11 event. Peace could have reigned on Earth following the collapse of the USSR - but instead of peace we got war. We proceed to examine the true nature of 9/11, the reasons for 9/11, and the consequences of 9/11.

Afterward, we will examine the specificities of the 2008 economic meltdown. Any official explanations of the 2008 crash should be regarded with extreme scepticism. The bedlam and confusion of September 2008 beg the question - how could this happen again after the lessons of the Great Depression?

We protest against the "things just happen" theory of history. Things don't just happen. Effects have causes.

We reject once again the idea that those in charge are hapless buffoons. Certainly, the puppet politicians are often dumb. Those who underestimate the puppet masters, however, do so at their own peril.

2.1 9/11

2.1.1 *Casus Belli* in American History

Researcher James Perloff has reached conclusions identical to the ones expounded in this subsection. His presentation *The Shadows of Power: The Council on Foreign Relations and the American Decline* is available on YouTube.

By the end of the 19th century, America had colonized the West and had thus reached the limits of its natural boundaries. The Anglophile members of the Eastcoast Establishment naturally wanted to follow the example of Mother England in acquiring a worldwide empire. America's Roman atavism - evident in the definition of the nation as a republic with a senate - was no coincidence. The time had come for the procurement of an overseas empire.

The most obvious target to the east was the large island of Cuba. Far to the west lay the Philippines. Both tasty morsels rested in the domains of the decrepit Spanish empire.

In 1898, Cuba was in the turmoil of a revolution of independence against the Spanish overlords. Washington sent the USS Maine to Havana Harbor to protect American interests in Cuba. Protect interests the battleship did, if in a roundabout manner. On the 15th of February 1898, the Maine blew up and sank. Following a US Navy investigation, Washington claimed the Spanish had sunk the battleship with a mine in an act of sabotage. The newspaper magnate William Randolph Hearst fired up the imagination of the public with a barrage of lurid propaganda. (Orson Welles highlighted this episode in his masterpiece *Citizen Kane*.) The US Congress declared war on Spain on April

21st 1898. The American army at that time was a meagre 28,000 - enough to discourage unlikely incursions on US soil from Mexico or Canada, but not enough to wage wars of imperialism. This idyllic state of affairs was about the end.

Spain was no match for the Americans, and so, following what Teddy Roosevelt termed a "splendid little war," the belligerents ceased fire on August 12, 1898 and signed a peace treaty in December of the same year. The Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico became US territories, and Cuba became a US protectorate. Meanwhile, the Filipinos declared independence on August 12, 1898. Neither America nor Spain recognized the Philippine government. On December 21, 1898, President McKinley kindly told the Filipinos in his *Proclamation of Benevolent Assimilation* that the Philippines were an American possession. The Filipinos refused to yield their independence. The bloody war that followed resulted in the deaths of hundred of thousands of Filipinos. Imperialism has never been anything but hideous. American luminaries of the stature of the redoubtable Mark Twain and "the Great Commoner" William Jennings Bryan protested to no avail against the annexation of the Philippines.

In 1974, Admiral Hyman G. Rickover undertook a thorough private investigation into the causes of the sinking of the Maine. The Admiral concluded that the explosion that sunk the battleship had not been caused by a mine. Rickover speculated that the cause of the explosion could have been a spontaneous combustion in the ship's coal bunker.

The Spanish conducted their own investigation in 1898 - the *Del Peral and De Salas Investigation*. Some observations of the investigation, found in Wikipedia, were:

- Had a mine been the cause of the explosion a column of water would have been observed.
- The wind and the waters were calm on that date and hence a mine could not have been detonated by contact but using electricity, yet no cables had been found.
- No dead fish were found in the harbor as would be expected following an explosion in the water.
- The munition stores usually do not explode when mines sink ships.

Del Peral and De Salas concluded that the likely cause of the explosion was the spontaneous combustion of the battleship's coal bunker.

The Sampson Board of Inquiry, despite claiming that the explosion was caused by a mine, noted that no evidence had been found implicating any person or persons in facilitating the destruction of the Maine.

A few years later, World War I erupted in Europe. Despite campaigning on a promise of non-intervention in 1916, Woodrow Wilson, at the behest of his controllers - the Colonel Houses and Baruchs and Schiffs and Morgans, was eager to throw America into the conflict. The warmongers had already fabricated a serviceable pretext in the Lusitania fiasco.

The British liner Lusitania embarked on a trip from New York to Liverpool on the 1st of May 1915. Germany had published ads in a number of New York newspapers warning that since a state of war existed between England and Germany, all ships carrying supplies to England could be subjected to submarine attacks. The warning went unheeded, the u-boats sank the Lusitania, and two years and a sea of propaganda later, the Americans joined the war. Lusitania's demise had been presented as an unjustified act of barbarity on the part of the vicious Huns.

After the war it turned out that the Lusitania's cargo had included tons of ammunitions, which had exploded following the submarine torpedo attack, and had thus contributed significantly to the swift sinking of the ship.

A couple of decades after The War to End All Wars, Europe embarked on a new martial adventure. The American population was largely isolationist, as it had been a quarter of a century earlier. To goad America into the war, the powers-that-be decided to provoke Japan into attacking the United States. So in July 1941 Washington cut Japan's oil supply, thus forcing the Japanese into a

dilemma. Tokyo had to choose between attacking the Western powers and abandoning its empire. The militaristic Japanese government opted for the first choice, suicidal as it was. Five months later the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor.

Did Roosevelt possess foreknowledge of the attack? There is suggesting proving that he did, the key being the fact that the US had broken a variety of Japanese diplomatic and military codes prior to December 1941. For the dirty details, see Robert Stinnett's *Day of Deceit*. Webster Tarpley has published a book in early 2012, which claims that the British and their allies within the Roosevelt administration provoked the debacle. Either way, a small group of people in Washington and London made sure to allow Pearl Harbor to happen.

World War II gave the United States a puppet Germany, a puppet Japan, and a variety of other bases across the world. The destruction of Europe and Japan turned the US into the world's sole industrial powerhouse. America's imperialism had been spectacularly successful, thanks in large part to the suicidal tendencies of the other Great Powers.

The next major American war occurred in Korea. In 1950, the Soviet puppet North Korea and the American puppet South Korea kept exchanging raids across their shared border along the 38th parallel. In June 1950, a sulking USSR had boycotted the UN Security Council on account of the UN's recognition of the Taiwanese Chinese government over the Red Mainland Chinese government. This opened the way for a 25th June 1950 US-led UN resolution condemning North Korean aggression. On the 27th, UN's Resolution 83 provided the US with a pretext for war. Truman sent in the troops. Three years later the war ended in a stalemate. Millions had died to provide the US with a beachhead in East Asia, to give the UN a boost in legitimacy, and to justify the creation of the permanent US military machine (a.k.a. the "Military Industrial Complex").

A few things ought to be said in regard to the Korean War. First, the Korean conflict was the first major US war waged without a formal congressional declaration of war. Truman's excuse was that the UN Resolution justified US armed action. This is an attack on US sovereignty, since it implies the supremacy of the UN's decisions over the US Constitution.

Over a million Koreans died in the war - the exact numbers remain unknown even today. Many of the casualties fell victim to Allied bombardment of civilian targets - a war crime. There is a question that few asked during the Cold War: If communism is tyranny, then how can the murder of the civilian victims of communist tyranny by the Western powers be possibly justified? Is death to be considered a welcome reprieve from the horrors of Communism? The reality is that in Korea, as later in Vietnam, the US committed genocide.

That the North Korean government is and has been rather mad and brutal is a given. Yet for some reason, South Korea's crimes rarely receive attention. During the Korean War, the South Korean government massacred at least 100,000 "suspected communists" in what is called the Bodo League massacre. In 1980 the then military dictatorship of South Korea suppressed with much bloodletting a "democratic" uprising in Gwangju in the south of the country. The US, which had troops in Korea, failed to conduct a "humanitarian intervention" against the vicious Korean military dictatorship. Democracy as most people understand it has nothing to do with America's wars. Geopolitics and imperialism, rather than idealism and moral principles, govern America's "foreign policy." By 1953, America had encircled the Sino-Soviet Eurasian core across the Germany- Turkey- Israel- Korea- Japan arc.

Next came the Indochina gang-bang. The Japanese had raped Vietnam during the Second World War, the French had raped Vietnam in the '50-ies, and in the '60-ies it was America's turn.

In the case of Vietnam, the US controllers simply fabricated a *casus belli*. The NSA has admitted that the Gulf of Tonkin incident was a fake. Millions more died, the US tax-payers paid taxes, the weapons manufacturers and the big financiers made a killing, the CIA ran drugs, and in the end the US withdrew. Fifteen years after the end of the Vietnamese war, the communist menace collapsed upon itself.

Vietnam killed America's bloodlust for about a generation. Ronald Reagan was a professional B-level actor who could read teleprompters with much artistry despite his Alzheimer's. He was a puppet. His controllers did manage to produce a nice little invasion of Grenada, but the next major war came under the George H.W. Bush presidency.

One of the key propaganda coups preceding the 1991 Gulf War was the story of Saddam Hussein's vicious murder of test-tube babies. In retrospect, the whole scenario sounds eerily hilarious, but in November 1990 people listened. On October 10th 1990 the Kuwaiti girl Nayirah testified that Saddam's troops had removed a batch of incubator babies from their incubators, thus killing the unfortunate infants. It was claimed that 92 test-tube babies had been massacred.

Later, it emerged that Nayirah was the daughter of the Kuwaiti ambassador to the United States. A major PR company, Hill & Knowlton, was implicated in the affair. Inquiries after the war found no evidence supporting the story. The test-tube babies were a fabrication.

As for Saddam, before 1990 he had been a long-term US ally. A murderer and a thug Saddam was, but he also managed to create a successful modern country out of the synthetic patchwork of ethnicities and creeds of Iraq. Saddam Hussein was a nationalist despot of the Stalinist mould. Bush's New World Order, which is the end goal of Globalization, has no room for nationalists.

Saddam's other unforgivable sin was his presumptuousness in interfering with the Seven Sisters' business in Kuwait.

Clinton's Serbian adventure merits little comment. The concept of "humanitarian intervention" is too ridiculous for serious discussion. As we mentioned earlier, in the 1990-s Turkey went after the Kurds. Nobody seemed to care. It follows that "humanitarian intervention" is nothing more than a liberal-friendly euphemism for war. In the 1990s Yugoslavian free-for-all the various ethnic entities were at each other's throats. Serbia became a patsy, like in 1914.

The bombing of Serbia served to justify NATO's existence in the post-Soviet world. NATO is groomed to be the nucleus of the future World Army of the incipient World Government. The brief war also provided the US with bases in Eastern Europe, including the monstrous Camp Bondsteel. Finally, the conflict proved once again that there is nowhere to hide on this planet. Any nation that dares disobey the globalist Oligarchy faces destruction.

Before taking over Afghanistan in accord with military plans drawn well before 9/11, Washington sent an ultimatum to the Taliban demanding the surrender of Bin Laden. The Taliban kindly asked the Americans for evidence of Bin Laden's guilt in regard to the 9/11 attacks. Washington provided no such evidence, because no such evidence exists. The FBI has found no hard evidence linking Osama to 9/11.¹

Bush's administration said that the Taliban had failed to satisfy the ultimatum and proceeded to invade and occupy Afghanistan.

Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction in 2003.

The recent Libyan War was another instance of "humanitarian intervention." In 2010 the Human Development Index ranked Libya highest in Africa. Gaddafi's country was a prosperous modern nation unencumbered by a central bank. This could not be allowed, and so a Colour Coup was staged against the colonel. The "rebels", a moniker straight out of Star Wars, were a gang of Al Qaeda terrorists, monarchists, mercenaries, and tribal enemies of Gaddafi. Even NATO, in characteristic euphemistic language, admitted that the rebel army contained "flickers of Al Qaeda."

To justify armed intervention in the Libyan conflict, which was a civil war, the Western leaders simply said that Gaddafi was bad and had to be removed. The double standard here is painfully blatant. Over the years plenty of US-friendly governments have conducted internal cleansing and have suppressed revolts without attracting Washington's ire. For a sample list, see William Blum's

¹<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13664.htm>, accessed on 8th October 2011

Killing Hope.

A few weeks after the war had started, the Benghazi rebels had managed to set up a central national (i.e. private) bank, and had dished out oil contracts to the Western oil giants. By September, Libya, one of the last independent stragglers on the face of the world, had been brought into the global system.

In conclusion, the U.S. has entered all of its major wars since at least the Spanish-American war of 1898 under shady pretexts. We have clear-cut fabrications like the Gulf of Tonkin incident, the test-tube babies, and the "humanitarian" justifications for armed intervention. We also have diabolical provocations as in the cases of the Lusitania and Pearl Harbor. No nation in the world wants to fight the United States. For more than a century America has been too powerful to bother. We therefore have good reason to suspect foul play in regard to the 9/11 tragedy.

2.1.2 The Post-Communist Programme

After communism collapsed in 1989, everything looked hunkey-dorey. Democracy and the free markets had carried the day, history had ended, and we would all live in paradise drinking coca-cola and gobbling cheese-burgers. Globalization would unite the world and civilization would triumph.

In reality, the Anglo-American Western combine had lost a useful enemy and had to quickly come up with a new vague global threat. As George Orwell explained, the presence of an existential enemy is necessary for the maintenance of Oligarchical control and for the expansion of Oligarchic interests. How can you pass war budget taxes if there is no one to fight? How can you justify the demolition of independent national states if there are no bad guys? There has to be an enemy, and the post-communist world contained a perfect fall guy.

In the mid-1990s the Western world had effective control or at least overwhelming influence over Latin America, Africa, and considerable portions of East Asia. The US still occupied Korea and Japan, and the British still owned Hong Kong. Singapore retained a British colonial legacy and owed its prosperity to its mercantile role in the global economic system. Eastern Europe was being hammered into proper shape on its way into the trans-national corporate economy.

Only the Muslim world retained some independence, in part because of its culturo-historical heritage, and in part because of oil revenues. The Islamic Morocco-Pakistan arc thus offered the West a perfect geopolitical target. By conquering the Islamic world, the Anglo-American cabal could accomplish a trio of objectives: 1) they could force the Muslim countries into the global system, 2) they could secure access to a large proportion of the reserves of one of the two of the world's foremost strategic commodities - oil (the other one being food), and 3) they could establish a strong presence on the strategically paramount point of junction of the European, Asian, and African continents. On top of everything, by singling out the Muslims for destruction, the Oligarchs would have a semi-credible outside threat for domestic consumption inside the Western countries.

All of this was understood throughout the 20-th century. The strategic importance of the Middle East is one of the key reasons behind the creation of Israel and the support Israel draws from its Western allies. President after president has singled out the Middle East as a target. The post-Suez Crisis Eisenhower Doctrine stated that the US would interfere in the Middle East to protect its interests and the interests of its allies. The post-Oil Crisis Carter Doctrine stated the US would resort to force if necessary to protect its interests in the Gulf Region. Then we have the two Bushes, who decided that the time had come for the US to conquer the Middle East. Obama has done his part, not the least by conquering Libya.

For an impressive overview of 20th century oil politics, see William Engdahl's *A Century of War* (2004).

The program for the destruction and the conquest of the Middle East was fully developed by the time Bush the Younger tumbled into office. Here we examine three of the influential documents, which established the framework of America's post-communist foreign policy.

First we look at Samuel Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations* thesis, originally argued in 1993 on the pages of the *Foreign Policy* magazine, of which Huntington was a co-founder. Huntington was a high-level think-tanker and a pal of Brzezinski and Kissinger. Foreign Policy is an arm of the CFR. It is important to realize that the people in charge of the CFR have the power to influence or even directly determine US foreign policy. We examine the CFR in detail later in this work.

In his essay, Huntington made the sage observation that there are different cultures on planet Earth. In the olden days international relations had been determined by the bickerings of the nobility. After the French revolution nationalistic sentiments had dominated world affairs. After World War I the divisions had become ideological - Nazism VS democracy, capitalism VS communism and so on. Now that communism had ignominiously expired, Huntington said, world conflicts would occur at the fault lines of the major world cultures. In particular, the Muslim world would clash with Western civilization.

This is the gist of Huntington's argument. It isn't much of an argument, as Edward Said could not help noticing. Said's attack of Huntington's thesis on intellectual grounds missed the point, because essays like Huntington's have little to do with intellectualism. When the CFR makes a prediction, one must realize that the CFR has the power to fulfil its own prophesy.

Thus, Huntington's thesis framed the context for the early stage of the 21st century. The Oligarch-controlled media and academia circles blew the Clash of Civilizations out of proportions, and, of course, 9/11 eventually "proved" the accuracy of Huntington's original proposition.

In reality, as globalization undermines the sovereignty of nations, and as the global pseudo-Western culture spreads on the wings of Hollywood and the Internet, annihilating traditional ideologies along the way, people will increasingly seek identification on two discrete levels - a local, tribal level, and on an overarching super-cultural level.

One example of a low-level tribal identification is identification with the rappers' favourite "'hood.'" As nationhood becomes increasingly meaningless in the global society, people, particularly ghettoised immigrants and the members of ethnic minorities, will look at their neighbours for support and succour. On the global scale these mini-communities are too small and politically impotent to present a threat to the Oligarchical globalist cabal.

For a more striking example of neo-tribalism, look at the cults around the various major European soccer clubs. There are people around the world whose idea of divinity is Manchester United. Bread and circuses indeed.

On the other end of the spectrum we have the super-cultures. Fore example, as immigrants flow into the Western nations, and as the North American and the European Unions gain power at the expense of the traditional nation-states, white Westerners will increasingly profess allegiance to an overarching Western white culture. Eastern Europeans will recognize the common elements of their languages, creeds, and histories, and on a higher level will stick with the pan-white extended-Western cultural bloc.

These are obvious consequences of globalization. The Oligarchs will try to exacerbate and exploit people's differences for the purposes of smashing world cultures one by one and setting up a global homogeneous pan-terrestrial culture. Thus, in the short run we get the Clash of Civilizations. We will discuss the globalist aspirations at length in the next chapter.

Next we look at the work of Big Zbigniew Brzezinski (1928-). Note that when Brzezinski speaks, we ought to listen, because Brzezinski is a high-ranking member of the CFR and of the Trilateral Commission, and therefore possesses influence over, or at least insider knowledge regarding, the foreign policy of America. Back in the late 1970s Brzezinski, in his position of National Security Adviser, was the grey eminence inside the Carter administration. To get an idea of Brzezinski's clout, note that he credits himself with embroiling the Soviets into the Afghan war, which contributed to the ultimate meltdown of the Soviet state. Remember that the Taliban, Bin Laden and Al Qaeda all come from the era of the Soviet-Afghan conflict, when the US quietly funded anti-Soviet Muslim

extremists. Hollywood released a surprisingly candid look at America's 1980s Afghan intervention in the recent 2007 picture *Charlie Wilson's War*, starring Tom Hanks.

Zbig was born in Warsaw to a szlachta diplomat. The Brzezinskis were in Germany during the interesting times of 1931 to 1935, and in Russia during the purges of 1936 to 1938. In 1938, Brzezinski Sr. had the fortune to be posted to Canada, and so his family escaped the War.

Young Brzezinski obtained a Masters from McGill University, and a PhD from Harvard. He specialized on Soviet Studies and geopolitics. Sometime during the 1950s, the Rockefeller machine recruited Zbig, and he has been their faithful servant ever since. He joined the CFR, the Bilderbergers, and so on.

For an overview of Brzezinski's mentality, consult his *Between Two Ages* (1970). The book is full of gems.

Zbig's fifteen minutes (more like years) of fame came in the late 1970s, when the Rockefellers conjured Carter via the Trilateral Commission. Zbig became Carter's National Security Advisor, in which position, among other things, he invented the Talibans, and opened up China. Following Carter's eclipse, Brzezinski has exercised influence behind the scenes, particularly over the elements of the Democratic Party.

During the Clinton era, Zbig's son Mark was on Clinton's National Security Council. Webster Tarpley in his unofficial biography of Obama identifies strong links between Zbig and Obama. Brzezinski remains a powerful player.

In 1997, Zbig published his take on global geopolitics in an oeuvre titled *The Grand Chessboard*. In this notable work, Zbig looks around the world and with deserved conceit notes that America reigns supreme - militarily, economically, culturally, and technologically. Brzezinski's conclusions involve a number of recommendations. Zbig thinks that America should interfere everywhere on Earth to promote Western interests and to maintain overall political stability. Ideally, Russia should be brought into the West as a junior partner to the Anglo-American combine. China should be kept within its region, but carefully, to avoid antagonization. In general, the Grand Chessboard is Eurasia. Brzezinski notes that though vast, America's power capital is not inexhaustible, and should therefore be spent circumspectly.

In light of that, Zbig frames America's strategy as follows: in the short-run, America should manipulate and divide & conquer the Eurasian players to retain supremacy. In the mid-range term (20-30 years), America should ally with a powerful Eurasian proxy power (apart from the implicit EU, this can only be China; perhaps Brzezinski also considered a Russo-Japanese, or a Japanese-Indian configuration) in order to retain a degree of control over the global game. In the long term (50+ years), some type of world government ("global core of genuinely shared political responsibility") is to be established.

For the benefit of these goals, Brzezinski advises an expansion of NATO and a consolidation and expansion of the EU - if necessary at the behest of American "prodding."

In regard to Russia, Zbig offers a carrot-and-stick approach. On the one hand he wants to contain Russia, and on the other he wants to provide Moscow with incentives for closer, preferably docile, co-operation with the West.

Curiously, Brzezinski is for a detente in American's relations with Iran: "A strong, even religiously motivated but not fanatically anti-Western Iran is in the U.S. interest, and ultimately even the Iranian political elite may recognize that reality."

Zbig notes with ire that America's uncultured masses may disagree with his splendid ideas. He drops the following gem:

Moreover, as America becomes an increasingly multicultural society, it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstances of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat. Such a consensus generally existed throughout World War II and even during the Cold War.

A more clear call for a 9/11 type of event could hardly be imagined - yet we will shortly see one. Zbig views the Middle East as a "global Balkans," i.e. an area of instability. In his view, America should act with caution in the Middle East, with the dual primary goal of maintaining stability and limiting Russian influence in the area. In general, Brzezinski argues for a light-handed policy in Central Asia, the idea being that the integration of the region into the global network can be done by non-violent means. Zbig likely had in mind a series of color revolutions of the type we saw in 2011. More on color revolutions later.

Brzezinski's argument is cold-hearted but cogent and comprehensive. Had a candidate congenial to Brzezinski's views won the 2000 US presidential elections, we would have witnessed a different, likely slightly saner, first decade of the 21st century. Unfortunately for Zbig, the Neocons carried the 2000 race. We next look at the Neocon gameplan.

The Neocon ideology stems from the works of the "philosopher" (in this case, hack) Leo Strauss, later expounded by Irving Kristol and his son William. In general, the Neocon outlook propounds the use of the "big lie" for the furtherance of the goals of a presumably benevolent elite. Some, including Chomsky, have described Neoconservatism as a Leninist philosophy. Neoconservatism does indeed exhibit Marxist tendencies - indeed, Irving Kristol was a Trotskyist.

It is worth noting that many of the key Neocon figures were Jewish; some, including Strauss, were Zionist. The obvious implications vis-a-vis Israeli interests loom large in the light of the War on Terror, which has benefited Israel to the detriment of America.

Neoconservative gurus liked to think of themselves as "realists," meaning that they did not see the need of letting "utopian" idealism get in the way of the healthy use of raw force. Combine this with the concept of the unifying "big lie," which allows for the reshaping and prodding of society into particular directions, to obtain the thuggish xenophobic smirking mendacious Bush II administration that we all knew and loved.

In the late 1990s, a gang of Neocons got together and designed a plan for their upcoming presidency. The Neocon think-tank was the notorious PNAC - Project for the New American Century. In September 2000, just a few months before assuming power, the Neocons released their manifesto in the form of a document entitled *Rebuilding America's Defences*. In classic double-speak, our Neocon friends meant "offences" when they wrote "defences."

The Neocons agreed with Brzezinski on the matter of America's supremacy and the need to retain and use that supremacy. It was not in ends but in means where differences occurred. Crafty Zbig's diplomacy and ruses were not to the Neocons' liking - the latter preferred the sledgehammer and the sword to the diplomatic quill and the rogue's dagger.

In the first place, the Neocons desired to have a large expansion of the US military machine. One can not help but notice that the Neocon gang, few of whose key members served in the military, favoured the doctrine of fighting to the last drop of other people's blood.

The authors of the *Defences* document repeatedly identify Iraq, Iran, and North Korea as potential threats to the United States. These three states later became Bush's poetically styled "Axis of Evil." Libya and Syria were also singled out as potential adversaries. Iraq held particular fascination for the Neocons. Iraq in 2000 was a broken nation, torn by war and starved by a criminal embargo. The idea that Iraq could have threatened anyone after 1991 is ludicrous. North Korea poses no real threat even to South Korea, whose military is more than a match for North Korea's million men army. Even supposing the "evil" states had WMDs, so what? Any state which dares attack the US with WMDs will suffer immediate evaporation. Why would the comfortable leaders of North Korea commit mass suicide?

Of course, the lucid minds of the Neocons were not deterred by such elementary strategic considerations. America needed to rearm, and when your only tool is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. After all, why make military toys if you can not use them? To some people who have never bothered to work at real jobs, war is a wonderful thing, because it turns society into a united herd of sheep willing to follow orders.

Like Zbig, the Lie-loving Neocons lamented the fact that people may fail to see the brilliance of their

ideas without the help of some vague major shock:

Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event like a new Pearl Harbor.

This was published in September 2000. In November 2000, the Bush faction lost the popular vote but stole the election through blatant fraud. Gore's hurried surrender suggests that the election had already been decided behind the scenes. Less than a year later, the "new Pearl Harbor" arrived in high-definition, and by October 2001, the US was embroiled in a war in Afghanistan, which along with the Iraq war, according to general Wesley Clark, on tape in a *Democracy Now* interview, was planned before 9/11. Clark went on to say that the hit-list also included Syria, Lebanon, Somalia, Sudan and finally, Iran.² At the time of this writing in September 2011, Libya and Sudan have been hit, Somalia faces another famine, the Syrian government combats shadowy insurgents (who undoubtedly enjoy CIA-backing), and Iran remains in the crosshairs.

So now we have multiple, independent, influential agents of power, including the people who were in charge in 2001, wistfully wishing for a new Pearl Harbor in the waning years of the 20th century. Could they have given fate a helping hand?

2.1.3 The Rotten Stench of 9/11

As we have shown, there is serious reason to suspect foul play in regard to the 9/11 lunacy. Once one dares open the 9/11 can of worms, the stench of rot overwhelms the senses.

We ignore any "conspiracy theory" guilt and self-censorship. "Conspiracy theory" is a ridiculous politically correct blanket term condemning research into sensitive issues. Conspiracies obviously exist. The American founding fathers and the Bolsheviks were conspirators. Now they are official history. Let us ignore the mumbo-jumbo and look at concrete issues and facts. For that matter, the official version of the events is an unsubstantiated conspiracy theory.

The three standard English-language references on 9/11 are David Ray Griffin's *The New Pearl Harbor* (2004), Mike Ruppert's *Crossing the Rubicon* (2004), and Webster Tarpley's *9/11 Synthetic Terror* (2005). Tarpley's is the best of three works. Griffin (1939-) is a retired professor who has had stints at major institutions. Ruppert (1951-) is an investigative journalist and a former LAPD officer. Tarpley (1946-) is a professional historian. His resume includes a PhD in history, a Fullbright scholarship, and fluency in the five major European languages.

Most of the facts I list below are trivially verifiable; for an exhaustive list of minute references, see the above works.

One can make a more or less waterproof case for the "inside job" version of 9/11 on the basis of three amazing events.

1) There was heavy insider trading on the stock market on September 10th. The stocks of the companies that suffered on 9/11 - airlines, insurance agencies, and WTC office-holders - were specifically targeted.

This can only mean that people in high places knew of the incoming attack. The world's major intelligence agencies and pre-eminent financial houses certainly monitor the stock market for suspicious activity. People knew.

Why would they risk exposure to make a buck? Perhaps, being in charge of the whole thing, they knew that some stock market honky-ponky would not jeopardize their plans. More likely, impecunious elements of the conspiracy could not resist the temptation. Note that the supposed Arab terrorists would not have had much to gain from financial speculation on account of suicide. Nor would they have dared risk the exposure of their plans. One could make the argument that the terrorists, or their controllers, were making money for the benefit of the terrorists' families - but this

²<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xBgRAWHJ89U>, accessed on 8 October 2011

is a stretch.

The insider trading stinks.

2) The biggest 9/11 rat is Building 7. World Trade Center Building 7 collapsed in the afternoon of 9/11 after suffering minor fire damage. The puny licks of flame certainly could not have brought down a steel-backed skyscrapers. Researchers have pointed out that skyscrapers have never in history collapsed because of fire, though some have been burned into shells.

Not only did Building 7 collapse, but it fell down in a freefall, in what obviously was a controlled demolition. Demolition experts are on the record saying Building 7 was a demolition job.

We also have the bizarre BBC report by Jane Standley. In the afternoon of 9/11, the BBC reported that Building 7 had collapses. The camera switched to Miss Standley, who said Building 7 had collapsed, even though Building 7 was clearly visible behind her, because at the time of the report, Building 7 had not collapsed yet.

Don't believe me? Look it up! Much of this stuff is hard to believe, which is why I did not bother to provide the names of the skyscrapers which burned and failed to fall, or of the demo-experts who claim Building 7 was blown up. Do your own research and see for yourself.

If Building 7 was blown up, could the Two Towers have also been rigged? The towers did collapse in freefall, which is not what one would expect considering the nature of the damage the planes caused.

When loggers chop a tree, the tree falls sideways. The top portions of the towers should have fallen first. Nothing like that happened. Instead, the towers blew up and fell like Newton's apples.

There is all sorts of evidence pointing toward a demo-job. Firefighters reported hearing explosions. Indeed, one can see a series of explosions across the floors of the Towers on the official videos. Sixteen hundred professional architects and engineers have signed a request for a new investigation into 9/11 on the basis that the official story is untenable. Academic physicists have written papers arguing that buildings can not naturally (i.e. given the type of damage the WTC had suffered) fall the way the Towers fell. Note that because of career considerations it takes a serious moral and intellectual commitment on the part of a professional to endorse a 9/11 "conspiracy theory."

In purely abstract terms, could a group have infiltrated and rigged the three World Trade Center buildings? Upon examining the problem one realizes that all one needs to carry out an operation of this kind is 1) expertise, and 2) control over the security of the two buildings. The world's intelligence outfits, and certain private mercenary agencies, have the expertise. Since the security of the WTC was in the hands of private companies, all an interested party had to do was to win the contract for the provision of the security of the WTC. Obviously, anyone serious enough to carry out an operation of the magnitude of 9/11 would have been able to procure both the expertise and the access. And, no, the owners of the WTC would not given the security clearance to a gaggle of jihadist Muslims.

3) The other insurmountable problem with the official version of 9/11 is the US Air Force's inaction in the face of a foreign attack on the sensitive Washington-New York-Boston region. Common sense and military doctrine tell us that after the hi-jackings, interceptors should have scrambled, tailed the hi-jacked aircrafts, and finally shot down the targets once their missions became evident. Certainly after the first plane hit the first tower, the subsequent crashes should have been pre-empted. Why did that not happen?

Research into this question leads to the issue of the 9/11 military exercises and drills. Tarpley has identified more than 20 military drills that took place on 9/11, and a number of other relevant drills that took place beforehand. Coincidences of this magnitude do not happen. The drills are the ultimate irrefutable proof of the "inside job" argument.

It turns out that on 9/11 NORAD (North American Aerospace Defense Command) ran huge drills - among them Operations Northern Vigilance, Northern Watch, and Southern Watch - which impoverished the interceptor reserves on the US east coast to a dangerous degree. One bizarre drill simulated the hi-jacking of commercial airliners for the purposes of a terrorist attack. This is why

the USAF was so confused on 9/11 - it could not tell the real thing from the exercise. But it gets worse. The Chief of Staff of the Russian Armed Forces on 9/11, General Leonid Ivashov, reported that on the morning of 9/11, *before the attacks had occurred*, the US had assumed a strategic nuclear posture comparable with that of the Cuban Missile Crisis. This was the Global Guardian drill. Ivashov is an unabashed proponent of the "inside job" thesis. The general's view, widely available on the Internet, is:

1. The organizers of those attacks were the political and business circles interested in destabilizing the world order and who had the means necessary to finance the operation. The political conception of this action matured there where tensions emerged in the administration of financial and other types of resources. We have to look for the reasons of the attacks in the coincidence of interests of the big capital at global and transnational levels, in the circles that were not satisfied with the rhythm of the globalization process or its direction. Unlike traditional wars, whose conception is determined by generals and politicians, the oligarchs and politicians submitted to the former were the ones who did it this time.
2. Only secret services and their current chiefs or those retired but still having influence inside the state organizations have the ability to plan, organize and conduct an operation of such magnitude. Generally, secret services create, finance and control extremist organizations. Without the support of secret services, these organizations cannot exist let alone carry out operations of such magnitude inside countries so well protected. Planning and carrying out an operation on this scale is extremely complex.
3. Osama bin Laden and "Al Qaeda" cannot be the organizers nor the performers of the September 11 attacks. They do not have the necessary organization, resources or leaders. Thus, a team of professionals had to be created and the Arab kamikazes are just extras to mask the operation. The September 11 operation modified the course of events in the world in the direction chosen by transnational mafias and international oligarchs; that is, those who hope to control the planet's natural resources, the world information network and the financial flows. This operation also favored the US economic and political elite that also seeks world dominance.

Ivashov is no cook. The only argument that could be made against him would be a Cold Warrior's argument; however, the evidence is on Ivashov's side - as is sanity.

If the preceding arguments have not at least aroused the reader's suspicion and curiosity, no amount of evidence will. Amazingly, most people have not heard of Building 7 or the drills. Nevertheless, here is a selection of eleven random 9/11 tidbits:

- The holes in the wall of the Pentagon could not have been made by a large airliner - they were too small. The Feds collected all video evidence from the security cameras around the Pentagon, and have only released a single murky video so far. Even that video was released only in 2006, five years after the event. A drill in June 2001 simulated the release of an unmanned missile/aircraft against the Pentagon from a rogue barge in the Gulf of Mexico.
- There is the "Israel did it" theory. Of the 4,000 Israelis (as opposed to American Jews) who were supposed to work in the towers on 9/11, only one to three died. The Haaretz reported that two Israel-based employees of the Odigo company (instant messenger) had received warnings on 9/11 prior to the attack, i.e. the means of warning the WTC Israeli employees existed.³ A band of Israelis were caught dancing in celebration on 9/11, next to, would you believe it,

³<http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/odigo-says-workers-were-warned-of-attack-1.70579>, accessed on 8 October 2011

a van full of explosives. Channel 4 did a piece on this, you can find it on YouTube. The company in charge of the security of the airports from which the hi-jacked planes flew was the Israeli-owned ICTS. Such companies have ties to the intelligence networks since they hire retired spooks. Larry Silverstein bought the WTC shortly before 9/11. The company in charge of WTC security - Kroll - was owned and ran by Jews. This means the Mossad or Mossad-type Israeli agencies or retired well-connected spooks had access to the WTC. The Mossad has a tradition of using Jews across the world for its purposes - these are named *sayanim* and usually know nothing of the Mossad's actual goals - see Victor Ostrovsky's books. The Mossad certainly had the expertise necessary for the rigging of the WTC for demolition. Moreover, Israel clearly benefited greatly from 9/11. The Neocons were predominantly Jewish. This is means, motive, and opportunity. What do I think? I think we need a serious investigation into 9/11. It should be noted that there are multiple reports claiming that the Mossad warned the US of the impending attack. Let us dispense with accusations of Jew baiting - I am merely relating a commonplace theory.

- A number (at least seven) of the alleged nineteen 9/11 hi-jackers turned up alive in the days after the event. For one example, we quote the BBC: ⁴

Hijack 'suspects' alive and well

23 September 2001

Another of the men named by the FBI as a hijacker in the suicide attacks on Washington and New York has turned up alive and well.

The identities of four of the 19 suspects accused of having carried out the attacks are now in doubt.

Saudi Arabian pilot Waleed Al Shehri was one of five men that the FBI said had deliberately crashed American Airlines flight 11 into the World Trade Centre on 11 September.

His photograph was released, and has since appeared in newspapers and on television around the world.

Now he is protesting his innocence from Casablanca, Morocco.

- After being told of the attack, Georgie Bush stood dumbfounded and enjoyed *The Pet Goat*. Where was the secret service? Why was not the President led to safety? Bush II had no foreknowledge of the attack. He was a loser who had repeatedly failed in business and had failed even in drinking himself to death. The semi-illiterate Georgie was the consummate puppet. All he had to do was walk his dog, open the baseball season, and play cowboy in front of the teleprompter. Nobody would confide in Bush. On 9/11 he was scared stiff - literally.
- Sibel Edmonds, a Turkish-American who worked for the FBI in late 2001, reported that she had uncovered comprehensive evidence proving that the FBI had been warned of the impending attacks in the summer of 2001. When she tried to report her findings, she was fired. There are other reports of shenanigans in the FBI in the days leading to 9/11.
- In the summer of 2001, the intelligence agencies of multiple countries repeatedly gave Washington highly specific warnings of an impending attack .
- The alleged hi-jackers were a gang of incompetents. Their flight instructors reported that some of the alleged hi-jackers could barely fly Cessnas, let alone Jumbos.
- Shortly after the attack, while the flying curfew was still in place, a military airplane flew a batch of Bin Laden family members out of the US.
- Technology permitting the remote control of airplanes has existed for ages. Think of the Predator drones.

⁴<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/1559151.stm>, accessed on 8 October 2011

- There is evidence indicating that CIA and FBI elements shielded and protected the "terrorist" patsies, Atta in particular, during the latter's stay in the US.
- This Mohammed Atta led a carefree life before 9/11. He partied and boozed up to the last day. Pork chops were a favourite of his. And this guy was supposed to have written a fanatically Islamic last will? He behaved as if nothing out of the ordinary expected him on 9/11. Proponents of the official version marvel at Atta's sangfroid. The possibility exists that Atta was ignorant of what fate had in store for him. His father has vehemently denied his son's involvement in the 9/11 plot. Was the unhappy father protecting the memory of his son? What if he is right? How can *you* tell? There are more incongruences in the Atta story.

Here is a non-exhaustive list of statesmen, brass, and spooks who disagree with the official version of 9/11⁵:

Senator Max Cleland; Senator Mark Dayton; Congressman Ron Paul; Congressman Curt Weldon; Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney; Director of the FBI, Louis Freeh; Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, Paul Craig Roberts, PhD; Assistant Secretary of Housing, Catherine Austin Fitts; U.S. Army Intelligence officer, Federal Prosecutor, Office of Special Investigations, U.S. Department of Justice, John Loftus; Foreign Service Officer, George Kenney, Foreign Service Officer, J. Michael Springman; Deputy Attorney General, State of Pennsylvania, Philip J. Berg; Major General U.S. Army, Commanding General of U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command, Albert Stubblebine; Col. Ronald D. Ray; Col. Robert Bowman; Col. George Nelson; Major Douglas Rokke, PhD; Capt. Russ Wittenberg; Lt. Col. Karen U. Kwiatkowski, PhD; Senior Military Affairs Journalist at the Naval Postgraduate School, Barbara Honegger, MS; Capt. Gregory M. Zeigler, PhD; Capt. Eric H. May, U.S. Army, Intelligence officer; Former Chairman, National Intelligence Estimates, CIA, responsible for preparing the President Daily Brief, U.S. Army Intelligence Officer, Raymond L. McGovern; National Intelligence Officer and Director of the CIA's Office of Regional and Political Analysis, William Christison; U.S. Marine Corps intelligence officer, case officer CIA. Robert David Steele; CIA Case Officer, Specialist in the Middle East, Directorate of Operations, Awarded Career Intelligence Medal, Robert Baer; Counter-terrorism expert in the Security Division of the federal Aviation Administration. Team leader of the FAA's Red (Terrorism) Team in the Federal Air Marshall program, Coast Guard officer, Bogdan Dzakovic; Minister of Justice, West Germany, Horst Ehmke, PhD; State Secretary, Federal Ministry of Defense, West Germany, Andreas von Buelow, PhD; President of Italy, Francesco Cossiga; General Leonid Ivashov, Chief of Staff, Russian armed forces, Ministry of Defense; Foreign Minister of Egypt, Mohamed Hassanein Heikal; Chief of Staff, Pakistani Army, General Mirza Aslam Beg; European Parliament, Committee on Security and Defense, Giulietto Chiesa; French Army Intelligence and artillery officer, Col. Pierre-Henri Bunel; Safety Engineer and accident Analyst, National Safety Technology Authority, Finland, Heikki Kurttila, PhD; Counter-Terrorism Officer, MI5 (Britain), David Shayler;

and finally, four of the fellows who were involved in the official 9/11 Commission: Chairman, 9/11 Commission, Thomas H. Kean, Former Governor of New Jersey; Vice Chairman, 9/11 Commission, Lee Hamilton, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Homeland Security Advisory Council; 9/11 Commissioner, Timothy J. Roemer, PhD, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; Senior Counsel, 9/11 Commission, John J. Farmer, Jr., Former Attorney General, NJ, Former Commissioner of the State Commission of Investigations.

Lots of conspiracy theorists out there.

So what really happened on 9/11? Let the reader examine the evidence and draw his own conclusion.

For my part, it looks like the towers were blown up and the Pentagon was hit by something like a cruise missile. The alleged terrorists were probably patsies and dupes. The planes could have been flown by remote control.

⁵<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=26897>, accessed on 8 October 2011

Who is the culprit? It is hard to tell, which is why I keep using the vague term "Oligarchs." Clearly, some high-level intelligence, military, and executive branch elements were involved. The problem of secrecy is not as serious as it appears at first glance. First, no one who participated in the plot would implicate himself. These are serious people. Besides, who would willingly confess to treason and mass murder? Next, compartmentalization in a hierarchical structure can go a long way. The Federal government's obsession with secrecy also helps.

In short, the "inside job" version of 9/11 best fits with the accumulated evidence. On the other hand, the official version of 9/11 is absurd and contradicts basic facts of history and physics. We will likely never know the full story. Nevertheless, a serious investigation into the 9/11 issue would be welcome.

For our purposes it suffices to know that 9/11 was indeed an inside job.

2.1.4 The Consequences of 9/11

Human crowds are swayed by myths and images. To get an idea of the phenomenon George Orwell called "groupthink," read Gustave Le Bon's *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (1895). Unsurprisingly, Le Bon's book was a favourite of both Hitler and Mussolini. For a different approach to the subject, read Bill Buford's examination of the legendary British football hooligans of the 1980s *Among The Thugs* (1991).

9/11 is the myth that lies in the foundation of the post-millennial world. 9/11 gave the West an existential enemy, an excuse for waging wars of imperialism, and an excuse for beefing up internal police measures. In short, 9/11 was an Oligarch's dream come true.

Bush's reliance on 9/11 became a running joke toward the end of Georgie's presidency. The nauseating yet penetrating TV show *Family Guy* ran an episode in 2008, in which one of the main characters won an election by answering all questions with "nine-eleven" to the thunderous applause of the voters. Tarpley labels the phenomenon of 9/11-religiosity "collective schizophrenia." The American public's pre-Iraq War attitude toward Saddam Hussein illustrates the insanity of 21st century society: The *Christian Science Monitor* reported on the 14th March 2003 that 45% of Americans thought that Saddam was personally involved in 9/11. This despite the administration's admission that no evidence links Saddam to 9/11 or to Al Qaeda.⁶ It is easy to create specious cognitive links in the minds of the unthinking - all you have to do is to repeatedly insert two concepts in the same paragraph or sentence in mass media broadcasts. Those who fail to pay attention will eventually unconsciously connect the two ideas. As we saw in the first chapter, most people, including the so-called intelligentsia, are utterly brainwashed and will readily believe anything.

The beauty of the terrorist threat is that it is all-encompassing. The Oligarchical mob can label domestic dissenters as "terrorists." Recalcitrant foreign leaders can be smeared as "terrorist supporters" or at least "terrorist apologists." With communism, the opposition at least had shape, form, and ideology. Terrorism, on the other hand, is an amorphous concept that can fit in any context.

Here we should note that given a gullible enough population, any threat can be invented. Consider the effects of Orson Welles's rendition of *The War of the Worlds*. With a mere microphone, Welles managed to create an imaginary alien threat. It is worth noting that Werner Von Braun's secretary, Carol Rosin, has stated that in the 1970s Von Braun spoke of both the anticipated terrorist threat, and of a future manufactured space threat - in the form of either fictitious meteorites or perhaps even faked aliens. This is another tale that is hard to believe, but Dr. Rosin is a credible witness, and our own terrorist-infested reality is strange enough to provoke speculation. If terrorists can be manufactured, why not aliens? Clever propaganda can accomplish astounding feats.

The irony of the terrorist threat is that even if we accept the official version of 9/11, things still fail to make sense. Less than 3,000 people perished on 9/11. In contrast, every year more than 30,000 Americans die in car crashes. Today (in late 2011) one in six Americans is on food stamps. Millions of people ingest toxic psychotropic drugs. Academic studies claim that between 40,000 and

⁶<http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/0314/p02s01-woiq.html>, accessed on 8 October 2011

200,000 Americans die every year from "preventable medical errors" (again, this is trivially verifiable via the respective documented article on Wikipedia). Since the post-9/11 wars started, more American soldiers have died of suicide than have perished in combat. Terrorism is a non-issue. At best, terrorism is completely irrelevant, and at worst it is a minor annoyance. We have bigger problems to deal with. And yet terrorism has been made into one of the premier problems of our society. Terrorism justifies the terrorist imperial wars, the taxation of the public for the funding of those wars, and the fascistic entrenchment of the global police state. Whether terrorism is even real, and whether it is really a threat, is of no consequence. In the age of mass brainwashing, the indoctrinators set the tune.

Even under the aegis of the original 9/11 story, the Anglo-Americans had no justification for invading Afghanistan and Iraq. Under no interpretation was 9/11 an attack by a foreign state. Most of the terrorist patsies were Saudis. The US never found any evidence linking Osama to 9/11. And yet the people accepted the invasion of Afghanistan. Saddam had nothing to do with 9/11 and possessed no WMDs - and yet his country was invaded and he was hanged. Of course, by the Nuremberg principles Bush and Blair would also hang. And yet many Americans cheered the destruction of Iraq. The 9/11 reality show permeates everything like a grimy smog.

This is why 9/11 remains a premier issue of our era and why the realization that 9/11 stinks is one of the first steps on the road to de-indoctrination. Fortunately, the colossal hubris of the Oligarchs, their gall in carrying out an event of such scope, has left us with a mountain of evidence large enough to awaken anyone willing to try to cease slumbering.

The sloppiness of the Oligarchs indicates that they are not all-powerful and that they make mistakes. The sheer scope of the event, on the other hand, gives us an idea of the cabal's confidence and power.

If the definitive event of the post-communist era was a fabrication, then how much of what we know is true? What other delusions do we harbour? 9/11, 2001, was a major glitch in the Matrix of our reality. Another glitch occurred in 2008.

2.2 2008 Economic Meltdown

A swath of topical books have come out since the 2008 financial crisis. I recommend Matt Taibbi's post-meltdown series of articles for *Rolling Stone*. Taibbi has also written a book on the subject - *Griftopia* (2010). The astute and vicious Taibbi is one of America's few real investigative journalists. Another useful reference is Michel Chossudovsky and Andrew G. Marshall's *The Global Economic Crisis* (2010).

For a comprehensive book predicting the crisis, see Tarpley's *Surviving The Cataclysm* (1999).

For an overview of 20th century financial history, see William Engdahl's *Gods of Money* (2010). Also read the relevant passages in Quigley's classic *Tragedy & Hope* (1966).

To understand economics, read the original sources - Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Pareto, Keynes, Leontieff, and so on. Personally, I would not bother with the free-market freaks of the ilk of Von Hayek, Von Mises, and Milton Friedman. To me, hardcore free-marketism (the "Austrian" school; the classic British Liberal Economists were also free-marketeers, but their works were the original ones) is an exercise in circular logic tinged with shades of cultism and obscurantism. When studying economics, keep away from the universities and the standard university textbooks. Modern academic economics revolves around silly mathematical models, high-level statistics, and doctrinaire hocus-pocus utterly divorced from reality. I know, because I have a degree in economics. Read the original works and try to reason things for yourself from basic principles and history. Once you get beyond the obfuscations, the science of political economy, as it used to be called, is relatively simple. Many complications come via the intentionally manufactured shenanigans related to the idea of money.

For an overview of the magical private Federal Reserve system, read the original work - Eustace Mullins's 1952 *Secrets of the Federal Reserve*. Mullins was the last of the long-term proteges/associates of the influential poet Ezra Pound, four other being Hemingway, T.S. Eliot, James Joyce, and W.B.

Yeats - all winners of the Noble Prize for literature.

2.2.1 The 2008 Crash

On the 15th of September 2008, the "global financial services" firm Lehman Brothers, one of the major players on Wall Street and on the world financial scene, collapsed. In the ensuing chaos, the various stock market indicators dived and it turned out that a plethora of major financial institutions were on the brink of insolvency. Financial Armageddon threatened the entire world. The then US Secretary of the Treasury Hank Poulson forced a terrified Congress into passing a \$700 billion bailout on the 3rd of October. This bailout patched the failing dike for a while. A second crash occurred in 2009. Politicians across the nations legislated more bailouts and stimulus packages. Meanwhile, the bankers kept awarding themselves record bonuses. Barrack Obama's foremost campaign contributors had been the big banks. The first black president's cabinet was rife with Goldmanites. In a bizarre "coincidence," Goldman Sachs made a killing during the meltdown. When the government bailed out the insurance giant AIG, the latter promptly proceeded to pay some of its outstanding debts to Goldman.

The crash plunged the world economy into a depression. Worldwide unemployment soared. Suddenly, most of the world nations found themselves mired in debt. The political figureheads started to implement austerity measures along the lines of the IMF shock doctrine, which has never produced positive results. No recovery took place. Entire nations, Greece being the basket case, faced the gloomy prospect of bankruptcy. A few shadowy "credit rating agencies," the same ones who had failed to predict the 2008 crash, began to downgrade companies and countries left and right. Even the United States was not spared. At the time of this writing, in September 2011, another crash looms in the near future. We have a situation marked by stock market volatility, banks on the brink, and states on the edge of the abyss.

What is going on? In particular one must asks the question, how could all of this happen again after the lessons of the Great Depression?

We look briefly at the immediate causes of the 2008 meltdown. Following the 1929 crash, in an effort to curb speculation, the US House of Representatives passed the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933. Glass-Steagall forced the separation of savings and investment banks. Saving banks are supposed to take care of credit (money) creation to provide "liquidity" (access to credit) and thus supply a financial framework for the general national economy. Investment banks, on the other hand, engage in large-scale, sometimes risky but potentially profitable, projects, and in good-old parasitic speculation. In general, the investment bankers are influential members of the Oligarchy playing with their own money. Investment banks do not take deposits. However, as one would naturally surmise, the Oligarchs would not mind risking other people's money in the global financial casino - hence the need for Glass-Steagall. Other safeguards were established at one time or another, such as governmental control over interest rates, and the prohibition of certain "financial instruments."

The other crucial characteristic features of the global financial system came from the Bretton Woods conference of 1944. Bretton Woods set up fixed exchange rates for the global currencies in regard to the dollar, and gave the dollar a gold backing. In effect, this defended the national currencies from predatory speculative attacks, and checked balance-of-trades abuses via an insistence on gold transfers. So far so good from Bretton Woods. Unfortunately, the 1944 conference also gave us the infernal succubus of the IMF-World Bank sisterhood of supranational institutions.

Such was the system of the post-war world. It worked reasonably well and saw the revival of Europe and Japan, as well as the golden decade of the American 1950s, which marked the pinnacle of the prosperity of the American middle and working classes. The system worked and therefore it had to be dismantled. To get rid of the pesky impediments to Oligarchical supremacy, our friends the international bankers, some of them based in London, others in Anglophile circles on Wall Street,

concocted the ideology of "free-market" deregulation, coupled with the long-desired idea of "globalization" (Tarpley uses the more lyrical and soothing term "Globaloney"). The kooky hack Milton Friedman was turned overnight into an economic guru. Countless learned professors and media outlets preached the glories of deregulation, which they euphemistically called "the free market." This is an elementary PR trick. "Freedom" is a word people like to hear. In the real world there is no such thing as a "free market," and the term itself is utterly meaningless.

The dollar gold backing was the first to go. By 1971, under the sage guidance of highly competent agents of the Oligarchy, the US, still mired in Vietnam, was on its way toward unending trade deficits. The US gold reserve, having been surreptitiously drained, could no longer fulfil its purpose. Nixon officially decoupled the dollar from gold on the 15th of August 1971. Since that date the dollar, and all other currencies with it, has been a fiat currency, meaning that the value of the dollar is a function of people's faith in the economic stability of the United States. In itself, that is perfectly fine. One of the main reasons for the persistence of the dollar as the world's reserve currency, apart from the still lingering economic supremacy of the United States, was Kissinger's petro-dollar system - the good doctor had managed to get the OPEC nations to promise to do their oil business in dollars only. So today the dollar sort of has an oil-backing, though, likely, not for long.

Pertinently, fixed exchange rates followed the gold standard out of the window. This opened the way to currency speculation and the attacks on national currencies. To smash a currency, all a few big players have to do is to announce that the currency is going down and at the same time give it a push by massive short-sells. Panic ensues and the currency tanks. The nation may lose its capacity to pay its foreign debt, which opens the door for IMF shock therapy, which we will discuss later. Furthermore, in the aftermath of a currency collapse, the big bankers can go in a country and buy the best companies at a discount. In the deregulated era of the 1990s the bankers had a field day. Eastern Europe and much of East Asia experienced horrific currency meltdowns in 1997-1998.⁷ Even the British pound incurred a hit in 1992. The shadowy yet grandiose figure of the hedge-fund-operator George Soros hovered over the entire unholy mess.⁸

The Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act of 1980 eliminated interest rates controls and set up the terrain for the late 1980s Savings & Loan scandal by allowing the merger of mortgage banks and regular checking deposit-type banks. The Garn-St. Germain Depository Institutions Act of 1982 finished the job by allowing the banks to offer "adjustable-rate", i.e. usurious, mortgages.

As deregulation progressed like a fast spreading tumor, the exotic financial instruments called "derivatives" began to penetrate the major world financial centers. The nature of derivatives is hard to explain, because derivatives make no sense. In general, we have companies which possess capital goods which produce tangible goods or not-so-tangible services. The goods have intrinsic value, and the services a more or less arbitrary ascribed value. Now some of these companies sell themselves piecemeal on the stock market. Stocks are just paper. They have no intrinsic value. The value of stocks depends to a large degree on the public's confidence in the company underneath the stocks. Now we go a step further and introduce derivatives. These would be pieces of paper except that in the age of computers they are not even printed. The derivative is something like a contract for the future payment of money based on the behaviour of various things, including stocks. Thus the derivative has no intrinsic value - it has imaginary value that depends on the imaginary value of stocks and on the behavior of commodity prices, which is subject to speculation.

To get an idea of the power of this particular scam, consider the following situation. A clever person loans a sum of money, rents an office, buys a few computers, and declares that he has opened a software firm. He announces that he will soon have the world's ultimate social network - or whatever

⁷In consequence of the "Reverse Plaza Accords"; see Ch. 9 of Chalmers Johnson's *Blowback* (2000).

⁸See, for example, <http://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/08/george-soros-bank-of-england.asp#axzz1kEvFy9Op>. Malaysia's Prime Minister at the time of the Asian Crisis, Mahathir Mohamad, explicitly fingered Soros for crushing his country's currency. This is mentioned on Wikipedia - *1997 Asian financial crisis*. A PBS documentary mentions Soros's key role in the Russian crash - <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/crash/etc/russia.html>. Links accessed Jan 22, 2012.

else. Then he sells stocks. People flock to this promising new start-up and the value of the company stocks appreciates. Meanwhile our entrepreneur plays backgammon and with himself. When the time has come, he sells his stocks, pays his loan, and flies to Dubai. The stocks of his firm crash. Out of nowhere, people owe debts, which they have to pay, if necessary, with tangible wealth. Naifs and con-victims who sold their houses to buy stocks jump from skyscrapers. Our entrepreneur uses his hard-earned fiat money to buy ice-cream, sensuous massages, fast cars, and other actual goods and services. This is like a Ponzi scheme, except it is legal. Events of this type took place around the millennial Dotcom Bubble.

Now picture such a scheme realized on a global scale with the benefit of derivatives to realize the extent of the mess in which we find ourselves.

The Financial Services Modernization Act of 1999 almost finished the deregulation job by fully repealing Glass-Steagall. The final step was the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000, which deregulated the derivatives, and, crucially, permitted speculation in the commodity markets. All sorts of banks started merging and speculation exploded. A moronic mentality of short-term profits, *apres moi le deluge*, ruled the day.

To make more dough, the newly hatched megabanks started offering mortgages to everybody who could breathe. Given the choice between renting cockroach-infested apartments, and paying mortgages on MacMansions, with at least the prospect of eventual ownership, the hapless downtrodden masses bit the hook and moved in. Many of the mortgages were classic debt-traps. The adjustable-rate ones were often impossible to pay off, because after a brief honeymoon period, the interest rates jacked up and people could not afford the payments. To make more money, and to "spread the risk," the banks upped the trading of derivatives. The total imaginary value of these derivatives attained incomprehensible proportions. Today the world's derivatives are evaluated at over one quadrillion USD. A quadrillion is a thousand trillions. In comparison, the world's GDP is estimated to be in the \$ 60 trillion range.

All the buying and selling of mortgages naturally inflated the average imaginary value of houses in America. After about 2005 it became evident that many of the mortgages could never be paid. The housing bubble would burst some day, and there would be hell to pay. Many realistic observers saw the crash coming. Here is a sample of ten names: Tarpley was on the record before 2000; Engdahl wrote a series of articles outlining the whole scam in 2006 and 2007; the Peak Oil cult-leader Mike Ruppert predicted the crash before 2006; Gerald Celente listed the crash as one of his trends for 2008; Mark Ames of *The eXiled* fame predicted the crash in 2006; the Austrian school lover Peter Schiff predicted the crash; the mainstream economist Nouriel Roubini saw it coming, as did his colleagues Marc Faber and Nassim Taleb; the Yale professor Robert Schiller also made the right guess; author William Bernstein claimed in a 2002 book that the removal of Glass-Steagall would have predictable dire consequences - and that's eleven. These are people of different backgrounds and views - and yet they all published specific warnings in the years before the crash.

By the way, should anyone accuse me of over-relying on the works of Tarpley, Engdahl, and Quigley - well, what do you want me to do? Refer to Greenspan, Marx, and Hayek? Tarpley and Engdahl dissected the economic meltdown long before it arrived - and hence their credibility has been established. Likewise, Quigley offered one of the best analyses of the Great Depression available. Considering the opinions of all sides is worthwhile. After considering all opinions, one must figure out the truth of the matter. Truth is not relative. Some people explain things more accurately than do others.

Which brings us to the main point of this section: the 2008 crash was totally predictable given the configuration of the world financial system after 1999. This means that the people at the very top, the creme-de-la-creme of the Oligarchy, must have anticipated, or rather created, the event. The bankers' swift action in the wake of the Lehman bankruptcy, as well as the heavy banker presence inside the Obama administration, also suggests foreknowledge. All of this means that the 2008 financial crisis was pre-planned. Things do not just happen. The 2008 crash was consciously and

deliberately set up via the mechanisms we examined above.

More broadly speaking, a priori there are only two conceivable overall explanations of the 2008 crash - 1) mass imbecility (or as the ghoulish Greenspan put it, "irrational exuberance"), and 2) pre-meditation. Again I ask my reader - do you really think that in a world in which by conservative estimates the top 2% of the population controls half the world's wealth the people at the top do not know what they are doing? Who really got hurt by the economic crisis? Was it the bankers, who keep awarding their lower-level lackeys record bonuses? Or was it the unemployment, impoverished masses?

The crash was most likely a part of the Big Plan, which we examine in detail in the next chapter. Before we get there, let us look at the real structural problems of the world economy.

2.2.2 Real and Imaginary Problems of the World Economy

In a sane world, the science of political economy would deal with two major problems: 1) Getting a community to make stuff, and 2) distributing the stuff among the members of the community.

The world economy, if we can call it that, fails spectacularly in both aspects. This is strange, because the knowledge of how things work is available to everyone in the public libraries. Between 1868 and 1939, Japan turned from a backward isolationist feudal kingdom into a bursting industrial martial empire. All in one lifetime! More impressive yet was Japan's post-war recovery. The bombed-out Japan of 1945 became the world's most powerful industrial nation (in terms of relative size) by the mid-1970s. Japan is a particularly fascinating case in the light of Nippon's poverty in natural resources. Or take the example of the United States - in 1790 the United States was a pre-industrial nation of about 4,000,000 souls. By 1920 the United States was the world's top industrial power and had a population of 106 million. Or take China - in 1980 it barely registered on the world's economic map, and yet today Chinese goods have flooded stores across the world.

Industrialization is simple enough: first, a country has to obtain a source of energy - from coal mines, oil fields, or dams. Next a basic machine tools and steel industry - capital stock - has to be developed, along with a reasonable infrastructure - railways, highways, canals, electric networks, communication networks. Finally, the country should set up some type of mid-range to heavy (or high-tech) industry - factories for cars, TVs and other electronics, tractors, airplanes, trains, chemicals, and so on. To finance this whole process the country can negotiate for loans from friendly developed nations, or it can peddle its basic natural resources - such as oil. Once in possession of sufficient industrial might, the nation can trade its surplus production for goods it does not itself produce. Wealth has to spread across the population, or the people would not be able to buy the stuff the country produces or imports.

That is all it takes. Various nations have gone through the steps. And yet today the world suffers increasing poverty and desperation. Why?

From the Oligarchical perspective, development is unnecessary. People who do not have to worry about putting food on the table have the means and the opportunity to stop and think about the world at large. This is unwelcome, because of the Wizard of Oz principle - if too many people peek behind the curtain, the Oligarchical shroud of deception will disintegrate and the Oligarchs will lose their privileges. As we will see in the next chapter, what an Oligarchy would like the best is a static caste society of the type all too often observed throughout history. India, China, and too many other societies all had systems of this type, which only crumbled under outside pressure.

The real problem in our world is underdevelopment. What causes this underdevelopment is not the intrinsic backwardness of many of Earth's peoples, as we have been surreptitiously told to believe, but the brutal sabotage from above that the Oligarchs have exercised overtly via colonialism and imperialism, and covertly via economic subversion - a silent type of warfare.

Let us quickly examine the anti-development scams perpetrated upon us.

A century ago, the big eight players - the Albion, the Habsburgs, France, Germany, Russia, the Ottomans, the US and Japan - owned the world. The imperial colonial possessions served as sources for raw materials and for markets. Various Oligarchical mouthpieces lamented the problem of "overproduction." Overproduction occurs when the markets can not absorb the output of the factories, a process which drives down prices and closes down the factories. Now, obviously, in reality "overproduction" has never been a problem. The real problem is the maldistribution of wealth, which prohibits the vast majority of the world's people from enjoying the fruits of their own labour. How can people buy things when the Oligarchy gobbles up so much?

The industrial magnate Henry Ford understood this problem and solved it on his end by paying his workers high wages so they could afford to buy his cars. He was an example of the type of paternalist Oligarch that makes Oligarchy almost tolerable. Unfortunately, he also happened to be a Nazi; but that is another question.

In our examination it suffices to say that colonial possessions, with a few strategic exceptions, were not allowed to develop. The imperialist powers looted the colonies for valuable natural goods like rubber and gold, and suffocated indigenous craftsmen by the dumping of mass-produced factory goods. This was called "the free market." In reality, a country which can not protect itself with tariffs can never develop its own industry, because it can not defend itself against underselling from more developed industrial nations. This has been proved again and again and was most recently demonstrated by China.

Colonial oppression of that type was, most likely, the greatest immediate cause for the American War of Independence of the late 18th century.

It should be realized that only the Oligarchs really profit from imperialism. Take 19th century Britain. The average Briton could work himself to death in a factory, go die in a colonial war, or emigrate to the States in desperation. A "middle class" existed, but its size was insignificant compared to the whole of the population. In contrast, consider a situation in which the would-be empire and the would-be colony both develop in peaceful cooperation and sportsmanlike competition. There will be more goods to go around for everybody. These self-apparent truisms seem to elude most people, including the colonial drones who persist in their "civilizing" missions to this day.

World War Two drained the resources of the imperialist states, and forced the Western powers to at least superficially try to live up to their spiel of democracy. After bloody and costly wars spanning from Kenya, through Algeria, to Indochina, the imperialists abandoned their empires and promptly set to the construction of a new scam. They came up with the old usury routine. Usury usually succeeds where plain bullying fails.

The main tool for the neo-colonialist con-game was the International Monetary Fund, the supra-national banker-controlled institution spawned at Bretton Woods in 1944. For an overview of the IMF racket, consult Chossudovsky's *The Globalization of Poverty* (1997), Naomi Klein's *The Shock Doctrine* (2007), and John Perkins's *Confessions of an Economic Hitman* (2004) and *The Secret History of the American Empire* (2007). Chalmers Johnson's trilogy also features comments on the economic aspect of Anglo-American imperialism. Parenti and Chomsky have published and talked on the subject.

Chossudovsky (1946-) is professor of economics emeritus from the University of Ottawa. Klein (1970-) is an influential left-wing pundit. Perkins (1945-) worked for the firm Chas. T. Main, which, according to him, was an Oligarchical front.

Here is how the IMF fraud works: First, the bankers send specially trained agents, meaning appropriate graduates of the various Oligarchical schools discussed in Chapter 1, to offer specific infrastructure projects to the leaders of the third world nations. These infrastructure projects serve two purposes: 1) They allow the big corporations to come in and exploit certain natural resources, and 2) The projects burden the host nation with debt. Leaders who see through the charade are bribed, or, if necessary, killed. Perkins provides Omar Torrijos as an example of a murdered nationalistic leader. One particularly elegant aspect of the scam allows for the funnelling of Western taxpayer "foreign aid" money back to the Oligarch controlled super-corporations - because the corporations are the

ones in charge of the infrastructure projects.

When the time is right, financial sharks sink the value of the target nation's currency, rendering the nation's foreign debt - expressed in, say, dollars - unpayable. This is where the IMF comes in with the "shock therapy." The bankers in their kindness agree to "help" the nation pay its debts, subject to a few reasonable conditions, namely: 1) the social safety nets have to go, being "unaffordable"; 2) public enterprises must be "privatized," i.e. sold off to the bankers; 3) and trade barriers have to go down, which allows the corporations to take over. Stricken nations are forced to mine and export natural resources to pay off their debts, which are often unpayable because of the intricacies of compound interest. This "shock therapy" invariably leads to: 1) social stratification, or should we say Oligarchization - the wealth of the country concentrates into the hands of a tiny elite; 2) economic decline - because the bankers liquidate some of the privatized companies, and commit other ones to exploitation in search for profits; 3) widespread suffering, as the economic meltdown coincides with the dismantling of the social safety nets; 4) loss of sovereignty as the IMF meddles in the country's domestic affairs.

In what can only be a crude joke, the Oligarchs came up with the following euphemism for their murderous shock doctrine: Structural Adjustment Program - or SAP. "Neo-liberal economics," "austerity measures," and "free-market fundamentalism" are three other more or less equivalent terms for the modus operandi of the IMF/World Bank hydra.

South America suffered a below-the-belt shock therapy blow in the late 1970s and the early-to-mid 1980s. In the 1990s it was Eastern Europe's turn. What the IMF did in Eastern Europe was a genocide. To get an idea, take a look at Russia's demographics. The population of Russia went from 148.5 million in 1992 to just under 142 million in 2009. Contrast this with the effect of one of the worst calamities in Russia's history - World War II: The estimated population of Russia in 1940 was 110 million. Six years later the figure stood at 98 million. The numbers speak for themselves. The case of Bulgaria offers another instructive example. From a 1989 high of 9 million souls, the population of Bulgaria dropped to 7.5 million in the shock therapy era - a decline of a sixth. Were the United States to undergo a debacle of such proportions, 65 million Americans would vanish in the ether. The causes of the decline in population were low fertility, mass emigration, and mass early death, all caused by the adverse economic conditions inflicted by the "shock therapy."

For another linguistic curiosity, observe that "shock therapy," as a technical term, resembles the psychiatric procedure of "Electro-Convulsive Shock Therapy," which fries people's brains out, and causes broken bones by inflicting spasms, but does not demonstrably relieve "mental illness," just as "economic shock therapy" does not demonstrably relieve poverty, but quite the contrary.

East Asia incurred an IMF assault in the late 1990s. Today, in the aftermath of the 2008 crash, the IMF bell tolls for the Western world. Thus the witch's raven has come home to roost.

In this way have the bankers tortured and exploited humanity for the last four-odd decades. Another of their recent gambits, imperative under the logic of the Big Plan, has been the push for "Globalization." The principles of globalization are simple: nations must commit to "international free-trade agreements," which are, in reality, abdications of sovereignty to the United Nations and its sister Oligarch-controlled institutions. This free trade amounts to the unlimited and unchecked movement of goods, currencies, and labourers across borders. What are the effects of such policies? Again simple - under globalization, American workers have to compete with Mexican workers, which means that the wages of the Americans will sink to the level of the wages of the Mexican workers. The unlimited movement of goods allows for the dumping of goods, amounting to the destruction of indigenous industries and agricultures. For example, following the passage of NAFTA, the American corporations dumped subsidized corn on the Mexican market. Unable to compete, millions of Mexican farmers went under. Many sought employment as illegal immigrants in America. This led to increased unemployment and downward pressure on wages in the States. Worse, the understandably aggrieved Americans resent their even less fortunate Mexican counterparts. Thus, instead of forming a united front against the merciless Oligarchical murderers, American and Mexican workers bicker to their dual detriment. This is the true face of Globaloney. The "free movement of capital" principle

amounts to a *carte blanche* for the banks, which can now go anywhere and buy anything. Mass migration annihilates cultures on all sides. Europe is losing its identity under the influx of aliens; meanwhile the Muslims see their traditions deformed under the onslaught of Western "entertainment," i.e. cultural goods.

Let me be clear - I have seen different cultures and appreciate cultural diversity. This is why I protest against the insidious dogma of multiculturalism. Under the silly euphemisms lies hideous double-speak. Multiculturalism is anti-culturalism. It will lead to ethnic strife and to the merger of the various cultures into one vast shapeless tasteless brown slop. I am for universal development and for the conquest of poverty. Let cultures develop cooperatively, each in its own sphere.

There are no winners under globalization - except for the bankers and their minions. Like Snake Plissken said, "Welcome to the human race!" A rat race to the bottom for all except the Oligarchs, who see themselves as a race apart. But we are getting ahead of ourselves. Plissken is a character created by the director John Carpenter, whose distinctive films belong almost without exception to the horror genre, and who is notable for his important picture *They Live* (1988), which the reader should see.

Most people fail to see the obvious long-term goal of globalization. Some see the goal but not its implications. The goal is and can only be corporate world government. We will look at the prerequisites for world government in the next chapter; for now we merely observe that, as the stooge Woodrow Wilson proved after Paris, an economically powerful and independent America would never accept a world government without insisting on American supremacy, a condition no self-respecting other nation can tolerate. In other words, the economical destruction of America is a necessary condition for the establishment of world government, which is the foreordained conclusion of the process of globalization.

Thus, one of the broken eggs of the stinking Globaloney omelette must be America. Which explains the de-industrialization of the United States that has taken place over the last four decades, at an accelerated pace since the mid-90s and the signing of NAFTA.

For a look into the hideous fallout of America's industrial decline, read Barbara Ehrenreich's *Nickel and Dimed* (2002) and *Bait and Switch* (2005), Jill Fraser's *White-Collar Sweatshop* (2002), and Elizabeth Warren's *The Two Income Trap* (2003).

Ehrenreich (1941-) is a Rockefeller University PhD in cellular immunology. Jill Fraser is a financial journalist who has written for *Bloomberg Personal Finance*, *Forbes*, and the *NYT*. Warren (1949-) is a former Harvard Law School professor, and the commander in chief of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which Obama reluctantly created.

Page 5 of Warren's book offers a concise summary of the situation: In 1981, about 69,000 women had filed for bankruptcy. The data on my printout indicated that by 1999 that figure had jumped to nearly 500,000 - an unimaginable leap." Moreover - and this is absolutely crucial in light of what we will see in the next chapter - emphasis Warren's - "*Having a child is now the single best predictor that a woman will end up in financial collapse.*" The victims were not deadbeats, but, often, educated professionals.

This is what has happened: since the 1970s, Americans work longer, under more stressful conditions, for less. One particularly tragicomic aspect of the scam is the role of radical feminism in the methodical defenestration of the American middle class. In the old days, the men worked, and the women also worked, but in the house. Housework is hard work, and to the chagrin of the Oligarchs housework was not taxed. So when the Oligarchs introduced radical feminism to go along with the process of de-industrialization. Women had to go out and get careers, which they did, mostly in the service pencil-pushing economy. And voila - nowadays both husband and wife have jobs, they both pay taxes, the work-stress strains their relationship, the double income masks the decline in wages that has occurred since the '60s, and almost nobody notices anything beyond the ubiquitous sense of malaise. The Oligarchs have done their best to suppress the expression of the public's growing unease by creating the "positive thinking" scam. Positive thinking amounts to convincing yourself

that the world is great and that nothing bad will happen if you don't think bad thoughts. This baloney goes hand in hand with a guilt complex, because when things go wrong the positive thinker has no one to blame but herself. I write 'herself,' because the disease of positive thinking seems to be especially prevalent among women, and is a major component of the Oprah package.

Let us make a distinction between positive thinking and the cautious optimism that comes with hard work, wide understanding, and commitment to worthy goals. The former is a form of delusion. The latter is a basic psychological phenomenon.

The observant Barbara Ehrenreich noticed the problem with positive thinking and wrote a book on the subject - *Bright-sided* (2009).

The nature of de-industrialization is well-understood - corporations offshore their factories to lower production costs, i.e. to use third-world slave labour. Globaloney with its deregulation and "free-trade" deals provides the vehicle for corporate offshoring. Yes, it is that simple, contrary to what the economists say.

Abundant empirical evidence of de-industrialization exists. Take steel production. Steel is one of the flagships of industry - a nation needs steel to make ships, railroads, cars, buildings, sturdy furniture, and so on. Let us take a look at the official US steel production figures.⁹ In 1944 the US produced 81 million tons of steel out of a 164 million tons total for the world. In '45, as the war ended, the US produced 72 million tons out of a 101 million tons total. At that time the US had half (or more) of the world's economy. As we saw earlier, the world industrialized massively in the post-war years. In 1973 American steel production peaked at 137 millions tons, and the world's combined production hit 700 million tons. Then came the dismantling of the original Bretton-Woods system, the oil shocks, the IMF shock therapy, and Volcker's 20% interest rates. America's steel production fell to an abysmal low of 68 million tons in 1982, before recovering up to a level of 90-100 million tons per year. The world's steel production hung around the 700 million ton mark until the late '90s, with East Asia making up for the production that the Westerners and the Eastern Europeans lost. In recent years, America's steel production hovered near the 100 million level, though the 2009 production was lower by a third because of the crisis. Meanwhile, the world's production has passed the 1.3 billion ton mark, largely because of China's stunning rise. Today, China produces half the world's steel, and Europe and Japan combined produce about a quarter (both very rough figures). The former giants of US and Russia & the Ukraine taken together barely produce as much as the EU.

For another illustrative contrast, compare the steel outputs of the US and South Korea. The United States is a large nation of 300 million and a history of success in the 20th century. South Korea is a tiny nation with a large population of 50 million. Barely half a century ago the semi-colonial South Korea burned in the hell of civil war. And yet in 2010 South Korea produced 58.5 millions tons of steel compared to an 80.6 million tons produced by the United States.¹⁰

The numbers speak for themselves. Note that the per-capita production figures look even direr. Europe has also de-industrialized, but far more slowly than the United States, perhaps on account of the relative independence of the European governments, which is now vanishing under the onslaught of the authoritarian EU super-government. One exception is the United Kingdom, which embarked on a gung-ho de-industrialization program under the wise and magnificent Thatcher.

Tarpley points out another useful statistic - machine tools production figures. Machine tools are key capital goods. Capital goods are those goods that produce other goods. The budding industrial power's main goal in life is the procurement of a healthy machine tool industry. We quote from Chapter V of Tarpley's *Surviving the Cataclysm*:

During FDR's defense buildup, US machine tool production went from 34,000 units in

⁹<http://minerals.usgs.gov/ds/2005/140/ironsteel.pdf>, accessed on 8 October 2011

¹⁰Figures from World Steel Association data published in Wikipedia here: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steel_production_by_country, accessed on 8 October 2011

1938 to 307,000 in 1942. During the first half of the twentieth century, the United States machine tool producing industry was the dominant one on the planet.

...

In 1981, the US produced 301,313 machine tools. By 1983, under the impact of Volcker, output had declined to 150,837 units, a drop-off of 50%. In 1967, there were 158.4 machine tools produced in the US for every 100,000 persons in the population. By 1995 that number had fallen to 37.6, meaning a per capita decline of almost two thirds over slightly less than three decades. The obsolescence of the machine tool park also increased.

As we can see, the de-industrialization of the West is one of those lunatic facts of life that we have to somehow cope with. There are two possible immediate explanations for the existence of this bizarre suicidal phenomenon. The first case is strong, the second stronger.

De-industrialization tends to be a taboo topic. When people discuss the subject, they put the blame on corporate greed. The usual argument says that the super-national corporations no longer care about the US economy, they only care about profits, and off-shoring offers profits via lower production (labour) costs. So far so good. But then the question arises, how did this mentality come about? The roots of the modern profit-obsessed corporate culture go back to the Austrian/Chicago school neo-liberal psychosis of the '70s, which, accidentally, also gave us the shock doctrine and deregulation. According to the free-market fundamentalist dogma, everything will be great if we all just sought to maximize profits. The idea is blatantly idiotic, as a moment's thought can show. For example, how can there be for-profit hospitals? Or, if profits and deregulation are so great, what's to stop monopolization? Monopoly is very profitable and we have a lot of monopoly - Microsoft, the old Standard Oil and US Steel, Intel, and so on. In general most industries feature oligopolies rather than monopolies, but to the person at the bottom the difference is academic. Free-market fundamentalism along neo-liberal lines is a front for corporate supremacy.

As the 1980s crept in, a new breed of ruthless sadistic yuppie corporate bosses appeared on the scene. They fired people in droves and sought only profits, profits, profits. Many of these people sincerely believed in what they were doing. Oliver Stone's 1987 picture *Wall Street* portrayed the "greed is good" mentality in no uncertain terms. Ironically, many Wall Streeters fell in love with the Gordon Gekko character. Things are even worse today. Profit-seeking at the top has made life hell for the white & blue-collar masses of Americans. Job security exists no longer. Anti-human Taylorist electronic monitoring renders workers into robots. Mark Ames links the deterioration in workplace conditions in America with the phenomenon of workplace and school-yard shootings that emerged in the late '80s - see his *Going Postal* (2005).

In the '50s era of paternal capitalism it was understood that the corporation has to provide for its workers to keep the social contract intact. Paternal oligarchism is semi-tolerable and has gone a long way in Japan. Another feature of the Golden Fifties was the peak of the power of American unionism. In an overlord-capitalist economy of the type we have, unionism is necessary as a safe-guard against the overwhelming might of concentrated capital. Adam Smith made the same observation in the 18th century. Unionism in America has declined since the '50s, precipitously after 1980.

This is indeed the type of mentality that allows for off-shoring. No matter how we look at it, we have to reach the conclusion that the top levels of the American oligarchy are internationalists rather than patriots. A few are clinical idiots who think that if an American corporation makes profits by off-shoring factories, America benefits. Such people should be committed to asylums, and yet they run the joint. Farcical, is it not, dear reader? At the very top, people know what is going on, which means they approve of what is going on, since they make the decisions.

Which brings us to the difference between the strong and stronger cases. The strong case argues that the process is somehow natural - the profit-driven corporate culture and Globaloney are taken as granted. I argue that both phenomena are parts of a larger plan. Globalization and neo-liberalism are well-understood ideologies designed to produce specific effects. Both ideologies are inherently elitist and supra-national, and could only have been pushed from above by an internationalist cabal of powerful Oligarchs. Thus, to solve our problems, we have to get rid of both the ideologies and

their authors. A tall task, but what choice do we have?

A few words on the debt problem that has garnered so many headlines since 2008.

To begin with, let us review a few *a priori* properties of money, debt and usury.

First, observe that it takes two to play the game of debt. If *A* is \$10 in debt, then there must be a *B* somewhere to whom *A* owes the ten bucks. So whenever we hear that so-and-so is in debt, we should ask after the identity of the owner of the I.O.U.

Next, note that debt is imaginary. Debt consists of entries in ledger-books. If we wiped out all debt on Earth and went on with our business, the wind would continue to blow, the rivers would continue to flow, and the Earth would continue to rotate around the Sun. Babies would be born, people would cook and eat, and the spinning wheels would keep on spinning. Debt and money are not real and do not produce anything. Factories powered by electricity and human labour make things. Debt and money are only facilitators that can, in principle, be done away with.

What is money? In general money is a universally accepted token which serves as 1) medium of exchange, 2) a unit of account, 3) a standard of deferred payment, 4) and a store of value. Exchange of goods without money is barter; but what if the goods are too heavy to carry around or if only one of the partners in the exchange has something the other one wants? Enter money. Instead of exchanging goods for goods, we exchange goods for money. We measure the value of goods in money. We can store money today and buy goods tomorrow when we need them. And we can set up a debt/credit system on the basis of money. Fiat money is money that has no intrinsic value. It's just paper; nowadays it is not even that. Non-fiat (commodity) money is a type of material good that fulfils the purpose of money. Salt has been used; as have cigarettes; gold is the standard choice. Gold is a soft, non-corrosive rare metal that you can not do much with - so it is perfect for money. The value of gold stems not so much from its usefulness, as from people's conviction in gold's value as a medium of exchange, and, crucially, from the fact that gold does not oxidise. In other words, people buy gold not because gold is useful for anything, but because they know that other people want to buy gold. In contrast to gold, oil has intrinsic worth. You can drive cars and fly airplanes with oil. As mentioned earlier, the dollar-based oil trade provides something of a backing to the dollar.

The deification of money combined with usury and wage-slavery amounts to one of the most ancient and nastiest scams on this our sorry planet Terra. Consider the following example. You are person *A*, and your neighbour is a person *B* who happens to "own" all the land on the little island the two of you cohabit. How come *B* owns everything? Nobody knows - all you know is that you were born and later you came to consciousness and you discovered that *B* owns all. Now you need a plough to work the land so that you have food to eat. Unfortunately, *B* owns all the land and all the ploughs. In his kindness, *B* offers you a plough on the condition that you take care of all the arable land on the island. As a deal sweetener, *B* allows you to keep as much of the crop as you need to feed yourself. This is what Don Corleone called "an offer you can't refuse," and so you accept. You spend your life tilling the land, feeding *B* in the process. When you die, *B* still owns everything, and your progeny serves *B*'s heirs.

We embellish the example as necessary: Suppose *B* owns a fortified castle and high-quality weapons, while you own no appreciable means of offence or defence. Thus, you can not try to change the status quo via raw force. Suppose, further, that *B* gives some of the loot to a third person, *C* the policeman, who looks after you while *B* relaxes. To avoid challenges from *C*, *B* keeps himself better armed than *C*, and indoctrinates *C* through compulsory "free" schooling.

This is how the world works and has worked, but since there are too many *A*'s out there, and they are not always harmless or unarmed, the *B*'s have had to resort to subterfuge and deceit. Hence money, debt, and usury. If you have nothing in a money-driven society, then you must sell your labour for money, and then you can easily be kept in check - all the owners have to do is make sure your wages are never high enough to let you accumulate wealth. In such a system you are effectively a wage slave. As Southerners were eager to point out before 1861, wage slavery beats even chattel

slavery in devilry, because the owner of the chattel slave must take care of his property, while the renter of the wage slave can work his slave to death, and then just hire a new one.

In the case when you own a little something, but not enough to join the local branch of the oligarchs' club, your stuff must be taken away. The easy way of doing the job is the following: the banker offers you a loan so you can buy something really nice - a bigger car, a bigger pool, a bigger liquor cabinet, anything. By the magic of usury you keep paying and paying, but the compound interest drives you deeper into debt. Soon the banker buys everything you own at bargain prices and that's the end of the story. If you are too smart to fall for a simple scam like that, the banker waits until some calamity hits you, and then goes through the usual motions.

That's how it works. A few questions arise: In the first example, how did B gain possession of everything? The usual answer is that B 's parents worked hard and yours did not. But this answer is useless, because 1) why should you pay the penalty for faults not your own? and 2) what do we make of the master-slave model, in which the slave does the work and the master sits on his behind? This was the model in the classical period, in the medieval period, and even in post-colonial America! Clearly there must be some limits on private property. Property is not theft when it refers to toothbrushes, but the idea that a single person can "own" vast tracts of land and huge palaces while many people have to *rent, thus feeding the property owners*, just to have roofs over their heads, is ludicrous. Therefore private property must be limited, perhaps to a quantity determined by the maximum amount of goods that a person and his dependants could reasonably use directly. Note that such an arrangement would be the opposite of communistic, because communism demands the absolute concentration of property in the hands of the state (i.e. the controllers of the state), while the notion proposed here places absolute limits on the concentration of private property in the hands of anybody. The idea is as old as it is obvious. One of its notable proponents was Huey Long the Kingfish of Louisiana, of whom we will talk more later.

Another interesting question is, why is usury allowed? The Bible condemns usury, so why is usury (30+% interest rates on credit cards) legal in our Christian-based Western society? Why when the evils of usury have been understood for millennia? Because the Oligarchs in power benefit from usury, and have therefore made it legal.

Where did the bankers get all the money? Usury alone goes a long way, but the bankers also have another scam - fractional reserve banking. Here is how fractional reserve banking works. Suppose you have 10 extra dollars. You can either put the dough away under your pillow, or you can deposit the money in a privately owned bank and receive interest. Let's say you deposit your 10 dollars at a 5% annual interest rate. Here comes the catch. The bank knows that at any one time only a few of its clients will want to withdraw their money. So the bank lends \$100 on the backing of your original 10 dollars. When lending to their pals the bankers can lend at rates lower than 5%; when lending to chumps on the street, the bankers charge more than 5%. Either way, the interest on the \$100 will quickly amount to \$10. After that, it is all profit. And that's how the banks create money according to university textbooks. A wonderful system, is it not? All the bankers have to do is suck on their cigars and ask for collateral before giving away loans. Thus the bankers can dispossess those lenders who fail to pay back the interest on the money which the bankers created out of thin air. All of this is "legal," in fact the government insures deposits to protect banks from bank runs. In principle, when a bank goes under during a bank run, the government is supposed to close the bank and accept responsibility (in the name of the taxpayers) for deposits under a certain value. In 2008, however, the banker-infested US government adopted the Too Big to Fail approach - the government accepted banking debts in the name of the taxpayers without really taking over the management of the banks.

Thus we now live in a state of affairs increasingly resembling corporate-banking neo-feudalism.

One of the obvious problems with fractional reserve banking is that if the bankers create money out of nothing via fractional reserve lending and the charging of interest rates, then the bankers can simply use the money to buy real wealth at an exponential rate. Eventually the bankers would end

up "owning" everything.

Note that the fractional reserve scam can still work in a system that uses gold (or silver) backing for the currency. As long as people treat banker-issued pieces of paper ("cheques") as real carriers of value, the bankers can do their magic.

The appearance of the fractional reserve system of banking in the modern world can be traced through the Northern Italian (particularly the Venetian and Genovese) banks of the medieval era, and later to the Dutch and English banks of the baroque period.

We need to examine one final scam before we turn our attention to the post-2008 debt crisis. The mechanism described above spawns \$100 out of an original \$10 - but we still need to somehow conjure the original 10 dollars. Enter the Generals of Lucifer - the Private Central Banks. For an overview of those, read Mullins's *Secrets of the Federal Reserve* or G. Edward Griffin's *The Creature From Jekyll Island* (1994). In short, the private central banks (and particularly the Federal Reserve, which "is neither Federal nor has any reserves") are privately owned entities semi-independent of the governments they are supposed to serve. These central banks charge interest to lend money to the governments. What happens is the central bank buys interest-bearing taxpayer-backed securities from the government in exchange for raw paper cash, on which central banks have monopolies, or for bit flips on secure servers.

So instead of printing their own interest-free money, governments across the world pay the international bankers for the privilege of allowing the private bankers the privilege to print money. How could this happen? This can happen when the bankers are powerful enough to take over a government. The US government itself was central banked almost a century ago, in 1913. If you don't believe in conspiracies, look this one up, because it is a classic bonafide. In 1910, a mob of bankers secretly descended upon Jekyll Island in the state of Georgia and ironed out the Federal Reserve Act. Then they handed the Act under different names to both Democrats and Republicans, financed the candidates of both parties in the 1912 election, and, setting their banker hearts, if such things exist, on Woodrow Wilson, financed Teddy Roosevelt's third-party candidacy to split Taft's vote. Wilson was an admirable stooge and presided over the establishment of the Federal Reserve and America's entry into WWI - two of the greatest crimes ever perpetrated upon the American people, each far worse than any silly 9/11. Jekyll island is one of the many incontrovertible proofs of the fact that banker conspiracies continuously occur at the highest levels. Apropos, the Federal Reserve Act passed during the Christmas recess of the House of Representatives, when most congressmen and senators were out of town.

Let us now look at the debt crisis. Indebtedness comes in two flavours - private and public. Private debt is the aggregate debt that individuals owe to somebody. Public debt is the debt that the government has kindly assumed in the names of its citizens. Public debt is internal or external. The internal public debt is owed to agents within the country; the external public debt is owed to foreign agents, governments, or supranational entities like the corporations or the IMF-type institutions.

Thus, to begin with, domestic Oligarchs do not mind a certain amount of internal debt, because they are the ones on the receiving end of this debt. With internal debt, the government taxes the masses to pay interest on debt it owes to the Oligarchs. Internal government debt is a form of surreptitious taxation. This is why the US public debt has been increasing under both Democrats and Republicans. Reagan and the two Bushes, for all their yammering, oversaw the post-1980 explosion in America's debt. Actions speak louder than words.

Foreign debt is more complicated. A nation can ask other nations to fund its debt by selling interest-bearing pieces of paper called "treasuries." US treasuries are particularly valuable, because they are (or were) considered "risk-free," and can be turned into US Dollars, which are the world reserve currency. Thus nations have incentive to buy USDs. Strong nations sell their treasuries with lower interest rates, and weak nations have to sell their treasuries with high interest, because otherwise people would not bother.

Who buys these treasuries? Here is who: foreign governments, foreign private agents, and the var-

ious corporations. Note that the central banks, which are private, buy treasuries in the name of the governments. Moreover, the various corporations and banks ultimately belong to private agents. Thus in a certain sense most national debt is owed to private agents or agencies.

How does a government default? Default occurs when the government willingly or unwillingly ceases servicing its debt. What happens then? 1) Owners of that government's treasuries "take a haircut." 2) The government can no longer borrow in the short run, so it has to cover immediate expenses with immediate revenues. 3) Affected foreign governments may adopt punitive measures toward the defaulter.

How does a government end up with debt it can not pay? There are a number of tried & true ways of attaining massive debt. We discussed some above. The executive branch of the government can embark on either a useless white elephant project or on an overpriced useful endeavour. For their trouble, the corrupt politicians end up with Swiss bank accounts full of stable money - USD in the old days. Once their own country hits default and devalues its currency, the corrupt politicians can use their foreign currencies to buy physical national wealth at low prices. This system is solid. Idealistic politicians get shot. Another way of creating unpayable debts is the hedge fund currency attack. The international bankers attack a currency, forcing its devaluation. In consequence, the nation becomes unable to pay its debt - and that is that.

Suppose all of a nation's debt is internal. This means the whole debt is owed to the people of the country. So the nation must tax its own people to pay the debt owed to those same people - an absurdity, except in the case where one class of people bears the tax burden and another owns most of the treasuries - in which case we are dealing with either a scam or a necessary redistribution of wealth, depending on the direction of motion of the money.

In the case of default on a nation's external debt: One can argue that those who suffer losses should take the haircut - after all, nobody forced them to invest in a profligate government's debts. What of the government's inability to find reasonable loans in the short-term? The problem here deals with the concept of credit.

What is credit and what does credit do? Credit is the act of a party borrowing something from another party on the condition of somehow reimbursing the borrower later. Notice that one can define credit without involving money or interest rates.

To see the potential problems with credit, consider the following examples:

Suppose we have a village near a river, and the villagers ("villains") want to build a bridge. What do they do? The villagers can organize themselves, cut a few trees, knit a few ropes, construct the bridge, and finally drink themselves silly in celebration of the festive occasion.

Let us make things more involved. Suppose there is plenty of good marble near the village, but no wood. Now our villagers can trade some of their marble for wood with the other villages on the river. Once enough wood arrives, our villagers construct their bridge and celebrate again.

What if the villagers need the bridge now but do not have enough marble to barter for the necessary amount of wood? This is where credit comes in. The villagers order the wood, construct their bridge, and deliver the marble later, when they can drive marble-full carts across the new bridge.

In modern society the situation is more complicated because of people's specialities and because of money. What happens is that the bridge must be constructed by either the city (or an equivalent public entity) or by a private monied organization. In the latter case the city grants the organization the right to construct a toll bridge. Over the years the tolls more than pay for the cost of the bridge, thus transferring money from the citizens to the wealthy private owners of the bridge. In the former case the city sells bonds to obtain financing for the bridge. These bonds can be 0% interest bonds, the idea being that those citizens who want the bridge will buy the bonds. Now the city can use bridge tolls to buy back its bonds, or it can use other sources of revenue - such as property taxes.

Let us add a bit of corruption into our example to more closely approach reality. Suppose now that our mayor takes a loan from his banker friend in the name of the city. The mayor then hires a contractor firm, which happens to belong to a friend of the banker's, to build the bridge. The

contractors do a poor, slow job. Soon the mayor takes another loan. By the time the bridge is finished, the city is so deep in debt it auctions both the new bridge and the older one, built back when the city was still a village. Toll booths are installed and the bankers win again.

One more useful point - suppose at the other shore of the river there is a gold mine. We can not sail across the river because of rapids. Now, building the bridge will give the village a new revenue source. Suppose that instead of a bridge the villagers are building a piece of industry, like a mill or a factory. Capital goods are worth investing in, because they quickly pay themselves off.

Therefore we can draw a few conclusions in regard to credit: 1) Credit is a necessary mechanism for the existence of civilization. 2) Credit does not have to deal with debt and money, but in our society it does. 3) The bankers can use credit as a backdoor for practising usury. 4) When used for the construction of capital goods or necessary infrastructure of any kind, credit is soon paid off.

Note that within the framework of a cohesive community, credit may be ignored. Suppose you have plenty of extra money and your sibling asks you for a few hundred dollars. Assuming the two of you are in good relations, you give him the money. On a larger scope, suppose that one of the villagers in our town loses his house to a fire. The other villagers can help him rebuild his home with the implicit understanding that he would do the same for his neighbours. Or suppose a calamity strikes Louisiana. Before you know it, Oregon and North Dakota will want to help rebuild Louisiana - with no conditions attached. Thus in a sane global society we would not need to bother with credit and debt. Resources would flow where most needed. The issuance of usurious debt is just an Oligarch-infested mechanism for the moving of resources from place to place. Other mechanisms can be invented for the same purpose.

Now let's finally look at the debt crisis. In our silly world the Oligarchs have taken over the mechanism of credit via their banks. So they can crash the economy at any time by tightening (i.e. refusing to distribute) credit, as they did in 1929 when they suddenly recalled all short term loans. This caused a problem because speculators operate "on the margin" and with "leverage." When a speculator sniffs a good deal, he loans a huge amount of money for a few days, makes a profit he could not otherwise have made, and then quickly returns the principal loan. If his loan is recalled before he has managed to make the profit, the speculator is done for - he is forced to sell the stocks he just bought, plus some of his own stuff, to pay back the loan. When a lot of such speculators hang dry at the same moment, mass selling ensues, panic follows, and a crash occurs.

Those who know there will be a crash have left the market beforehand, and buy stuff at low prices after the meltdown. The bankers do not mind a good recession.

When the credit system collapses, many firms that operate on the margin and depend on short term loans for their existence fold. The whole fabric of industrial society collapses. Because credit is the mechanism underlying the movement of goods, when credit dies so does trade. Goods remain on their stockpiles, industries close because nobody is buying their production, layoffs and unemployment ensue, and things spiral downward. This is called a deflationary spiral and is the nature of the 1930s Great Depression. In the 1930s America and the Rest of the West had the means of production, which comprise the first element of an economy, but had lost the means of distribution to atrophy.

A similar thing happened in 2008, coupled with the issue of systemic debt. In their pursuit of profits, the banks have created a network of obligations to themselves and to the world governments which defies belief. Phantasmagorical obligations exist on the high levels of the financial system. Thus, when one bank collapses and can not pay its obligations to the other banks, suddenly everybody involved finds out that he depended on the debt payments of the destitute bank for the payment of his own debts. Everyone risks default, a type of default that would lead to the collapse of the entire credit system, and therefore to a collapse of the goods distribution mechanism, which would in turn kill the production mechanism. It is strange that the imaginary notion of debt can cause so much real suffering. But then, it is stranger that millions of men committed fratricide and suicide in the 1914-1945 period because of vague ideologies. The imagination is a powerful force.

To shore up their system, the bankers simply had the governments assume the bank debt. This was

called "bailouts." So for example Iceland's debt went from a manageable 30% of GDP in 2006 to a ridiculous 90% of GDP in 2010. In 2006 the Icelanders had a surplus and were liquidating their debt; in 2010 the downturn and the interest payments have pushed the budget of the country into deficit, meaning the Icelanders are sinking deeper. How did this happen? To give you an illustrative comparison, the US government debt jumped from about 50% of GDP to over 100% of GDP - during WWII. How did the same thing happen to Iceland without a war? Simple - after the deregulation had ran its course, the three major private banks of Iceland went into the derivative business, and when the house of cards collapsed in 2008, it emerged that the banks of Iceland were bankrupt. To keep them going, the government of Iceland assumed the imaginary bank derivative debt, which was owed mostly to a number of British banks, themselves decrepit and cash-strapped.

Now you might ask, why would the Icelanders have to pay for the misdeeds and mistakes of a few greedy incompetent bankers? The Icelanders ask the same question, and have refused to pay the debt, to the consternation of the City of London bankers. Of course, the Icelanders can not physically pay off the debt even if they sell their whole island.

This is the situation across the board. To deal with this fabricated "debt," the bankers demand austerity - meaning imposed deflationary effects (without, necessarily, deflationary symptoms) - which amounts to industrial suicide. Austerity has never worked. In all historical cases - from the initial reactions to the Great Depression, through the IMF interventions in the '80s and the '90s, to the basket case of modern Greece, austerity measures have always failed to pay off the debt but have succeeded in impoverishing the industrial bases and the peoples of victim nations. The bankers want genocide as the answer to a problem they themselves invented.

For some reason no one in the controlled media asks the very pertinent question of who, in the end, is on the receiving end of all the debt? The debt chain has to end somewhere - where is that? The American people are up to their ears in debt - credit card debt, student debt, mortgages, car payments - debt everywhere. The American banks and corporations are so full of debt they barely survive. Even the titanic auto-firms collapsed in 2009. The American government itself is in debt. Western Europe is in debt. Eastern Europe had a debt crisis in the '90s. Latin America suffered in the '80s and '90s, East Asia had debt problems in the '90s. How can everybody be in debt? Who is in the black?

It turns out that following the series of third-world defaults, the third-world nations are today largely debt-free. In terms of foreign currency holdings minus external debt, only China and Saudi Arabia are far in the green, and the entire industrialized world, including Japan, is deeply in the red. Japan is a curious case. The Japanese hold about a trillion of American dollars in reserve, as well as a bagfull of other currencies; and yet Japan's public debt is a horrifying 200% of a massive GDP.

Who exactly owns all this debt? Governments own only a portion via their central banks. In the important case of US debt, foreign governments owned \$4.5 trillion of US debt in 2010 - something like a third of the total debt, which is in the range of \$14 trillion. Who owns the balance? The only conceivable answer is - private agents, i.e., the international bankers. So the members of the "public," i.e. the bankers, own about \$10 trillion of US debt.

Let us try to make the whole thing clear. The bankers caused the depression by deregulation, the mortgage bubble, and the derivatives exponential debt hocus-pocus. Then they forced the major governments of the world into assuming the derivative debt. Again, look through the roster of the Clinton-Bush-Obama administrations - you'll find Goldmanites enough to form a battalion of shameless banker warriors. So now the governments owe the debt of the bankers to the bankers. What a scam! As the way out of the crisis the bankers suggest the final destruction of the Western economies, which have been steadily though quietly de-industrialized for the last few decades.

Harbour no illusions - barring resistance, the bankers will get theirs. Suppose the US defaults. Would the bankers care? Not necessarily, because whatever they get in return for their bonds will be a gift, and because, by controlling the government, they will continue to milk the US as long as they want to. The bankers make the rules. Therefore they win no matter what happens, unless someone (you?) challenges their power of arbitrage.

One magical cure-all that various people have been proposing (e.g. Ron Paul) is the return to the gold standard. Unfortunately, such a return will only make things worse. Gold-backing has a tremendous deflationary effect. Note that the wage slavery scam is independent of gold. Fractional reserve banking can co-exist with gold. Gold does not solve the problem of credit creation - on the contrary: Take a country brimming with oil, fertile soils, and rich iron mines. Now suppose this country can not procure gold. What now? Do the people just sit on their behinds and lament?

Observe that gold possesses no special quality other than scarcity and non-corrosivity. Iron makes better tools, conductive copper is more abundant, aluminium is more lightweight - the major use of gold is for ornamentation. People have used gold as money for the same reason they use paper as money - because of an often unstated collective agreement. Almost any reasonable commodity can serve as currency as long as people agree to accept it as "legal tender." We examine a certain additional ridiculous aspect of gold in the section below.

Thus, gold is hardly a panacea. Fiat money is a tool. Used as a utility, fiat money can do the job of credit production. The key issue is the ability of private agents to produce and charge interest on fiat money. Note also that even if we solve the former problem, we still have to consider the implications of the concentration of wealth and the concept of limitless private property.

Having examined so many scams, let us take a look at one more. Behold the commodity bubble scam. Read Chapter 4 of Taibbi's *Griftopia* for the details. Commodities are the physical building blocks of an economy: oil, copper, gold, grain, etc. The usual Econ 101 explanation on how the prices of commodities fluctuate pairs supply and demand. If more people want more stuff, the price rises. Or, if more firms produces more stuff, the price falls. In reality, in the world of deregulation, Goldman Sachs (along with its allies and "competitors" on Wall Street and in the City) inflates commodity prices to make money. That is the cause behind the 2007 oil price spike. During an oil spike one expects the oil producers to increase their production so that they make a better buck; meanwhile the consumers are expected to cut on the consuming. This happened during the shock and should have caused a double downward pressure on the price of oil. Instead, oil went up, until the bankers decided to relax the screws in 2008, when the world economy was on the verge of self-immolation. Back in 1936, FDR correctly instituted the regulation of commodity speculation (Commodity Exchange Act), because playing with the prices of commodities can lead to mass death and other problems of similar character. In the 1990s, the big investment banks / hedge funds began to quietly lobby for license in speculation. Thanks to the deregulatory craze, their requests were granted. By 2008, says Taibbi quoting an informed congressman, conservatively 80% of the commodity buying and selling was speculative - i.e. it was activity which sought simply to grease a margin out of the consumption of indispensables. To make things more fun, most of this activity was private, meaning secret, because it was done behind closed doors. Remember Enron's funny Californian games at the turn of the millennium? You can watch the documentary *The Smartest Guys in the Room* (2005) for a quick fill-in. That is what we are talking about.

Here is how it works - the speculators pour money on the commodities market, betting at the same time that commodity prices will go up. Because of all the money and the constant fictitious buying and selling of products, which occurs independently of the location or even existence of the product - for example the imaginary deed to a barrel of oil can change hands 50 times before the oil gets from Arabia to your car - because of all the money the prices of commodities do go up. It is a self-fulfilling prophecy - a bet you can not lose. In effect the end-buyer pays a tax to the speculators.

Here's another scam - the bankers take management of some public money, say a pension fund. They invest the dough in a losing gambit and bet against the package. They win, you lose. Goldman Sachs did exactly that, as the NYT itself will tell you.¹¹

For another proof of the banker conspiracy, look up the ramblings of the bizarre character the padre Lindsey Williams. The good father claims that once upon a time under extreme conditions he be-

¹¹<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/24/business/24trading.html?pagewanted=all>, accessed on 8 October 2011

came pals with a few Oligarchs. In the following years some of Oligarchs, old and ailing, fed the padre bits and pieces of information. If you do a quick search, you will find Williams accurately predicting oil prices over the last five years. His story (but not his former predictions) is impossible to check, but it looks like the padre is telling the truth - and we are being swindled.

It must be understood that rising prices of bare necessities like food crops and energy sources directly translate into impoverishment and death across the world. Thus, if a gang of blood-thirsty lawyers were allowed to go after Goldman Sachs, they could indite the whole outfit on charges like mass murder and crimes against humanity. Remember that the Nuremberg principles announced that following orders in a hierarchical structure does not excuse one from criminal behaviour. Of course, since Goldman owns the government, no one will go after Goldman barring something akin to a coup.

There are more scams! Take the service economy. The idea of the service economy is that the Western world is done with industrial production and will now occupy itself with "services" like pet manicure and bureaucratic pencil-pushing while the third world does all the work. The favourite services are financial services, which gave us 2008, "health" services, which we will discuss later, and education, which has given us a population of nincompoops, perhaps including the author and you my dear reader. In reality, productivity has risen so drastically since the 19th century that most of the population need no longer "work." Today, 5% of the population can take care of the food production, and 20% can take care of the industrial production. In other words, there is nothing to stop us from working only 3 months a year and spending the rest of the time in endeavours like self-education, sport, and artistry. Nothing, that is, except the Oligarchs and our ignorance and apathy. Obviously, if the population stops worrying about making ends meet, it will figure out the Oligarchical scam, and the Oligarchs will no longer have yachts, servants, and palaces. To prevent such a development, the Oligarchs invented the service economy. Under the service economy, the masses work at make-believe jobs. For example the government can channel various college graduates into agencies where the graduates spend their time writing reports nobody will ever bother to read. Psychology graduates can be put into the schools to monitor the process of brainwashing and to administer drugs to the nuts that refuse to be cracked by the Pavlovian routine. Use your imagination, reader! Dog stylists can take care of the pets of the Oligarchs. Truck drivers can deliver moronic plastic gadgets across the country. Nannies can take care of the children of those too busily engaged in the service economy. What a beauty, the service economy! A whole population busting its behind to get taxed - because if you have a job, you get to pay taxes - and without a job you can not live.

Speaking of which, unemployment is another scam that can only exist in an Oligarchical society. A person is unemployed if he wants a job but can not find one. How can such a thing happen in a non-saturated society? Is there work to be done? If yes, then how can there be unemployment? If no, then what is the problem? In the Oligarchical context, however, unemployment makes perfect sense. The risk of unemployment drives wages down and renders people willing to do ridiculous jobs. Oligarchs like reasonable levels of unemployment. The problem is that high unemployment makes people restless. Having the time to think for a bit, they begin to figure out the various scams. That is why an economy with high but manageable rates of layoffs and unemployment, like the one we have, is perfect for the purposes of the Oligarchs.

When things get out of hand and the risk of public wrath becomes unmanageable, the Oligarchs invent wars. Large-scale wars solve the problem of unemployment very quickly. This is why we should beware the arrival of some form of World War III in the near future.

GDP is another scam. The formula for the calculation of GDP is Consumption plus Investment plus Government Spending plus Net Exports. Here is the trick: the housewife does not contribute to the GDP, because her work goes under the radar, even though it is real and necessary work. Now have the housewife get a job as a cook. Send the kids to kindergarten for indoctrination, hire nannies and cleaning ladies, have the former housewife eat lunch outside and buy supper from McDonalds,

and tax her (to pay the national debts, of course). The GDP just went up! All those cooks and janitors and nannies are now part of the economy. Instead of doing the same work at home, they do it outside - to their loss but to the gain of the Oligarchs.

Here is another problem with GDP. Suppose you jump into your car, drive 50 miles to a gas station, fill the tank, and then drive home. You just increased the national consumption and therefore the GDP. Congratulations! That your effort was a waste of time and energy is another question.

Another example - suppose you download a piece of free software and use it for some purpose. Now suppose you download an equivalent commercial software for a fee of fifty dollars. In the latter case you increased the GDP. Now suppose you donate 50 bucks to the author of the free program. Does that increase the GDP? I don't know, I'm getting lost. These are metaphysical problems, for which we should consult the spiritualist cultist gurus found in the economics departments of the larger universities. I suspect that the donation does not raise the GDP, but if the subject of your benevolence goes out and buys an ice-cream with your 50 bucks - perhaps a whole bucket of ice-cream! - the GDP will spring right up.

On the next exports front, sell a few pieces of iron to China for a buck, buy back the gadget the Chinese produce out of the iron for two bucks, and sell the product to the consumers for \$10. Voila, GDP!

Thus, the Oligarchs can point to rising GDP as evidence of economic growth, even though the real economy - or at least standard of living - of the Western world has been stagnating (and falling) for decades.

Another good scam is HFT - High Frequency Trading. This one is a beaut! The top banks have set up hyper-fast supercomputer-nodes, which monitor trading activity, and sneak in on trades to glean tiny profits in split-second in-between trades. As the classic motion-picture *Office Space* (1999) informed us, money can accumulate fairly quickly in such a way. Observe that HFT does not even pretend to benefit society. It is blatant speculation and theft. (Though some corrupt or confused academics may tell you the opposite.) Goldman Sachs is, of course, a major player on the HFT scene.

It is worth noting that both the USEC and the CFTC blamed HFT for the "flash crash" of May 6, 2010. At 2:45PM on that day, the Dow lost about 1,000 points - or 9% of its total value. Twenty minutes later, the "market" went back up to its original level. Simply put, the HFT turnover is so great, that unless carefully monitored and controlled, it can blow up the entire system in a matter of seconds.

There is absolutely no need for HFT to exist at all. But let the bankers have their HFT - on one condition: they have to pay 1% for every transaction they make. If people have to pay GST, why should the banks pay nothing? The official term for such a tax is "Tobin Tax." And we desperately need a Tobin Tax (or something better) to curb speculation.

There are more scams, but I think that the amount of scams we have enumerated so far will suffice for the present. In short, the whole structure of the world economy is one giant Oligarchical fraud. The problem we face is not imaginary debt, but a massive worldwide under-development. So what do we do?

2.2.3 Inflation and Deflation

But before we continue to the conclusions, let us briefly look at the concepts of *inflation* and *deflation*.

In general terms, inflation means the depreciation of a currency. Prices rise, and one unit of currency can buy less. Deflation is the opposite - the currency's value rises as prices fall and single units of currency buy you more.

Inflation and deflation tend to be extremely confusing terms. For one thing, it is important to

realize that as the currency in a nation A depreciates in respect to the currency of a nation B, those in possession of B-Dollars can, if allowed to, go to nation A and organize a buying spree. Thus, while the bankers would obviously hate to see the inflation of their own currency, they may, in principle, be willing to see all other currencies depreciate.

Now, what are the causes for inflation and deflation?

In the broadest terms, inflation translates to a deluge of nominal credit (i.e. money), while deflation corresponds to the contraction of credit and the money supply.

Hence, in principle, inflation occurs when the money-printing power in a nation is forced to print vast amounts of money, most often in order to pay outstanding short-term debts.

The classic example of inflation is the post-war inflation. Historically, governments and potentates often accumulated debts during wars (to pay the soldiers and to keep them supplied), and had to dilute their coins (or devalue their paper currencies) to more easily pay the nominal values of their debts. Thus, if a Roman Emperor waged war, and had to pay 50 coins to each of his soldiers, he could find himself forced to pay with inferior (in terms of gold content) coins.

Examples abound. America experienced notable inflation during both World Wars. Two significant periods of inflation occurred after WWII - one immediately after, because of the GI Bill of 1944 (which gave the returning troops free college education and one year's worth of unemployment benefits), and one in the late 1950s, because of Eisenhower's Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (which authorized the construction of the glorious American highway system).

Another standard cause for hyperinflation are unpayable foreign debts. The classic example is Weimar Germany, which collapsed under the combined pressure of the post-war re-accommodation of the troops, and, more importantly, the obscene reparations imposed on Berlin.

When a nation can not pay its foreign debts, it has to devalue the currency under a double pressure. First, it prints domestic currency to buy the foreign currency in which the debts are made; and second, it devalues its own currency so that domestic goods become more attractive on the foreign markets, and bring home more foreign cash. Now, a strong nation can simply say "Sue me!" and cancel the debts. It will suffer diplomatic repercussions, but with a powerful enough domestic economy, it can take the hit.

A weak nation overcome by debt is more or less doomed. It will experience the joys of hyperinflation. The printing becomes unmanageable, prices sky-rocket, and the currency dies. At this point, all domestic nominal savings have been wiped out. The lender is forced to "restructure" the debt. More importantly, a powerful enough lender can force the prostrate nation to sell its major public assets, and to allow the predatory lender to swoop in and buy out private assets. This is what happened across the world since the IMF began its rampage following the Oil Shocks. The Oil Shocks massacred weaker countries, because all oil trade is done in dollars, and so many "third-world" nations ended up buried in dollar-valued unpayable debt. Observe that as Estulin and Engdahl have both pointed out, the Oil Shock was the handwork of Kissinger (and hence Rockefeller), and the Bilderberger gang. Eastern Europe had its own hyperinflation during the 1990s.

But the Weimar example remains the classic one. Incapable of paying the reparations, the Germans printed and printed, until the Mark collapsed. The Anglo-Americans were not particularly enthused about this turn of events, since it benefited France so greatly, and so they instigated the Young and Doves plans, as we will see.

Another way of causing inflation is the release of free credit into the national financial system. If that credit goes to useful production, there is no problem. But if it goes toward the purchase of goods and assets for mere consumption, or toward speculation, inflation occurs.

Thus, the Spanish gold of the 16th century brought Spain a great deal of trouble. In principle, having more gold makes one richer, right? Not necessarily. The gold, in itself, does not increase the nation's useful production, which comprises the real national wealth. If the king spends the money to import

capital stock, the nation prospers. But if he uses the gold to hire mercenaries and wage war, the nation does not necessarily benefit. If those who brought the gold go on a domestic spending spree, they will simply raise prices, diminishing the value of the savings of the people. If they go on a foreign spending spree for manufactured goods, they will emaciate the domestic economy. Such a development has been termed the "Dutch Disease," and has plagued, in more recent times, certain oil producers, notably Venezuela.

Now, is inflation good or bad? A small amount of inflation, coupled with a compatible interest rate, rises in wages, and real domestic growth in useful production, is perfectly fine. Suppose prices rise by 10% in one year. If your wages rose by 15% and your bank account by 12%, you have enjoyed a net benefit. This has been recognized fairly widely. In particular, it is hard to keep an exact parity between the national money supply and the real value of national production. Modern economists, for better or for worse, prefer to err on the side of inflation. Remember that *prices have only a relative meaning*.

In regard to hyperinflation, the situation is different. Take a closed system. If a small amount of the population holds most money, and the bulk of the population struggles under debt, a hyperinflation removes the debt and liberates the masses of debt-slaves from their yoke. That is not necessarily bad. The problem is that, of course, in principle, the ones in charge of the money supply will be the money-lenders - and they will not be too eager to create a hyperinflation - exactly the contrary. If they, however, owe money, in turn, to an outside agent, who forces them to create hyperinflation, the nation can benefit from the entire farce. Perhaps something of that sort happened in Weimar Germany. The Republic, fuelled by generous Anglo-American loans, was quite prosperous between the hyperinflation (1923-24) and the onset of the deflationary Great Depression (1929-1930). The deflation, not the inflation, was the true killer of Weimar Germany.

Who loses in a hyperinflation? The big-time lenders make sure to demand their money in kind if necessary. The small time lenders lose their loans. Those who hold money in the dead currency lose their assets. The government's monetary policy becomes useless, and there are no funds for fiscal policy. If allowed to, foreigners swoop in and buy stuff on the cheap. Thus, the savers and the government lose.

Who gains? The foreigners, the nationals who accumulated foreign currency beforehand, and the small debtors, who see their debts vanish.

In principle, big industry may be able to withstand an inflation, while big banking suffers. This is because big industry's main assets are in capital stock, and the inflation reduces the wages big industry pays. Moreover, the products of big industry become cheaper on the international market. On the other hand, if the industry sells its products on the domestic market, it may run out of buyers (people's money having been wiped out, and their wages demolished) and collapse.

The trouble with hyper-inflation is that by wiping out all claims to wealth, it sterilizes the economy, since no one (inside the country) can muster enough claims to wealth to undertake a project. What inevitably happens is that the nation instates a new currency and starts over. In principle, a strong government under a competent leader can kick-start the economy with appropriate policies. Unfortunately, 1) leaders tend to be ignorant of economics, and susceptible to believing in the various false theories pushed forward by the banker-types; and 2) inflation tends to diminish confidence in government and thus weaken governmental authority exactly when it is most needed.

The bankers, who wield great power in society, tend to be against inflation, with some provisos. If the interest rate (or pure profits) stays above inflation, the bankers keep what they consider theirs. Moreover, I suspect that if stock prices rise at rates higher than that of inflation, the bankers feel good about themselves.

Furthermore, if the bankers control a good deal of big industry, they may tolerate a certain level of inflation.

How the bankers feel is vital, because of their tremendous influence.

What do interest rates do? Given low interest rates, the lenders are reluctant to lend, while borrowers are willing to borrow. If allowed to, the money runs away to places with higher interest rates. High interest rates translate to the converse - money floods the country, and everybody wants to lend, but nobody wants to borrow. Since a complex economy needs credit to function, high interest rates can cause all sorts of problems. More on this shortly.

Let us now look at deflation. What causes deflation, and what effects does deflation have?

Deflation occurs when credit magically dries out. Suddenly, nobody is lending. The money supply contracts. Prices fall.

Now, prices tend to fluctuate more easily than do wages. Thus, during inflation, real wages fall, while during deflation, real wages rise. The problem with this deflationary rise in real wages is that it goes along with a fall of prices. The currency appreciates on the international scene, making the nation's goods relatively more expensive. Exports fall. Between the lower prices and the lower exports, businesses have lower profits. Worse, if, under such circumstances, a business goes into the red, it may have problems acquiring credit to carry itself through the rough times. This leads to layoffs, bankruptcies, and closures. With the increase in unemployment, public spending falls, more businesses close, and the nation enters a deflationary spiral. Tax revenues fall while government debts increase in real value, which prompts the governments to cut spending and raise taxes, which places additional hindrances on industry. That is what happened across the West during the Great Depression.

Such are the effects of deflation. But what causes the phenomenon?

Well, who is in charge of the creation of money and credit? The bankers are! They operate under two strong influences - their own feelings on things, and the popular opinion. So if a banking panic occurs, and people start drawing their deposits, the bankers curtail lending in order to have money in the vault. Moreover, following periods of "irrational exuberance," speculation, and inflation, the bankers in the old days liked to cause a bit of deflation in order to restore the value of their bags of gold (metaphorically speaking).

So when the time for deflation comes, the banker closes shop, puts his feet on the table, lights a cigar, and waits for his money to appreciate. Then he goes out and buys bankrupted businesses at bargain-basement prices.

Of course, if a great enough banking run occurs, even the bankers suffer - because under fractional lending they never have as much money in their coffers as they lend out! Now, from the perspective of the top bankers, the demise of a few smaller banks is no big deal. They just go and buy those as well.

When a *major* bank collapses, however, the world wavers. People figure that if a top bank managed to fall, their money will only be safe at home in the attic in the Jar Bank. Moreover, the major banks are the major sources of credit, and without credit there is no economy.

The 1343-1345 crash of the Bardi and Peruzzi megabanks (the latter associated with the Knight Hospitallers) was one of the major causes for the terrific 14th century European disintegration. Deflation went along with War, Plague and Famine.

The abolition of the silver standard in America in favor of a pure gold standard in 1873 caused a massive deflationary depression.

A big bank crashed in Europe on May 11, 1931 - the Creditanstalt. And the exact process described above took place - banking runs, panics, droughts of credit, massive unemployment in Germany, etc, etc, and then Adolf Sieging and Heiling left and right.

America had its own troubles and banking runs.

And so the bankers ended up threatening their own system. Now, the bankers types are prone to circular thinking. They tend to think that what is good for them is good for everybody and is good

in principle. Hence they like "sound money" and "stable currencies" (in the old days more than now). Their desire for "sound money" caused the Great Depression, and caused even themselves a great deal of grief. Quigley thought, somewhat non-judgementally, that they were woefully ignorant of economics, and also knaves. That they were.

The existence of unrealistic debts further exacerbates deflationary spirals. What happens is, following a speculative boom, which raises nominal prices to ridiculous levels and creates baseless claims to wealth, or a long war (which increases public debt), the lenders (i.e. the bankers) say "OK, that's it, we are not lending any more until you give us our money!" And then the lenders light their cigars. Those seem to be very important. The "genius" cocaine-addict phallus-collector Freud explained why.

Such turns of events put the real economy in an impossible situations. People start selling everything in order to pay their debts. Prices fall, factories and houses sell for pennies, capital stocks deteriorate, and the real economy collapses.

What should be done in the wake of a speculative bubble is a healthy debt annihilation. The courts should rule that speculative debts are gambling debts, and therefore are non-enforceable. That is what the Dutch courts did following the famous Tulip bubble of the 17th century. Unfortunately, under the Liberal Economics doctrine postulated by the British in the 19th century, debts acquired a holy status. This led to the so-called "boom and bust" cycle, which delusional economists regard as some kind of a divine process. The bankers would unleash an avalanche of credit, speculation would occur, a bubble would form, and then - wham! - deflation! "Give me my money!" This process was very good for the bankers, until they overreached in the 1930s.

The events of the 1930s led to, among other things, the following two important pieces of legislation: First, the governments intervened to halt bank runs by insuring small deposits. Thus, private losses would become public debts. Second, the Americans pushed through the famous Glass-Steagall Act of 1933, which curbed "irrational exuberance," meaning insane speculation. That is why no serious new bubbles occurred until Greenspan gradually dismantled Glass-Steagall in the 1980s and 1990s.

Deflation tends to be bad for the population (unemployment; unpayable mortgages; mass bankruptcies), for big business (bankruptcies), for small banks (bank runs), and for the government (which loses legitimacy in times of crisis). Barring egregious circumstances, deflation benefits the big bankers (so-called "financial capitalists"; Wall Street and the City).

A few more questions need answers. First, money. As discussed above, money comes in two types - commodity and fiat. There is pure commodity money (gold coins), half-commodity-half-fiat (gold-backed currency), and pure fiat (government-backed currency).

Given only gold, those who hold the gold are in charge. The government can only get gold, strictly speaking, from taxation, which has always been a contentious issue, and hard to enforce. So in the old days, roughly speaking, the goldsmiths and the money-lenders were in charge of the money supply. The governments could cause inflation by debasing the gold coins in their treasuries (i.e. by lowering the coins' gold contents). They could reflate by minting purer coins. In general, as far as the governments were concerned, inflationary moves diminished their credit worthiness. Moreover, when in trouble, the kings had to borrow from the bankers, who demanded pure gold in return. Thus, with commodity currency, a government/king could go out of business after a prolonged flirtation with inflation.

A key problem with commodity money is that, in rough terms, there is only as much credit out there as there is gold. So if the Spanish want some credit to build a factory, they will have to wait until the Germans (or whoever) free up some gold, which can be lent to Spain.

The only way to boost total credit in a gold-only world was to discover new gold mines. The Europeans did find some in the Americas ("Mexico" in the 16th-17th centuries, California, Alaska, and

other places in the 19th), in South Africa (late 19th century), and in Australia (mid-19th century). The introduction of letters of credit and gold-backed bank-notes lifted this problem somewhat. The ability to unleash credit expanded, creating, in the process, the danger of bank runs. But in principle, those in charge of the gold still exerted great influence, and the sum of all credit still had limits.

Fiat currencies gained traction in the modern period in the 19th century United States, and, gradually, by the late 20th century, practically everywhere on the globe. With fiat currency one has unlimited credit, which is great. But one can also get unlimited speculation, which is not so great. With fiat currencies, the governments and the communities finally have the opportunity to take charge of money creation. Unfortunately, the vigilant bankers prevented such an event from occurring frequently enough. They kept control of money creation, and thus, in effect, parasitically taxed all useful economy, and retained excessive political influence on the world stage. To add insult to injury, in the first half of the 20th century, particularly around WWI, the bankers demanded payments in gold for loans in fiat.

Let us briefly examine "stagflation." Stagflation is the unholy union of the joys of inflation with the pleasures of deflation. For example, in the 1970s, governments had to print money to buy expensive oil. Inflation occurred. The bankers in the UK and the US raised interest rates to halt the inflation and to preserve their pecuniary assets. Borrowing became expensive and people did not borrow as much, i.e., in effect, credit dried out. Thus one had the effects of deflation without the appearance of deflation. The British and the American productive economies, and the third world economies, suffered grievously in that period (mid-to-late 1970s, early-to-mid 1980s).

Which brings us to the current debacle. What is going on, and what can we expect in terms of inflation and deflation?

By 2007, the world economy strained under an enormous, practically unimaginable, speculative derivatives bubble. It finally burst in 2008, and banking runs ensued. The governments promptly converted private losses to public debts ("bail-outs"). Lending dried out, and so the central banks flooded the interest rates and flooded the markets with cheap (taxpayer-backed) credit (the central banks had to intervene, since at 0% interest, the private banks are uneager to lend). Unfortunately, Glass-Steagall having been removed, and the absurd debts not having been erased, the cheap money found its way to speculative (rather than productive) enterprises, and to the derivatives black hole. So now we have a derivatives balloon with a hole on its top, and the bankers are desperately blowing air into the balloon from the bottom end. The moment they decide to deflate the balloon, they stop blowing. Either that, or they blow until they run out of wind, which will happen eventually.

In this wonderful magical way, the bankers have managed yet again to combine the beauty of inflation with the splendour of deflation. Credit still fails to reach the productive economy (deflationary effect), and speculation continues to raise nominal prices (inflation).

Which brings the vital question: What next for the world currencies and the world economy?

Note that, in principle, the bankers would be reluctant to devalue their own currency, unless they have some contingency plan. Historically, the banker currencies were the Pound, and later the Dollar. Today we also have the Euro, which the Anglo-American bankers may crash.

The real question, then, is - what of the Pound and the Dollar? Could the bankers try to convert their money into such tangibles as gold and land (they are doing exactly that), and then crash the Dollar in order to do who knows what? Maybe they want to try to instate a world currency? Maybe the City of London truly is in charge, and will try to boost the Pound?

Because if they just keep feeding money into the derivatives abyss and into new and improved speculative bubbles, they may eventually trigger hyper-inflationary spirals. They certainly are causing inflation, as food, gold, and oil prices, manipulated as they are, suggest.

At the same time, the pernicious effects of deflation will take place, since no credit will reach the productive economy. Unemployment would rise and real production would halt. That seems to be what we are seeing today.

Lindsey Williams, whom we will meet later, and who has credibility, has claimed that the top honchos intend to kill the Dollar in 2012. Indications to that effect certainly exist.

So let us suppose the bankers stomp the Dollar. What then? China and Japan would be big losers, and may consider halting exports headed to America - which will empty shelves across the United States. Those in possession of gold, oil, and unscathed currencies would be able to, if allowed, waltz into the United States and buy everything in sight. The middle-class and small-rich Americans who hold paper wealth would be wiped out. The government in charge would lose all legitimacy and the next elections.

What of the oil trade? It would have to shift to a new currency, perhaps one conveniently proffered by the IMF-World Bank-BIS combine.

Could it happen? Well, if they keep printing money without fixing the underlying problems, they will cause inflation. Another major bank failure, and... Who knows.

Perhaps they want to reinstate a gold-backed currency? Oh, horror!

What should be done to solve the problem? 1) Curb speculation via something like Glass-Steagall, or a Tobin Tax (i.e. Wall Street Speculation Tax), or some other form of regulation. 2) Erase the derivatives debt and ban derivatives.

Given those two measures, credit will start finding its way to the useful economy again. But it would still be under the control of the bankers. So the major governments should go ahead, and 3) nationalize the powers of credit creation. The European nations should force the EU (Central Bank) to provide them with cheap credit for useful purposes. Washington should flat-out take over the Fed, and send the FBI to bag Wall Street.

In summary, 1) inflation and deflation are not divine plagues and are often the results of governmental weakness rather than governmental mismanagement; 2) divorced from credit, the inflations and deflations of currencies merely constitute reshufflings in claims to material wealth; 3) coupled with credit, inflations and deflations exercise specific, predictable effects on the productive economies; 4) in principle, neither inflation nor deflation is bad in itself - one has to look at the effects exercised on the real economy; 5) commodity-currencies impose grave restrictions on the productive economies; 6) credit creation via fiat currencies should be in the hands of the public rather than in private hands, unless the public wants to surrender itself to those who control credit creation.

For a further discussion of inflation and deflation, consult Quigley's *Tragedy & Hope* (Chapter VII), and Engdahl's *Gods of Money*.

Also see William T. Still's masterful documentary *The Secret of Oz* (2009), and his earlier *The Money Masters* (1996).

2.2.4 The Way Out

In principle, the way out of the current mess is simple and has been known for ages. Tarpley has a commendable program on his website. Huey Long offered a similar program during the depression. The Kingfish planned to gain the presidency on the basis of his program. He could have succeeded and would undoubtedly have become the greatest president in America's history. Naturally, the Oligarchs shot him. We will examine Huey's story in detail later in this book.

Here is what should be done: the whole world should industrialize as it did in the aftermath of World War II. Freeze all the imaginary debt and let a few competent people of the ilk of Ralph

Nader, Elizabeth Warren, and Tarpley unravel the web of debt and simply erase all the useless derivatives garbage that should not exist in the first place. Ban all derivatives, nationalize the banks, and render the financial system into a public utility. Why should private persons make vast sums of money for the privilege of manufacturing credit - something the cities and counties, not to mention the provinces and the nation-states, can well do on their own?

Have the nationalized central banks immediately offer long-term zero-interest development loans for real industrial/infrastructure production. Give money to the states so they can build hospitals and modern railways. Repair the bridges and the highways. Fix the school system - in the electronic era of ultra-cheap information quality education can be provided at practically no cost. Want to learn economics? Download *The Wealth of Nations* and enjoy yourself. Want to learn mathematics? Thousands of textbooks are at your disposal; form discussion groups and you are on your way. It is as simple as that, I know from experience. Learning a foreign language is also easy. One can absorb the basic vocabulary and rules of grammar in a week of hard work. From there on, to learn to speak, one can chat to fluent strangers on Skype; and to learn to write one can start a diary and practice writing on online forums.

To get rid of the problem of Oligarchy, install wealth-ceilings. This alone should force an equitable distribution of wealth, which would take care of the distribution ("over-production," in reality under-production) principal problem of real political economy.

The whole world can industrialize in a decade, as the post-war experience proved. Poverty can vanish in a decade. Afterwards humanity can dedicate itself to its spiritual elevation, to the harnessing of solar and hydrogen (water) power-sources, and to, say, the exploration of space.

That is what ought to be done. The ideas are simple. Not *all* policies could pass at once, but *some* could and should. So why is this not happening? The problem is mainly one of deception and indoctrination - people fail to realize the true state of affairs. We have a Wizard of Oz situation and not enough people have dared pull the curtain.

Here is Tarpley's program in full:

30 Million Productive Jobs to Rebuild US Infrastructure, Industry and Agriculture: The Program to End the Economic Depression

by Webster G. Tarpley, www.tarpley.net

November 14, 2009

The US and the world are gripped by a deepening economic depression. There is no recovery and no automatic business cycle which will revive the economy. This bottomless depression will worsen until policies are reformed. The depression results from deregulated and globalized financial speculation, especially the \$1.5 quadrillion world derivatives bubble. The US industrial base has been gutted, and the US standard of living has fallen by almost two thirds over the last four decades. We must reverse this trend of speculation, de-industrialization, and immiseration. Current policy bails out bankers, but harms working people, industrial producers, farmers, and small business. We must defend civil society and democratic institutions from the effects of high unemployment and economic breakdown.

We therefore demand:

1. Measures to reduce speculation and minimize the burden of fictitious capital: End all bailouts of banks and financial institutions. Claw back the TARP and other public money given or lent to financiers. Abolish the notion of too big to fail; JP Morgan, Goldman Sachs, Citibank, Wells Fargo and other Wall Street zombie banks are insolvent and must be seized by the FDIC for chapter 7 liquidation, with derivatives eliminated by triage. Re-institute the Glass-Steagall firewall to separate banks, brokerages, and insurance. Ban credit default swaps and adjustable rate mortgages. To generate revenue and discourage speculation, levy a 1% Tobin tax (securities transfer tax or trading tax) on all financial transactions including derivatives (futures, options, indices, and over the counter

derivatives), stocks, bonds, foreign exchange, and commodities, especially program trading, high-frequency trading, and flash trading. Set up a 15% reserve requirement for all OTC derivatives. Use Tobin tax revenue and a revived corporate income tax to provide immediate tax relief to individuals, families, the self-employed, and small business by increasing personal exemptions and standard deductions. Stop all foreclosures on primary residences, businesses, and farms for five years or the duration of the depression, whichever lasts longer. Set a 10% maximum rate of interest on credit cards and payday loans. Re-regulate commodities markets with 100% margin requirements, position limits, and anti-speculation protections for hedgers and end users to prevent oil and gasoline price spikes. Enforce labor laws and anti-trust laws against monopolies and cartels. Restore individual chapter 11.

2. Measures to nationalize the Federal Reserve, cut federal borrowing, and provide 0% federal credit for production: Seize the Federal Reserve and bring it under the US Treasury as the National Bank of the United States, no longer the preserve of unelected and unaccountable cliques of incompetent and predatory bankers. The size of the money supply, interest rates, and approved types of lending must be determined by public laws passed and debated openly, passed by the congress and signed by the president. Stop US government borrowing from zombie banks and foreigners – let the US government function as its own bank. Reverse current policy by instituting 0% federal LENDING with preferential treatment for tangible physical production and manufacturing of goods and commodities, to include industry, agriculture, construction, mining, energy production, transportation, infrastructure building, public works, and scientific research, but not financial services and speculation. Issue successive tranches of \$1 trillion as needed to create 30 million union-wage productive jobs and attain full employment for the first time since 1945, reversing the secular decline in the US standard of living. Provide 0% credit to reconvert idle auto and other plants and re-hire unemployed workers to build modern rail, mass transit, farm tractors, and aerospace equipment, including for export. Extend 0% federal credit for production to small businesses like auto and electronics repair shops, dry cleaners, restaurants, tailors, family farms, taxis, and trucking. Maintain commercial credit for retail stores. Create an unlimited rediscount guarantee by the National Bank for public works projects to provide cash to local banks for bills of exchange pertaining to infrastructure and public works. Repatriate the foreign dollar overhang by encouraging China, Japan, and other dollar holders to place orders for US-made capital goods and modern hospitals. Revive the US Export-Import Bank. Set up a 10% tariff to protect domestic re-industrialization. Nationalize and operate GM, Chrysler, CIT, and other needed but insolvent firms as a permanent public sector. Maintain Amtrak and USPS.

3. Measures to re-industrialize, build infrastructure, develop science drivers, create jobs, and restore a high-wage economy: state and local governments and special government agencies modeled on the Tennessee Valley Authority will be prime contractors for an ambitious program of infrastructure and public works subcontracted to the private sector. To deal with collapsing US infrastructure, modernize the US elgeneration, pebble bed, high temperature reactors of 1,000 to 2,000 megawatts each. Rebuild the rail system with 50,000 miles of ultra-modern maglev Amtrak rail reaching into every state. Rebuild the entire interstate highway system to 21st century standards. Rebuild drinking water and waste water systems nationwide. Promote canal building and irrigation. For health care, build 1,000 500-bed modern hospitals to meet the minimum Hill-Burton standards of 1946. Train 250,000 doctors over the next decade. The Davis-Bacon Act will mandate union pay scales for all projects. For the farm sector, provide a debt freeze for the duration of the crisis, 0% federal credit for working capital and capital improvements, a ban on foreclosures, and federal price supports at 110% of parity across the board, with farm surpluses being used for a new Food for Peace program to stop world famine and

genocide. Working with other interested nations, invest \$100 billion each in: biomedical research to cure dread diseases; high energy physics (including lasers) to develop fusion power and beyond; and a multi-decade NASA program of moon-Mars manned exploration, permanent colonization, and industrial production. These science drivers will provide the technological spin-offs to modernize the entire US economy in the same way that the NASA moon shot gave us microchips and computers in the 1960s. These steps will expand and upgrade the national stock of capital goods and enhance the real productivity of US labor. Return the federal budget and foreign trade to surplus in 5 years or less.

4. Measures to defend and expand the social safety net: Restore all cuts; full funding at improved levels for Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, jobless benefits, WIC, Head Start, and related programs. Offer Medicare for All to anyone under 65 who wants it at \$100 per person per month, with reduced rates for families, students, and the unemployed. Pay for this with Tobin tax revenues and TARP clawback, and by ending the Iraq and Afghan wars. Seek to raise life expectancy by five years for starters. No rationing or death panels; savings can come only by finding cures. Quickly reach a \$15 per hour living wage. Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and affirm the right to organize. Pass card check to promote collective bargaining.

5. Measures to re-launch world trade and promote world recovery: Create a new world monetary system including the euro, the yen, the dollar, and the ruble, plus emerging Arab and Latin American regional currencies, with fixed exchange rates and narrow bands of fluctuation enforced by participating governments. Institute clearing and gold settlement among member states. Replace the IMF with a Multilateral Development Bank to finance world trade and infrastructure. The goal of the system must be to re-launch world trade through exports of high-technology capital goods, especially to sub-Saharan Africa, south Asia, and the poorer parts of Latin America. Promote a world Marshall Plan of great projects of world infrastructure, including: a Middle East reconstruction and development program; plans for the Ganges-Bramaputra, Indus, Mekong, Amazon, and Nile-Congo river basins; bridge-tunnel combinations to span the Bering Strait, the Straits of Gibraltar, the Straits of Malacca, the Sicilian narrows, and connect Japan to the Asian mainland; second Panama canal and Kra canals; Eurasian silk road, Cape to Cairo/Dakar to Djibouti, Australian coastal, and Inter-American rail projects, and more. American businesses will receive many of these orders, which means American jobs.

This program will create 30 million jobs in less than five years. It will end the depression, rebuild the US economy, improve wages and standards of living, re-start productive investment, and attain full employment with increased levels of capital investment per job.[Emphasis Tarpley's] Most orders placed under this program will go to US private sector bidders. Because of the vastly increased volume of goods put on the market, inflation will not result.

Let me note that I do not subscribe to this program as some sort of a holy mantra. I have independently reached the same conclusions as has Tarpley, I agree with his program, and I print it in deference to the man's proven astuteness, capability, and integrity.

The details of Huey Long's Share the Wealth / Every Man a King plan can be found in Huey's remarkable book *My First Days in the White House*. Or - turn to the Long Chapter in this work.

Conclusions

The two smoking guns of 9/11 and the 2008 economic meltdown should jerk all thinking persons into a state of alert. Non-doctrinaire examination of the two problems quickly points to pre-mediation and to grand conspiracy. There is a cabal of international power-mongers, many of them bankers,

banker-affiliates, or banker-dependants, lurking behind the scenes, and they are working toward something. What is their final goal? A basic extrapolation of current events points to the following future: the nation-states will wither to be replaced by corporate neo-feudalism; mass ignorance and poverty will engulf most of the population of the world; an international Oligarchical cabal will live in utter luxury under the aegis of an Oligarchical world government; a heavily brainwashed privileged but impotent managerial class will take care of day-to-day administrative issues. This is the *1984* scenario. Again, the picture painted above is not speculation but extrapolation. That is what we will get unless major changes take place. The reader may recall that *1984* goes hand in hand with another book of the same sort - *Brave New World*. Huxley's predictions are also coming true, though their realization is subtler.

We can throw in a couple of remarkable quotes at this stage. The following quotes are so spectacular I think it best to print them in full.

From: Alex Jones's *Reflections And Warnings - An Interview With Aaron Russo* (2009)

Russo: I met Rockefeller through a female attorney I knew who called me up one day and said, "One of the Rockefellers would like to meet you." I had made a video called *Mad as Hell*, and he'd seen the video and wanted to meet me, and knew I was running for governor of Nevada. I said, "Sure, I'd love to meet him." And I met him and I liked him. And he was a very, very smart man. And we used to talk and share ideas and thoughts. And he's the one who told me eleven months before 9/11 ever happened that there was going to be an event. Never told me what the event was going to be. But there was gonna be an event. And out of that event, we were going to invade Afghanistan, to run pipe lines from the Caspian Sea. We were going to invade Iraq, you know, to take over the oil fields, establish a base in the Middle East, and make it all part of the New World Order. And we'd go after Chavez in Venezuela.

And, sure enough, later, 9/11 happened. And I remember he was telling me how we were gonna see soldiers looking in caves for people in, you know, Afghanistan and Pakistan and all these places. And there's gonna be this War on Terror, in which there's no real enemy, and the whole thing is a giant hoax, you know, but it's a way for the government to take over the American people.

Jones: He told you it was gonna be a hoax?

Russo: Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. There's no question. He says, "There's gonna be a war on terror," and he's laughing. There's no... Who are we fighting? I mean, why do you think 9/11 happened, and then nothing's happened since then? Do you think that our security is so great here that these people who pulled off 9/11, who were able to... can't lock down another plane? Come on, it's ridiculous. 9/11 was done by people in our own government and our own banking system to perpetuate the fear of the American people into subordinating themselves to anything the government wants them to do. That's what it's about. And to create this endless War on Terror. And that's why we're... And that was the first lie. And the next lie was to go on into Iraq, you know, to get Saddam Hussein out with his weapons of mass destruction. That was the next lie.

Jones: Now, specifically, this was a little over six years ago?

Russo: This was, uh...

Jones: Eleven months before 9/11.

Russo: Yeah.

Jones: And Nick Rockefeller, who's a lawyer, he's become your friend over the previous years, and he's saying to you that there's gonna be this big event, and that out of that we're gonna have a war on terror, and it's just gonna go on and on?

Russo: Right. An endless war on terror. Without any real enemy. So you can never define a winner.

Jones: And did he say that it's gonna be perfect, because you can't define an enemy and it just goes on and on?

Russo: Yeah. He says, "Because you can't define a winner. There's no winner, there's no one to beat." So it goes on and on forever. And they can do whatever they want. They scared the hell out of the American public. Look, this whole War on Terror is a fraud. It's a farce. It's very difficult to say it out loud, because people are intimidated against saying it. Because if you say it, they wanna make you into a nutcase.

Jones: Let's be sp...

Russo: But the truth has to be... the truth has to come out. That's why I'm doing this interview. The fact of the matter happens to be that the whole War on Terror is a fraud, it's a farce. Yeah, there's a war going on in Iraq, because we invaded Iraq. And people are over there fighting, you know? But the War on Terror? It's a joke, you know? And until we discover what really happened on 9/11 and who was responsible for 9/11... Because that's where the War on Terror emanates from. That's where it comes from. It was 9/11 that allowed this War on Terror to begin. And until we get to the bottom root of 9/11, the truth of 9/11, we'll never know about the War on Terror.

Jones: Aaron, you said that he was, and I think it's important, and I know this about the Rockefellers from Doctor Dennis Cuddy and many others, who literally... You'll be twenty years old in a lunch line in college, and [unintelligible] there's Rockefeller. And he hears... I mean, they're experts at recruiting and getting what they call "players," and that, clearly, he was uh- I mean, I wanna make it specific and just get you to reiterate what you said last night about you were... you got thirty percent of the vote, you were having an effect, you were... you had made *Mad as Hell*, they knew that you'd started the Constitution Party...

Russo: Yeah.

Jones: They knew that you were somebody who's taking action and getting things done. You'd already made some big films, had a lot of other successes...

Russo: Right.

Jones: So they were trying to recruit you and didn't it come down to the point of, "Hey, we are here to recruit you, and don't worry, your chip's gonna say, 'Don't mess with us, you know? This guy's don't-touch'"?

Russo: Yes. That did happen. I was definitely being recruited. But it's more subtle than that.

Jones: Well, your word, just go through the process, and then, what did he say?

Russo: Well, what it is is, remember, we were friends and he used to go to my house a lot, we'd have dinner, we'd talk, and he'd tell me about business investments that he'd get involved in, you know, or they would help me with this business investment or that business investment. And, was I interested in joining the Council on Foreign Relations? You know, I would have to get a letter to join them, but was I interested in that? And, you know, just stuff, you know? ... And I used to say to him that I never really did that because that wasn't where I was coming from, you know? "As much as I like you, Nick, you know, your way isn't my way. We're the opposite sides of the fence, you know? I don't believe in enslaving people, you know?" And, um...

Jones: And he would come back with, "Oh, I do," or...?

Russo: Well, it would be more like, you know...

Jones: "It's better for them!"?

Russo: It's more like, you know, um... How do I put it? It was like, "What do you care about them? What do you care about those people? What difference does it make to you? Take care of your own life. Do the best you can for you and your family. What do the rest of the people mean to you? They don't mean anything to you. They're just serfs, they're just people." You know, it was just a lack of caring, you know, and that's just not who I was. It was just sort of, like, cold, you know? And I used to say to him,

"What's the point of all this? You have all the money in the world you need. You have all the power you need. What's the point? You know, what's the end goal?" And he said the end goal is to get everybody chipped. To control the whole society. To have the bankers, the elite people, you know, the bankers and some government controlling the world. And I said, "Do all of the people in the Council on Foreign Relations believe this way you do?" He said, "No, no, no." You know, he said, "Most of them believe they're doing the right thing. A lot of them believe it's better off being socialistic. You know, we have to convince people that capitalism... that socialism is really capitalism." He said, "America's becoming a socialist country. It's a communist country today."

Aaron Russo was a recognized filmmaker and a man of undisputed credibility. The full interview is available on YouTube.

Our second quote is the perennial classic from Quigley's *Tragedy & Hope* (1966).

From: Quigley's *Tragedy & Hope*, page 324:

The powers of financial capitalism had another far-reaching aim, 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. This 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 Basle, 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.

In each country, the power of the central bank rested largely on its control of credit and money supply. In the world as a whole the power of the central bankers rested very largely on their control of loans and the gold flows. ... They made agreements on all the major financial problems of the world, as well as on many of the economic and political problems, especially in reference to loans, payments, and the economic future of the chief areas of the globe.

The B.I.S. [Bank of International Settlements] is generally regarded as the apex of the structure of financial capitalism whose remote origins go back to the creation of the Bank of England in 1694. ... It was intended to be the world cartel of every-growing national financial powers by assembling the nominal heads of these national financial centers.

Quigley was one of the major historians of the 20th century and a partial insider to the CFR/RIIA gang. His credibility is beyond question. In fairness, we should point out that Quigley was under the impression that the banking power had waned in favour of industrial power in the aftermath of the 1931 crash. Recent events show that either Quigley had miscalculated, or that the bankers have regained their standing (likely after 1971, or by allying or taking over the industrial powers) - with a vengeance.

Let us take a comprehensive look at the specifics of the Oligarchical Big Plan in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

The Big Plan

The nature of the Big Plan is obvious enough and in fact has been elaborated in detail over the last three millennia.

In principle, what could an oligarchy, possessed of immense power, desire? The most immediate goal of an oligarchy is self-perpetuation and the preservation of the status quo. Thus the oligarchs are always looking for new ways of controlling the population.

The long term goal is the extension of the oligarchical domain. Have a nation? Expand to an empire! Have an empire? Try to conquer the world! Then perhaps the stars... The Oligarch is a human too, he has to dream!

Oligarchy has to have a *raison d'être*, which leads to the concoction of various lunatic pro-oligarchical ideologies, all of which amount to the same thing. All oligarchical ideologies insist on the existence of a superior class within humanity, a class that should be in charge of the human "herd."

The Oligarchs have repeatedly expounded their views throughout the ages. The Big Plan is at least as old as Plato. Let us take a look at the Utopian texts of the ages, most of which still qualify as timeless classics.

3.1 Utopianism Through the Ages

3.1.1 Plato

Plato laid out the whole Plan in his *Republic*. Plato's Oligarchical credentials went back to his ancestors' kingships of Athens and Messenia. After receiving training in the elite schools in Egypt and elsewhere, Plato came back to Greece to establish his famous Academy around 388 BC.

The Republic, the flagship of Plato's diverse writings, deals with the ideal society as imagined by an oligarch. Plato envisions a collective society of four tiers - the Philosopher King on top, then the rulers, then a Guardian police-army-managerial class, and the rest of the herd at the bottom. In Plato's City, the commoners are supposed to shut up and work for the grandeur of the State. This caste system to Plato is Justice. The commoners need not be multifaceted men - on the contrary, Plato insists on absolute division of labour combined with a program of eugenics.¹ People would be bred for their roles in society like so many domestic animals. Plato explicitly compares the well-trained soldier ("noble youth") to a well-bred dog (Book II). The strong men would couple with the strong women to produce blacksmiths, the short men would mate with the short women to produce dwarfish miners, and so on. We see, therefore, that Darwin's wonderful ideas were anything but radical. For that matter, Plato also came up with behavioural training.

¹"Eugenics" is a pseudo-science, in reality an ideology, which proclaims that some people are inherently better than others, and that the "inferior" types should be prevented from breeding at all costs and by all means.

Not only that, but Plato also came up with brainwashing via state propaganda, and with compulsory schooling as a system of indoctrination. Already in Book (Chapter) II of his work, Plato proposes that the people in charge of the State tell the children stories, which, "though not wholly destitute of truth, are in the main fictitious." This is to be done until the children are ready to "learn gymnastics." In modern terms, Plato talks of compulsory schooling and compulsory military service. In order to avoid the corruption of the youth, Plato advocates for absolute state control over literature. The writers of the Republic must adhere to a strict censorship, just like in the Union of Soviet Socialist *Republics*. Curiously enough, Homer was on Plato's blacklist. The authorized works were to promote hard work, self-sacrifice, and obedience to "God and parents" (i.e. the status quo). Plato also frowns on laughter, because ridicule of one's "superiors" is antithetical to blind obedience. Controlling literature is not enough for Plato, he also wants to control music: military music promotes war, jazz-type music promotes promiscuity, slow brooding music promotes depression and apathy, and so on.

In this context I refer the reader to Mark Twain's short stories *Of the Good Little Boy* and *Of the Bad Little Boy*.

Plato also propounds the idea of the Noble Lie. (Book 3) "If any one at all is to have the privilege of lying," says Plato, "the rulers of the state should be the persons; and they, in their dealings either with enemies or with their own citizens, may be allowed to lie for the public [i.e. oligarchical] good." Our "leaders" have clearly read Plato.

One "royal lie" that Plato advises for is the dual package of genetic pre-determination and class mobility. (Book 3) "Citizens, we shall say to them in our tale, you are brothers, yet God has framed you differently." Some of you are made to be in charge, some to be managers, and most of you are only fit to be passive labourers. Your children, however - that being the "Big Lie" - may be of a mettle greater than yours. Through this great illusion Plato proposes to maintain the cohesion of society. The modern equivalent of Plato's "royal lie" is the American Dream, which, as George Carlin famously said, you have to be asleep to believe in.

Wealth, says Plato in Book 4, destroys "art" (meaning the desire to work), which is why people should not be allowed to accumulate much savings. The same philosophy applies today, and is the motivation behind gradual inflation (which destroys savings) and subsistence level wages.

The family does not exist in Plato's City. Children grow up in communal quarters. There is a "community of women," i.e. marriage does not exist. The "community of women" would later become one of the main goals of the Marxist Communist Party.

Plato was also a forerunner of the modern feminists. "Are dogs divided into hes and shes, or do they both share equally in hunting and in keeping watch and in the other duties of dogs?" They share alike, and therefore so must the men and the women in Plato's City. The sharing of duties includes military service. At the same time Plato opines that in regard to important matters, "the male sex has... gifts and qualities in a higher degree than the female."

A convinced eugenicists, Plato argues for the frequent mating of "the best with the best," and the obstruction to the unholy union of "the inferior with the inferior" (Book 5). For the good of the flock, Plato recommends that "they [the Oligarchs] should rear the offspring of the one sort of union, but not of the other." Strict regulations of marriage and birth are advised. Earlier, Plato explains that the "good" are the obedient and the temperate, while the "bad" are the rebellious and the boisterous, or, may we say, the vivacious. This programme of purification is to be (Book 5) "a secret which the rulers only know, or there will be a further danger of our herd ... breaking out into rebellion." Let the reader keep these deep statements in mind.

The one in charge of Plato's wonderful zoo is to be the Philosopher King - meaning Plato himself. He is to rule from behind the scenes, like the Wizard of Oz. The official, apparent ruling class is just for show. True power rests behind the scenes.

After introducing his philosopher, Plato embarks on a discussion of epistemology, which gives us the useful parable of Plato's Cave (Book 7). In this cave we have a gaggle of chained humans looking

toward a wall behind which burns a fire. Fire symbolizes knowledge. The unfortunate prisoners see the shadows of those who pass behind the wall, and in their ignorance speculate helplessly as to the nature and origin of the shadows. Suppose one prisoner escapes his chains and leaves the cave. At first, he will be blinded by the sun - meaning that the true state of affairs will stun him, as it stunned me when I first began to make my way through the lunacy I hereby relate to you, my dear reader. If compelled to look straight at the light, the escaped prisoner will suffer pangs of pain, and redirect his gaze to the soothing familiar shadows. Continues Plato, "suppose once more, that he [the prisoner] is reluctantly dragged up to a steeped and rugged ascent, and held fast until he is forced into the presence of the sun [truth] himself, is he not likely to be pained and irritated?" But once accustomed to the "sight of the upper world," our hero finally accepts reality. Suppose now we put our prisoner back in his chains. What would his comrades think of his tall tales? Writes Plato, "Men would say of him that up he went and down he came without his eyes; and that it was better not even to think of ascending; and if only one tried to loose another and lead him up to the light, let them only catch the offender, and they would put him to death."

And this is why, reader, that should you go through the effort to verify all the horrors I tell you of, and find the truth for yourself, and try to enlighten your family and friends, you will be shunned, ridiculed or ignored. To the prisoner, the parable of Plato's Cave shows the path out of darkness. To the Oligarchs, the Cave provides a recipe for control.

One other crucial implication of Plato's Cave is that appearances deceive. If fed fake or insufficient information, on which solely we base our thinking, we will reach specious conclusions. This gets into the conflict between rationalist and empiricist reasoning. In general, the rationalist approach is the abstract, first-principles method, while the empiricist approach is the hands-on, what-I-see-is-what-it-is way of thinking. In the post-renaissance era, continental Europe leaned on the rationalist side, and England promoted empiricism. Plato and Leibnitz are two famous rationalist, while Aristotle, Francis Bacon, Hobbes and Locke argued for empiricism. In general, rationalists rely on logic and the examination of causal relationships, and empiricists conduct endless experiments, and obsess over numbers and statistics. Moreover, rationalism takes a positive approach to knowledge by claiming that truth can be deduced independently of the senses, while empiricism is negative in the sense that it claims that only that which is verifiable by the senses can be accepted as truth. Note that the 19th century doctrine of "positivism" has a separate meaning, one that appears to be but is not synonymous with empiricism.

To illustrate the contrast between the two main epistemological methods, consider the following argument. Suppose we have a pharmaceutical manufacturer whose sole goal is to make profits. The rationalist will make the argument that such a manufacturer is bound to produce addictive drugs which treat rather than cure the patient's illness. Having reached a conclusion, the rationalist will proceed with his day, keeping an eye open for verifications of his thesis. The empiricist, if he even considers the problem, will claim that we have to examine each drug separately and see what the data tells us. To conduct a trial, the empiricist collects as many people as possible, selects a control group, feeds the rest of the people drugs, waits, collects data, realizes he has made a crucial error, starts over, collects more data, and finally discovers that the drug does indeed cause addiction and treats the symptoms rather than the causes of the illness. At this stage, the empiricist announces that even though we have showed that one particular drug is poisonous, we can not claim that all of the manufacturer's drugs are poisonous without conducting further tests, for which we would need additional funding, thank you very much.

In other words, in a society which embraces empiricism, a person can not say that he knows something, no matter how obvious, because he figured it out from first principles. He has to present "data." Often, one can not obtain the necessary data due to secrecy or expense. Even if one should find some data, his opponents can argue that the data is bad or that it represents an outlier case and thus proves nothing.

Unfortunately, a society founded on pseudo-rationalist principles - like Classical Greek society - can justify, say, slavery, with pseudo-rational arguments. They can say, for example, that axiomatically

some people are born to be slaves. The rare person who manages to escape slavery was clearly not born to be a slave, and those free persons who become slaves were born to be slaves. This is almost circular reasoning, but it does possess superficial plausibility.

Hence, there are limitations of rationalist thinking. A false axiomatic assumption, or a subtle error in a long chain of logical statements, is enough to render an argument absurd. This problem drove Greek science into a dead-end toward the wane of the classical Greek civilization.² Therefore, the proponent of rationalism should always try to justify his own conclusions with examples, and moreover, he should actively seek counter-examples which would disprove his theories and send him back to the drawing board. The empiricist thinker risks succumbing to minutiae, denying the obvious for lack of data, and reaching ridiculous conclusions on the basis of shifty data. Worse, empiricism performs exceedingly poorly when dealing with phenomena, which do not succumb to accurate quantitative measurement. Take intelligence. One can evaluate intelligence qualitatively, but not quantitatively.

In principle, the scientific method unites both rationalism and empiricism. Instead of randomly collecting useless data, the scientist should carefully examine the world around him, seeking the answers of important questions in terms of causal relationships. After formulating a rationalist, abstract hypothesis, the scientist should test his ideas. This process involves (a) making predictions on the basis of the hypothesis, and examining "nature" to see if those predictions do hold; (b) seeing if past events fit the hypothesis; (c) conducting controlled experiments. A single counter-example disproves the hypothesis. Having found no counter-examples, the scientist accepts his hypothesis as an approximation of the truth. Read Chapter 1 of Quigley's *The Evolution of Civilizations* to see how the scientific method could be applied in the social sciences. Note that the scientific method is only a method - though useful, it is not always applicable, and it implicitly approximates rather than establishes the truth.

But let us return to Plato.

After presenting his Cave, Plato explains that even though (Book 7) "us who are the founders of the State" should "compel the best minds to attain that knowledge which we have already shown to be the greatest of all," the "best minds" should be sent back to the cave short of learning all of the philosopher kings' tricks - for the good of the State.

Later Plato extols "dialectical" thinking, which is essentially the doctrine of rationalism, or so-called formal logic.

The last chapters of *The Republic* deal with the various forms of government. Plato condemns "oligarchy," which to him is the rule by force of the wealthy few - i.e. plutocracy. His own proposed government Plato labels "timocracy" (rule by the honourable) or "aristocracy" (rule by the best). After dealing with plutocracy, Plato thrashes tyranny (absolute monarchy), and mob-rule (democracy). The pros and cons of both the latter types of government are obvious enough - let the reader read Plato's musings and ponder on the problem for himself. It stands to note here that in at least two senses, America is not a democracy, but a republic. First, I think it is clear enough that America is not a democracy in the sense that the people govern themselves and their nation, but a republic after the Platonic model.³ Second, the idealistic America of grade-school history books, which does exist to an extent, is not a nation of mob-rule, but a republic which protects the individual with law on the basis of the Constitution.

In brief, Plato proposes the organization of society in a caste system captained by a self-appointed oligarchical cabal of "philosophers," who exact obedience via heavy-duty indoctrination, the practice of eugenics, and outright fraud.

A technical issue that one could consider here is the question of whether Plato really meant what he

²See Ch. 9 of Quigley's *The Evolution of Civilizations*.

³See Michael Parenti's excellent *Democracy for the Few*.

wrote, or if he was being ironic. Plato does distance himself from the ideas he proposes by writing the book as a dialogue between Socrates and a few others. Whatever the case, the *Republic* speak for itself, particularly in regard to current developments.

3.1.2 Aristotle

The Greek noble Aristotle was Plato's most famous pupil and the mentor of Alexander the Great. In adherence to his philosophical principles, Aristotle studied all spheres of human knowledge, and wrote a number of important works, of which *Politics*, written circa 330BC, pertains to our discussion. Despite his undeniable sophistication and erudition, Aristotle committed critical errors in some of his writings. Lost for an era, Aristotle's works emerged in the middle ages and attained great popularity among the universities of both Europe and the Arab world.

Aristotle wastes no time, and already at the beginning of *Politics* he tells us that (1.2)

It is also from natural causes that some beings command and others obey, that each may obtain their mutual safety; for a being who is endowed with a mind capable of reflection and forethought is by nature the superior and governor, whereas he whose excellence is merely corporeal is fittest to be a slave; whence it follows that the different state of master and slave is equally advantageous to both.

Having settled this axiomatic excuse for oligarchism, Aristotle proceeds to justify imperialism:

...amongst [barbarians] there are none qualified by nature to govern... For which reason the poets say, it is proper for the Greeks to govern the barbarians, as if a barbarian and a slave were by nature one.

Next Aristotle explains why we need government:

...a government complete in itself is that final cause and what is best...

Where the "final cause" is "the end which we desire." Aristotle also formulates the "common good" doctrine:

...the notion of a city naturally precedes that of a family or an individual, for the whole must necessarily be prior to the parts...

But why should some be slaves? Aristotle observes that there are those who argue against slavery (1.3):

Some persons have thought that the power of the master over his slave originates from his superior knowledge, and that this knowledge is the same in the master, the magistrate, and the king, as we have already said; but others think that herile government is contrary to nature, and that it is the law which makes one man a slave and another free, but that in nature there is no difference; for which reason that power cannot be founded in justice, but in force.

The next two chapters squash the nonsensical idea that slavery rests on force not justice (1.4,1.5):

...a slave is an animated instrument...

...for that some should govern, and others be governed, is not only necessary but useful, and from the hour of their birth some are marked out for those purposes, and others for the other, and there are many species of both sorts.

...tame animals are naturally better than wild ones, and it is advantageous that both should be under subjection to man; for this is productive of their common safety: so is it naturally with the male and the female; the one is superior, the other inferior; the one governs, the other is governed; and the same rule must necessarily hold good with respect to all mankind.

To make sure no one harbours any illusions in regard to the reality of justice, Aristotle tells us that (1.6)

...victory is always owing to a superiority in some advantageous circumstances; so that it seems that force never prevails but in consequence of great abilities. But still the dispute concerning the justice of it remains; for some persons think, that justice consists in benevolence, others think it just that the powerful should govern: in the midst of these contrary opinions, there are no reasons sufficient to convince us, that the right of being master and governor ought not to be placed with those who have the greatest abilities.

In terms of learning (1.7),

There is also one sort of knowledge proper for a master, another for a slave... The knowledge of the master is to be able properly to employ his slaves, for the mastership of slaves is the employment, not the mere possession of them; not that this knowledge contains anything great or respectable; for what a slave ought to know how to do, that a master ought to know how to order.

It is no surprise that the legendary oligarch Cicero described Aristotle's glorious writing style as "a river of gold."

Having relieved himself of his oligarchical juices, Aristotle proceeds to summarize what we call political science.

In 1.8 Aristotle suggests that perhaps some boundary should be set on the riches that people can accumulate, a principle we find not unreasonable. In the following few chapters, Aristotle demolishes the idea of the intrinsic value of money, blasts usury, and explains that philosophers do not particularly care for money, for they can always make money on account of their wisdom. In illustration, Aristotle tells of a philosopher who made good by setting up a monopoly - not for greed, but to make a point.

Fathers are to be as kings to their children and husbands to be as the state to the citizens in regard to their wives. For the hard of understanding, Aristotle reiterates that "the courage of the man consists in commanding, the woman's in obeying." We are also told that Sophocles observed that "Silence is a woman's ornament" - a statement, the validity of which we leave to our reader to gauge.

In the second book of *Politics*, Aristotle bulldozes Plato's communistic Republic. After defeating communism, Aristotle turns his guns on free market fundamentalism. The issue here is that between total private property and the abolishment thereof there is a continuum. It is as ridiculous that one man should own, say, a power station or a whole block of apartments, as that a man can not lay claim to even his toothbrush or the roof over his head. Thus the free market libertarianism VS communism polar split is a classic example of false dichotomy. Thinking in binary terms often leads to dead-ends; abstraction via a continuum generally models reality more successfully.

Aristotle manages to smash another ludicrous 19th century philosophy two millenia prior to its inception - namely utilitarianism, allegedly the brainchild of the vicious oligarch thugs Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, the latter the author of *On Liberty* (1859), and an employee and defender of the virtue of the BEIC (British East India Company) at the time of the genocidal suppression of the Sepoy Rebellion. Says Aristotle in 2.5, "happiness is not like that numerical equality which arises from certain numbers when added together, although neither of them may separately contain it; for happiness cannot be thus added together, but must exist in every individual, as some properties belong to every integral."

Politics defines six forms of government, three of which aim for the public good and three for private enrichment. These are: the good - monarchy, aristocracy, and what we will call republicanism; and the bad - tyranny, oligarchy, and what Aristotle calls democracy. The first four are defined in the obvious way. Oligarchy Aristotle defines as the rule of the rich, who usually but not always are few;

and democracy he says is the rule of the poor, who usually but not always are many. We can accept the definitions with the following proviso - let us consider malignant democracy as the mob rule of the 51% over the 49%, and republicanism as constitutional rule with laws defending minority groups, along the lines of what the US is supposed to have.

Though in this manner acceptable, Aristotle's definitions can use improvement. He insists that tyranny is the malicious rule of a single individual. I pose that no such thing can exist. A tyrant needs the support of either an oligarchy or a mob, or someone will simply slit his throat. Let the title of "tyrant" go to the despot who rules via a tight oligarchy and a subservient army. Stalin is a perfect example of this type of animal. The despot who rides on the crest of a mob we can call a demagogue. A basket-case demagogue was Hitler, who won office in an election, and who for a long time enjoyed the love of the majority of the German people. Finally, we note that under certain circumstances, a monarch can rule in a voluntary investment by a people. Consider a ship's captain, or the leader of an independent military company. In history, we refer again to Huey Long. Michael Parenti makes the case for Julius Caesar as a man of the people in his *The Assassination of Julius Caesar* (2003).

Furthermore, we point out that as long as slavery exists, there can be no true republicanism, or democracy as understood today, but only oligarchy or a type of mob rule.

Aristotle dedicates the bulk of the remainder of the text to an articulation for the preferability of republicanism/democracy over the other modes of government. In 4.4 he makes an explicit argument for the promotion of what we call the "middle class."

In 4.13 Aristotle tells us that "The citizens of a free state ought to consist of those only who bear arms," implying that one who lacks the right to bear arms can not be a true citizen. The full citizen is one who shares in the judicial and the executive parts of government. Such a man should know how to command as well as to obey - those who only know how to obey are slaves, and those who only know how to command are oligarchs. The citizens vote each other into office under strict term limits.

Book 5 deals with revolutions. According to Aristotle, revolutions occur from drives for equality and drives for supremacy; the former leading to republicanism/democracy, and the latter to oligarchy and tyranny.

In Book 7, Aristotle attempts to define what the "good life" should look like. Here, Aristotle introduces the crucial but generally poorly understood doctrine of the necessary versus the important. The idea is that necessary things are not necessarily important. (7.14)

...life is divided into labour and rest, war and peace; and of what we do the objects are partly necessary and useful, partly noble: and we should give the same preference to these that we do to the different parts of the soul and its actions, as war to procure peace; labour, rest; and the useful, the noble.

Thus, the accumulation of money is only worthwhile as the means to achieve leisure. Conflict and war and not worthwhile in themselves, but only means for the end of peace. The reader can apply this principle down the line. Aristotle reaches the typical and agreeable conclusion that life should be the pursuit of virtue, which consists of bodily health, external comfort (rather than luxury), and the spiritually satisfying quest for understanding and human decency.

In line with his view of slavery, Aristotle notes that "none of [the citizens] should be permitted to exercise any mechanic employment or follow merchandise, as being ignoble and destructive to virtue; neither should they be husband-men, that they may be at leisure to improve in virtue and perform the duty they owe to the state."

For the education of the future citizen Aristotle suggests that children are allowed to grow until the age of five; protected from obscenity and triviality; and forbidden to play with slaves.

The eighth and last book deals with education. Aristotle advises that citizens receive a common

education - for the good of the whole, of course. He notes that since menial work is only fit for slaves, the citizens should learn the four arts of reading, gymnastics, music, and painting. This theory is consistent with present reality - as we saw in Chapter 1 of this work, the children of the Oligarchy go to private boarding schools to enjoy a classical education, while the progeny of the masses goes to public school to learn how to obey.

Aristotle also makes the point that leisure is too precious to be wasted on play. Says he in 8.3, "we ought to learn what we should do when at rest: for we ought not to employ that time at play; for then play would be the necessary business of our lives. But if this cannot be, play is more necessary for those who labour than those who are at rest: for he who labours requires relaxation; which play will supply: for as labour is attended with pain and continued exertion, it is necessary that play should be introduced, under proper regulations, as a medicine: for such an employment of the mind is a relaxation to it, and eases with pleasure." This is why we have so many movies and TV channels and brands of beer and professional televised sports and video games and gadgets and "hobbies." So that the drones recuperated on Sunday in order to work on Monday.

We remark the the American Republic, as defined in the late 18th century, was largely consistent with the Aristotelian proposal.

3.1.3 Machiavelli

In effect, utopianism is a large subset of what is called "political science." In general, the utopians try to say how things should be on the basis of first principles. We now look at the work of Machiavelli, a fellow who dealt not with how things should be, but with how things are. As such, Machiavelli's work is far more honest than the hypocritical venom of, say, Plato and Hobbes.

Political realities are the realities of power. In his *The Prince*, finished though not published in 1513, Machiavelli examines politics from the point of view of the highly ambitious individual, without pretences of justice, or excessive forays into the area of good & evil. The principles established by Machiavelli apply to international relations, revolutionary and civil politics, criminal systems, corporate strategy, and in general to any remotely political sphere of human activity.

For a comprehensive overview of history from the perspective of power relations, read Carroll Quigley's *Weapons Systems and Political Stability* (1983). Quigley argues that 1) democracy is a function of the availability of modern weaponry to the bulk of the population: societies that have citizen armies and cheap access to weapons are more democratic; and 2) governmental centralization is a function of the ratio between the offensive and defensive powers of weaponry: when offensive weapons dominate defensive weapons, centralization occurs, and vice versa.

The author of *The Prince* was a minor Tuscan noble who served in the Florentine administration for a decade and a half before a coup forced him into the sidelines, following a bout of torture. Machiavelli defines two types of governments - republics (the people govern themselves) and principalities (a prince governs the people). *The Prince* examines the government of principalities from the point of view of the prince; Machiavelli looks at the republican form of government in his other major work, the *Discourses on Livy*.

A principality is either hereditary, or new. A newly acquired principality is either used to freedom (republicanism), or used to monarchical rule. The former case makes the life of our prince tougher. In Machiavelli's view, only rabid imbecility or great misfortune may cause a prince to forfeit a hereditary principality of his.

If he conquers a new principality as a monarch of a larger kingdom, the prince should adopt the following measures to retain control of his new fiefdom: 1) try to obtain the goodwill of the people; 2) slaughter the old rulers to erase outstanding claims (as the Bolsheviks killed the Romanovs); 3) govern in person if possible; 4) send colonists from his main possessions to establish a ruling elite (as the British liked to do); 5) if necessary, establish a puppet regime consisting of a domestic oligarchy dependant on himself; 6) keep track of the activities of greedy neighbours. In regard to the first two

points, Machiavelli observes that "men ought to either be well-treated, or crushed." Indeed, mistreating a person powerful enough to cause trouble is an obvious cardinal error in political strategy. Machiavelli advises that one allies with small powers against greater ones, because in the event of victory, the small powers would be easy to control, while a greater power could become unmanageable. Thus, in the game of thrones, "he who is the cause of another becoming powerful is ruined." The British imperialists adhered to this strategy of divide and conquer with considerable success. Machiavelli further distinguishes between two types of monarchy - feudal and absolute. In feudal monarchy, the people swear to barons, who in turn swear to the prince. In absolute monarchy, the prince receives the direct allegiance of his subjects. A feudal kingdom, notes Machiavelli, is easier to conquer, but harder to retain, than an absolute monarchy.

Having conquered a republic (i.e. a province whose people are accustomed to self-rule) by force, the prince has three ways of retaining control: 1) cause the ruin of the republic, thus rendering its citizens incapable of resistance; 2) govern in person; 3) puppetize the province. Imperialism has relied heavily on all three strategies, with the accent having fallen on different strategies in different times. Observe again that the promoters of world government must first ruin America before they can impose their New World Order.

To succeed, the prince should imitate the actions of the successful figures of history, and aim high. For the competent prince, the difficult part of the game is the acquisition rather than the retainment of his principality. Machiavelli advises his reader to be bold and forceful. Again we find the axiom that politics is the interplay of force (chapter 4):

It is necessary, therefore, if we desire to discuss this matter thoroughly, to inquire whether these innovators [reformers] can rely on themselves or have to depend on others: that is to say, whether, to consummate their enterprise, have they to use prayers or can they use force? In the first instance they always succeed badly, and never compass anything; but when they can rely on themselves and use force, then they are rarely endangered. Hence it is that all armed prophets have conquered, and the unarmed ones have been destroyed.

In modern terms, do not expect "peaceful demonstrations" and "petitions" to necessarily achieve anything. Only raw force carries any weight. Those in power yield to the wishes of mass rallies, not because so many people asked them nicely, but because a mass of men needs only a spark of fury to burst into violence. Peaceful protest, unless backed by potential force - be it physical, legal, monetary, or otherwise - is laughable to the wielders of power.

A principality acquired for our prince by others is easy to obtain but difficult to retain. In this scenario, so unstable are the foundations of the prince's rule, that he may lose his principality even if he does everything right.

To gain power via the avenue of elections, our prince must be shrewd rather than forceful. Machiavelli divides society into two general groups - the people and the nobles (i.e. oligarchs). In general, the prince should appeal to the people, because they will always be around, while once in power the prince can proceed to dump the nobility. Another reason for adopting a populist strategy is the fact that "one cannot by fair dealing, and without injury to others, satisfy the nobles, but you can satisfy the people, for their object is more righteous than that of the nobles, the latter wishing to oppress, while the former only desire not to be oppressed." In this instance, Machiavelli's tone is refreshingly anti-oligarchic. Note that an anti-oligarchy can only be monarchy or some type of democracy; and an anti-oligarchical monarchy must have the support of the people, or collapse, as Machiavelli also argues.

In some cases a third group - soldiery - enters the fray. Its importance varies according to the power of the army. The implications of citizen versus professional armies should be obvious.

Having won the election, the prince should 1) be nice to the people, and 2) try to rule in person rather than through magistrates.

Machiavelli observes that self-sufficient (autarchic) principalities are stronger than those dependant on others. As mentioned before, Globaloney clearly defies this principle to the detriment of all globalized states of the world. The larger problem is that by forcing Globaloney on the nation-states, the Oligarchs are forcing trade that is not mutually beneficial, but often beneficial to only one party, or to no party at all. Moreover, by limiting national sovereignty, Globaloney prevents the states from doing what they have to do in times of acute crisis such as the present. The pursuit of absolute autarchy tends to lead to militarism and, indeed, to inefficiency; but the pursuit of some autarchy is only healthy.

Next, we examine the soldiery of our prince. Three types of troops exist: mercenaries, auxiliaries (the troops of one's allies), and one's own troops. Obviously, one can reasonably trust only one's own cohorts. This point was important in Machiavelli's time, when the Italian principalities overused mercenaries and auxiliaries to the ruin of all Italy. The point is also important today, when the United States has deployed more mercenaries than US Army personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan.⁴ The Xe corporation, formerly known as Blackwater, is a privately owned international army. It is only a matter of time before the Xe thugs become a band of condottieri (brigands) roaming the surface of the globe like a crazed 14th century mercenary company. Like financial derivatives, Xe should not even exist. Private armies have been the tools of oligarchy since time immemorial, Venice being a classic example.

Machiavelli advises his prince to maintain his arms in the form of both his army and his own physical strength. "For among other evils which being unarmed brings you, it causes you to be despised, and this is one of those ignominies against which a prince ought to guard himself, as is shown later on. Because there is nothing proportionate between the armed and the unarmed; and it is not reasonable that he who is armed should yield obedience willingly to him who is unarmed, or that the unarmed man should be secure among armed servants." This, of course, is the incontrovertible argument in favour of unrestricted gun ownership. Subjects go unarmed. Citizens and free men bear arms. The unjustified use of weaponry we can consider a crime - but not the mere possession. Gun control is a sure indication of the presence of some form of dictatorship. Lest the reader accuses me of bias, let me note that having grown up in cities, I have never dealt with guns. But I do insist on my right to bear arms. That the Americans have their Second Amendment is yet another proof that, for all of its failings, America remains the freest nation on Earth. Another useful example is the nation of Switzerland, one of the richest and freest on Earth, untouched by the maelstrom of two world wars: the Swiss are armed to the teeth.

What qualities should the prince possess? He should appear liberal with being so (chapter 16).

...liberality exercised in a way that does not bring you the reputation for it, injures you; for if one exercises it honestly and as it should be exercised, it may not become known, and you will not avoid the reproach of its opposite.

This quote suggests that Machiavelli was an idealistic realist rather than some kind of a medieval monster. Some damn Machiavelli for poisoning politics. What nonsense! As if the man invented murder and fraud! Machiavelli merely described the true nature of politics. It is a testament to the poverty of our intellectual culture, that we are reduced to having to cite classical works to imbue gravity into statements that should be self-evident to any perceptive child or reasonably observant adult.

Generosity is useful on one's way to power, but burdensome after one has entered office, because people can receive gifts indefinitely, and will indeed consider you stingy if you cease gifting them after they have grown accustomed to receiving.

⁴As of 2009, "contractors (armed and unarmed) now make up approximately 50% of the 'total force in Centcom AOR [Area of Responsibility]."

<http://www.alternet.org/blogs/world/140378>, accessed on 8 October 2011

The prince "ought to desire to be considered clement not cruel," though he should try not to misuse clemency. A new prince can not help some cruelty. It is best to be both loved and feared; if forced to choose between the two, it is safer to be feared, if possible without arousing the hatred of the population, which hatred usually stems from the abuse of the property and the women of the subjects.

Machiavelli advises his prince to be strong and yet crafty (be "a lion and a fox"). In politics, agreements and pacts are valid only as long as the configuration of power on which they lie remains stable.

In sum, the prince should try to possess the various good qualities in appearance, but adhere to Realpolitik in practice. Unfortunately, as Machiavelli observes, most people are unaware of this elementary principle of politics (chapter 18).

But it is necessary to know well how to disguise this characteristic, and to be a great pretender and dissembler; and men are so simple, and so subject to present necessities, that he who seeks to deceive will always find someone who will allow himself to be deceived.

This is why Oligarchs do not at all mind the trappings of fake democracy. A cleverly designed oligarchical "democracy," such as the one we have, can give the people the illusion of freedom and choice, even as the deceiving puppet masters pull the strings from behind the scenes.

Behind the scenes, because, writes Machiavelli, the prince had best leave affairs of reproach to others. Thus the politicians take the flak and rotate every four years, while those who yield the real power skulk in the shadows.

Reality is ugly (emphasis mine):

And here it should be noted that hatred is acquired as much by good works as by bad ones, therefore, as I said before, a prince wishing to keep his state is very often forced to do evil; for when that body is corrupt whom you think you have need of to maintain yourself it may be either the people or the soldiers or the nobles you have to submit to its humours and to gratify them, and then good works will do you harm.

Machiavelli establishes the principle of false-flag attacks in a brief comment in chapter 20: "...many consider that a wise prince, when he has the opportunity, ought with craft to foster some animosity against himself, so that, having crushed it, his renown may rise higher."

When given the opportunity of choosing sides, Machiavelli advises you to pick one, because otherwise both sides will regard you with suspicion.

Luck matters a great deal, but free will, intelligence, and the willingness to take risks can protect the prince from the vicissitudes of fortune. Machiavelli concludes the main part of his work with the following wise words, which we reprint as a useful advise for our gentlemen reader, and a gentle warning for our lady reader:

For my part I consider that it is better to be adventurous than cautious, because fortune is a woman, and if you wish to keep her under it is necessary to beat and ill-use her; and it is seen that she allows herself to be mastered by the adventurous rather than by those who go to work more coldly. She is, therefore, always, woman-like, a lover of young men, because they are less cautious, more violent, and with more audacity command her.

3.1.4 Thomas More

Thomas More, the "man for all seasons," was a dedicated Catholic who paid for his convictions with his head. Perhaps his 1516 work *Utopia*, which was somewhat anti-oligarchical in character, contributed to More's downfall. Given to hair shirts and the occasional self-flagellation, More was an ascetic type who sincerely believed in the idea that the holders of public office should work for the

public good rather than the enrichment of themselves and their cronies. As an intimate member of the Henry VIII administration, More was one of the most important men in England between 1514 and 1533. Henry VIII's spat with the Pope led to a rift between the king and More. On 6 July 1535, More mounted the scaffold.

More employed the familiar story-within-a-story gimmick to present his views on optimal government. His *Utopia* argued for a communistic representative democracy.

The Utopia is an autarchic island-state governed by an elected prince, chosen by elected senators, chosen in turn by elected representatives. After announcing that no reasonable society can be constructed on the basis of money and property, More drops both and hands all property to the state. There being no private property, all houses are open to all people, and the citizens draw lots for the redistribution of domiciles every ten years. Little privacy exists in More's collectivist-minded society. The denizens of the Utopia work six hours per day and are encouraged to spend much of their free time in reading and self-education. Duties in craftsmanship and agricultural work alternate in two year cycles, so that all people understand the principles of agriculture. The state encourages the division of labour, but allows the workers to change professions. Those unwilling to work become "slaves" - today we would call them prisoners. In general, the magistrates strive to "never engage people in unnecessary labour." The learned elements of society provide frequent public lectures, which people are encouraged but not required to attend.

Utopian society exhibits high degrees of uniformity in architecture and dress code. More has no time for fashion and dresses his people simply but well.

The state practices strict population control. Fecund families "donate" children to frigid couples, though in general mothers take care of their own children. The cities maintain constant populations. When "excess" population accrues, the state establishes a colony somewhere on the mainland, by force if necessary.

Utopia's society is strongly patriarchal. Women and children must obey the male head of the family. Nevertheless, women hold a strong position in society, are free to work, and can even become priests. More distributes goods in the simplest way - people deposit their production in the middle of the city and take away whatever they need from the piles of common goods. Public cafeterias do most of Utopia's cooking.

What sordid jobs exist are given to the slaves. The pool of slaves consists of the misfits of Utopia and all prospective immigrants. The parallel with 19th-20th century America stands out. Thomas More explicitly states that unlike the Greco-Romans, the Utopians do not employ war prisoners as slaves.

To travel, the Utopians need passports and visas. Idle wanderers quickly become slaves.

The state gives away a seventh of the island's excess production, and sells the rest for necessary goods, and for gold. Since gold is inferior to iron for the purposes of tool-making, the moneyless Utopians think little of the precious metal, and employ it in the manufacture of chamber-pots. To further the point, More ornaments his slaves with golden badges. The state does use gold in its foreign relations.

The Utopian government permits religious freedom, though most sensible citizens practice a monotheistic creed founded on the following three principles: 1) man has an immortal soul, 2) God is omnipotent and good, and 3) upon death one undergoes judgement. Ironically, More in his chancellorship cracked down on the nascent Protestant sects. Sadly, the differences between Utopia and Reality are real and vast.

Vice and sloth do not exist in Utopia. The people frown on gambling, hunting, and other useless pastimes. Utopians prefer music, education, and physical exercise. Adultery is strictly forbidden. Offenders to public decency become slaves, and repeated offenders are killed. Victorianism comes to mind.

The island state recommends but does not demand euthanasia.

On the international scene, More, in true English fashion, advises for the practice of Realpolitik. Trust actions rather than words and vapid promises, warns More in reference to international agreements. Fraud and economic warfare qualify as acts of war in More's book. When Utopia goes to war, it fights to win. This was an important doctrine in the age of chivalric lunacy, when the noble elements fought for glory and pleasure rather than for victory. Read Barbara Tuchman's *Distant Mirror* for a description of the heroic incompetence of the sparkling French chivalry in the Hundred Years War.

Where appropriate, More wants to use spies. He reasons that if a war can be averted by the murder of a particular political figure, then so much for the better for the populations of both countries, who would have to do the dying in the case of open conflict. This again is an interesting concept in the context of the 16th century, in which the European nobles were heavily inter-married and ransomed and hostages each other after every major battle. Then again, poisoning and murder were rampant in the good old days of the 14th century European madhouse.

When unable to avoid combat, the Utopian statesmen hire mercenaries from a warlike nearby nation, just as the English used the highlanders. When mercenaries do not suffice, More sends in "the worst sorts of men" to serve as cannon fodder.

More advises against conscription, because it lowers the morale of the army.

Toward the end of his work, the conspiracy theorist More unleashes a vigorous diatribe against the Oligarchs of his own day (emphasis mine):

I must say that, as I hope for mercy, *I can have no other notion of all the other governments that I see or know, than that they are a conspiracy of the rich*, who, on pretence of managing the public, only pursue their private ends, and devise all the ways and arts they can find out; first, that they may, without danger, preserve all that they have so ill-acquired, and then, that they may engage the poor to toil and labour for them at as low rates as possible, and oppress them as much as they please; and if they can but prevail to get these contrivances established by the show of public authority, which is considered as the representative of the whole people, then they are accounted laws; yet these wicked men, after they have, by a most insatiable covetousness, divided that among themselves with which all the rest might have been well supplied, are far from that happiness that is enjoyed among the Utopians; for the use as well as the desire of money being extinguished, much anxiety and great occasions of mischief is cut off with it, and who does not see that the frauds, thefts, robberies, quarrels, tumults, contentions, seditions, murders, treacheries, and witchcrafts, which are, indeed, rather punished than restrained by the severities of law, would all fall off, if money were not any more valued by the world?

More concludes his work with the caveat that although he thinks his ideas are on the right track, he does not think that his *Utopia* is the only way to go.

It seems that the Oligarchs took what they liked from More's work and ditched the rest, because nineteenth century America followed More's model fairly closely, with some success. The Oligarchs want license for themselves, and consider communism as a reasonable mode of government for the masses.

A note: some of the content of More's book obviously contradicts the Catholic Law he died to uphold. People have puzzled over this discrepancy for centuries. At one point More states that the main religion on his island is Mithraism. Historically, the Mithraist cult was popular in Rome even during the Christian era. Christianity eventually subsumed some of Mithraism to produce the Catholic church, which was, in a sense, the embryo of a new version of the Roman Empire. The Mithraist cult has survived until today in the form of a secret society. Perhaps More, like so many of his fellow philosophers, was a member of some secret society?

3.1.5 Jean Calvin

We turn now to the ravings of the fanatic psychopath and heretic Jean Calvin (1509-1564), one of the key figures of the Protestant Reformation, which led to two centuries of war and a depopulation of Europe unrivalled even by the lunatic outburst of fratricide in the early 20th century.

Calvin was a faithful Catholic until the autumn of 1533, when, at the age of 24, he experienced a mental breakdown, which he interpreted as a sign of God. Under the influence of what undoubtedly was psychotic schizophrenia, Calvin wrote the first edition of his famed, enduring, and almost unreadable *Institutes*, published in 1536, to which, throughout his life, such as it was, Calvin attached four times as many pages of rambling obscenity.

When the renaissance man Michael Servetus pointed out some of the internal contradictions of Calvin's wonderful *Institutes*, the latter had Servetus burned at the stake, which, one has to admit, is a clever way of winning an argument. Impressed with his prowess of reasoning, Calvin enthusiastically helped conduct a purge of Geneva, one not unlike the Bolshevik purges of the early USSR, and the Reign of Terror of the French revolutionaries. When he finally relieved humanity of his presence, Calvin ended up buried in an unmarked grave, for the fear of his followers of unwittingly spawning a cult of sainthood.

The *Institutes* in its essence is an anti-human totalitarian manifesto. Calvin begins by observing that (1.1,1.2)

...we cannot aspire to [God] in earnest until we have begun to be displeased with ourselves.
 ...nothing appears within us or around us that is not tainted with very great impurity...
 ...And what can man do [in the sight of God], man who is but rottenness and a worm...
 ...If [God is in charge], it undoubtedly follows that your life is sadly corrupted, if it is not framed in obedience to him, since his will ought to be the law of our lives.

Because man is so horrible, Calvin advocates healthy self-hatred, repentance, contrition, and so on.

(1.2) Such is pure and genuine religion, namely, confidence in God coupled with serious fear...
 (2.1)... guilt is from nature...

Aware that his whole argument hinges on the existence of God and the divine veracity of the Bible, Calvin hurries to prove both. Since the existence of God may be impossible to prove one way or the other, and the Bible is patently a mix of history and myths written by a bunch of priests God knows when, Calvin ends up committing elementary logical errors. Like so many of our philosopher friends, Calvin is a lover of circular reasoning.

Postulates Calvin (1.3),

That there exists in the human minds and indeed by natural instinct, some sense of Deity, we hold to be beyond dispute, since God himself, to prevent any man from pretending ignorance, has endued all men with some idea of his Godhead...

In short - the idea of God exists because God put it there. One can hardly imagine a more blatant example of *petitio principii*. More over, even if we admit that for one reason or another all men have "some sense of Deity," how do we know that all sense the same deity, or that all are not wrong? But these are trifles to the madman Calvin.

The better argument for God is that since the universe has to come from somewhere, either God made the universe, or the universe made itself. And whoever has heard of something creating itself? Hence God. One can argue that this is the argument Calvin makes - but I would disagree.

To prove that the Bible is true, Calvin cites the Bible. Moreover, though he repeatedly insists that God is incomprehensible and operates according to a secret plan, Calvin has no problem in figuring out that God authored the Bible; and though he admits that it was men who committed the Bible to paper, Calvin protests against the idea that Christianity was invented by a few crafty conmen

who wanted to swindle a great many naive human beings.

Calvin glosses one other problem, namely, if God is good, then why does he allow so much horror and suffering? Note that God has to be good - or why should we bother with Him? Calvin says that when bad things happen, those are according to God's plan, and who are we to question God? Better yet, the fact that some crimes go unpunished proves, for Calvin, the existence of Hell - because God who is good must at some point judge the sinners. More circular reasoning. Calvin's general tone says: shut up, obey, and pray to God whenever things go poorly. In 2.4, would you believe it, Calvin explains that sometimes God gives sinners to Satan, and yet remains free from taint.

The correct argument here, it seems to me, should be that God is good, but that Satan meddles in God's affairs, and that since God in his goodness gave men free will, men may misuse their free will to commit sin. For ideological reasons, Calvin could not afford to entertain this argument.

And even if the Bible is divinely inspired, what do we do with its internal contradictions and the errors in translation? Calvin looks at a few contradictions and explains that they are not really contradictions if only you read the Bible properly. Of course, one can interpret the Bible in a myriad ways. Apparently, only one interpretation is correct, presumably that of Calvin, who writes - emphasis mine - "whosoever adulterates pure religion (and *this must be the case with all who cling to their own views*), make a departure from the one God."

To be fair to the Bible, one can simply assume that later postulates override earlier postulates, thus resolving all contradictions. Calvin, however, picked the stuff that appealed to him, and reasoned away the rest.

Biblical errors in translation are a source for unending and justifiable scholastic debate.

Furthermore, by insisting that there is only one way to read the Bible, Calvin denies the most useful doctrine of Protestantism, namely that people ought to forget the Church and the priest, and focus on figuring out the Bible by themselves.

Much of the *Institutes* deals with abstruse matters of Christian dogma: Is God three or one? Was Christ a God or a man? And so on. In some sense these are interesting questions, since to a degree they underlie the fundamentals of the Western outlook. Let us, however, focus on earthlier matters. From the story of Adam, Calvin deduces that 1) God took away man's free-will, and 2) until Judgment comes, men are doomed to hereditary degeneracy ("greater part of mankind enslaved by error"), except for a select "righteous" or "elect" few ("the righteous are the special objects of his favour"), of whom undoubtedly Calvin was one. In light of these sad facts, Calvin instructs that men should live in self-denial and obedience. Obedience to whom? To the "righteous," of course!

In general, the question of free-will versus determinism is axiomatic; meaning that one has to pick either free-will or determinism and proceed from there. It is perhaps impossible to prove that either of the assumptions holds. I find determinism repugnant, since it serves as a justification for the status quo and for a variety of pernicious ill-founded doctrines. Moreover, determinism fosters apathy and dejection - what do one's actions matter, if everything is pre-determined? Calvin acknowledges this problem and advises the reader to shut up, stop thinking, and listen and obey the wise Calvin's pious inventions.

The idea that a few men are special and should take care of the rest, who are scum, is of obvious implications.

Preaching morbid self-denial, self-hatred, and blind obedience, I regard as anti-human behaviour of the worst kind. Calvin considered sex something disgusting, but, reasoned he, since humans are disgusting also, it is best to use the God-given avenue of marriage to satisfy one's unholy desires.

Of children, Calvin thought the following (2.1):

The Pelagian cavil, as to the improbability of children deriving corruption from pious parents, whereas, they ought rather to be sanctified by their purity, is easily refuted.

Children come not by spiritual regeneration but carnal descent.

This leads us to the concept of hereditary depravity, which is still with us in the form of Darwinism, which we will discuss later.

We sum up the ideas of Calvin with a few more quotations (2.8; emphasis mine):

The Law shows, moreover, that there is nothing more acceptable to God than obedience.

...

Moreover, while the Lord promises the blessing of present life to children who show proper respect to their parents, he, at the same time, intimates that an inevitable curse is impending over the rebellious and disobedient;

...

...let each of us consider how far he is bound in duty to others, and in good faith pay what we owe. In the same way, *let the people pay all due honour to their rulers, submit patiently to their authority, obey their laws and orders, and decline nothing which they can bear without sacrificing the favour of God.* Let rulers, again, take due charge of their people, preserve the public peace, protect the good, curb the bad, and conduct themselves throughout as those who must render an account of their office to God, the Judge of all. Let the ministers of churches faithfully give heed to the ministry of the word, and not corrupt the doctrine of salvation, but deliver it purely and sincerely to the people of God. Let them teach not merely by doctrine, but by example; in short, *let them act the part of good shepherds towards their flocks.* Let the people, in their turn, *receive them as the messengers and apostles of God,* render them the honour which their Supreme Master has bestowed on them, and supply them with such things as are necessary for their livelihood. Let parents be careful to bring up, guide, and teach their children as a trust committed to them by God... Let servants show themselves diligent and respectful in obeying their masters...

Many, perhaps most, ministers are decent people who fulfil useful roles in their communities. Nevertheless I note that I have always marvelled at the bizarre metaphor of the shepherd and his flock - for does not the shepherd fleece his flock? Does he not guide it with the help of dogs? Does he not, when the time comes, lead his flock to the slaughter?

3.1.6 Tommaso Campanella

The Dominican friar Campanella (1568-1639) was born a quarter of a millennium too early. True to his communist principles, Campanella paid with blood and time for his incessant revolutionary activity. While in jail in Naples, the friar penned his famous utopian dialogue *The City of the Sun* (1602-1623), which portrays an imaginary communistic technocracy (or rather, in this case, theocracy) along Platonic lines.

Campanella's city of seven rings rests on a hill overlooking fertile plains. The ruler of the city is the priest-king Metaphysic. Under the king a triumvirate of Power, Wisdom and Love takes care of the day to day business in military, scientific, and social matters respectively.

As in Bacon's Bensalem, the people of the City of the Sun keep abreast worldwide events through a network of spies, informants, and emissaries.

The City is communistic, with property, women, and children all under the jurisdiction of the magistrates. No one has too much and no one suffers from a lack of necessities. People wear uniforms and sleep in dormitories rather than in private dwellings. The society is of a collectivist bent - the people "always walk about and work in crowds."

Metaphysic, Power, Wisdom and Love select the magistrates from the pool of outstanding citizens. Marriage does not exist in the City. Selective breeding, however, does - as in Plato's Republic. Carnal passion does not appear to be an issue in the City, where physical exercise has made everyone

beautiful, and where "the love born of eager desire is not known among them; only that born of friendship." Campanella mentions apropos that wearing make-up is a capital crime.

Pride is a vice in the City of the Sun, where "Every man who, when he is told off to work, does his duty, is considered very honourable." The work-day is four hours long; the balance of the time goes to voluntary studying, physical exercise, and so on.

Campanella's city maintains social cohesion through a pervasive system of public education. The state appropriates all children at the age of two. There is some division between boys and girls, though both are expected to work and fight for the state, which is considered an entity more important than its individual components.

The religion of the City is quasi-Christian. People do not fear death, because they believe in the immortality of the soul. Once in a while a volunteer locks himself in a cage for a few weeks as a sacrifice to God. Upon release the volunteer joins the priesthood. A system of confessions provides the state with a discrete self-policing spy network.

Prisons have no place in the city, where there are few laws, which are known to all. The heads of the various crafts act as judges. The trials are swift. Campanella, likely because of experience, favours soft punishments over hard time and extensive torture - he opts for banishment, lashing, public shaming, and the deprivation from luxuries like the common table and the community of women.

Public execution are the duty of the people rather than of appointed lictors. The convict has the right to argue his case before the people on the day of execution.

We should also point out that Campanella took the anti-Aristotelian side in the epistemological controversy of the early baroque era. The problem was that Aristotle's specious rationalism was obstructing scientific inquiry. Campanella joined the budding empiricist camp and bitterly complained against Aristotelian dogma. His efforts got him in trouble with the Inquisition.

Campanella's ideas follow closely those of Plato and More. Subsequent writers such as Bacon took a few points from *The City of the Sun*.

3.1.7 Francis Bacon

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was a choice Oligarchical specimen, a favourite of the Queen Elizabeth at the time when England began to grab for its Empire, a progenitor of the proto-Masonic Royal Society ("Invisible College"), and a noted formulator of the empiricist epistemological doctrine. A prolific writer, Bacon authored two particular essays that have influenced thought and action across the ages and across the world in the last four centuries. Bacon's *Novum Organum* (1620) essay elaborated on what became the scientific method. The work we will examine here was Bacon's Utopian manifesto, the renowned *New Atlantis* (1624-7).

Bacon presents his ideas from the point of view of the crew of a European ship which has stumbled upon an unknown island in the South Seas of the Pacific. The islanders invite the crew to their island, which they call Bensalem, subject to a few conditions. On the island everything is just great, straight out of a Frank Capra picture. Eventually, one of the island's priests approaches our crew and explains how things work.

The governing body of the island is a priesthood which calls itself Saloman's House, or the College of the Six Days' Work. The priests attained power in the following manner: after a flood sunk Atlantis, humanity went through a time of trouble. At some time a "Saviour" came to the island. Twenty years later a beam of light appeared a mile off the coast of the island. Upon investigation, the people found themselves stuck in boats about 60 yards from the beam. At the appropriate moment a priest on one of the boats made a prayer, and lo and behold, his boat could move again. The priest approached the beam, which vanished, leaving a cedar box floating upon the waves. In the box there was the Bible, which had not yet been written at the time. The box also contained a recommendation letter from God's secretary. From then on the Saloman's House brethren were in charge.

Bensalem's society reminds one of what puritan New England is supposed to have been. Bacon accents on the marriage laws on his island - they are strict, adultery and prostitution being expressly prohibited.

Bacon spends the second half of the work explaining how the priests pass the time. Once in a while they send spies across the world to collect all human knowledge. Thus, while the priests know about everybody, nobody knows about them. The acquired knowledge the priests store in underground vaults. Saloman's House is a private university / think-tank / foundation, and the priests spend their days doing secret research.

There is a pharmaceutical faculty, where the priests concoct potions and pills. There is a botanical garden replete with fertilizers. There is an astronomical observatory. Say the priests,

We have also some rocks in the midst of the sea, and some bays upon the shore for some works, wherein are required the air and vapor of the sea. We have likewise violent streams and cataracts, which serve us for many motions; and likewise engines for multiplying and enforcing of winds to set also on divers motions.

There are water and air purification plants, and hospitals.

We have also great and spacious houses, where we imitate and demonstrate meteors as snow, hail, rain, some artificial rains of bodies and not of water, thunders, lightnings; also generations of bodies in air as frogs, flies, and divers others.

The good priests also have genetic modification laboratories for members of both the flora and the fauna. They also have something which we will take the liberty to describe as a Frankenstein Factory. The priests have textile and steel industries.

We have also perspective houses, where we make demonstrations of all lights and radiations and of all colors; and out of things uncolored and transparent we can represent unto you all several colors, not in rainbows, as it is in gems and prisms, but of themselves single. We represent also all multiplications of light, which we carry to great distance, and make so sharp as to discern small points and lines. Also all colorations of light: all delusions and deceits of the sight, in figures, magnitudes, motions, colors; all demonstrations of shadows. We find also divers means, yet unknown to you, of producing of light, originally from divers bodies. We procure means of seeing objects afar off, as in the heaven and remote places; and represent things near as afar off, and things afar off as near; making feigned distances.

...

We make artificial rainbows, halos, and circles about light. We represent also all manner of reflections, refractions, and multiplications of visual beams of objects.

The priests also have a recording studio and camouflageable loudspeakers. Naturally, the Saloman folks also possess a chemical industry - "perfume-house & confiture-house." A priest has to smell sexy - or else what is the point?

To defend this cornucopia the priests have tanks, an air force, machine guns, and heavy artillery. Finally,

We have also houses of deceits of the senses, where we represent all manner of feats of juggling, false apparitions, impostures and illusions, and their fallacies. And surely you will easily believe that we, that have so many things truly natural which induce admiration, could in a world of particulars deceive the senses if we would disguise those things, and labor to make them more miraculous.

Bacon next gives an overview of the duties of the faculty. The last paragraph of the work closes the shipwreck narrative frame. We are more interested in the second last-paragraph, which is the real denouement, and which says:

Lastly, we have circuits or visits, of divers principal cities of the kingdom; where as it cometh to pass we do publish such new profitable inventions as we think good. And we do also declare natural divinations of diseases, plagues, swarms of hurtful creatures, scarcity, tempest, earthquakes, great inundations, comets, temperature of the year, and divers other things; and we give counsel thereupon, what the people shall do for the prevention and remedy of them.

What do we make of all of this?

The most important point rests in the above quotations. In effect, the priests admit that 1) they had the means to create the beam of light theatre that gave them control over Bensalem, and 2) they control the population by fear of events the priests can, unbeknownst to all but themselves, manufacture. Wily Bacon's message is subtle, but it certainly is there.

One of the first things that crosses one's mind after grasping Bacon's meaning is: 9/11! We have discussed that issue already.

We should keep the following points in mind:

Bacon published the *New Atlantis* in 1624, four years after the departure of the Mayflower. As the puritanical motifs of the work suggest, the New Atlantis is a metaphor for America. Note that Bacon, as the *éminence grise* behind Bonnie Queen Betty, was instrumental in the creation of the English American colonies.

Observe that under the camouflage, Bacon suggested the same thing as did Plato - the rule of society by a secret self-appointed oligarchical priesthood which uses deception "for the public good." Here we must consider the possibility that Bacon, one of the predecessors of the legendary Invisible College which in large part spawned the "scientific revolution" in England, spoke from experience in the closing paragraph of his work. Perhaps he was a front for such a priesthood - the possibility definitely exists. Researcher Alan Watt has made this claim repeatedly and with good argumentation - I refer the reader to Watt's work. Priesthoods of the type Bacon describes did exist in the ancient times. Could they have survived through the ages? What would it take? 1) A solid home base - let the reader study the historical arc of Crete / Egypt / Babylon - Greece - Rome - Venice / Genoa - Amsterdam / Paris / London - New York; 2) A system of inheritance coupled with facilities for the education / indoctrination of successive generations - let the reader consult our section on secret societies. Neither of these pre-requisites would be hard to obtain for a determined, already powerful group of individuals. After all, the Catholic Church has stood for centuries. If Rome made it, did not others? The study of the possible existence of such a priesthood is worth an entire volume of its own; however, I lack the necessary background in ancient history to discuss the issue in detail, and it pertains to the themes of this book only tangentially. One interesting but poorly documented book on the subject is Manly P. Hall's *The Secret Destiny of America* (1944). Hall was one of the pre-eminent Masonic occultist scholars of the 20th century. Hall and his writings exerted influence on FDR and Truman, both of whom were Masons. See also the documentary series *Secret Mysteries of America's Beginnings*, and Ralph Epperson's writings.

The New Atlantis is a momentous text that has been read widely by the ruling castes of the last four centuries. Many of America's founders, for example Jefferson, held Bacon in high regard. It is said that the published version of *The New Atlantis* was a bastardized version of a greater whole. The rest of Bacon's work, if it exists, has never seen the light of day. It is of interest that Bacon suffered a political fall-from-grace in 1621, shortly before publishing his utopian work.

3.1.8 Thomas Hobbes

The next specimen in our utopianist zoo is the propagandist for absolute monarchy Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), who postulated his doctrine in the highly influential 1651 text *Leviathan*. The Leviathan

is, essentially, what became, in its extreme forms, the modern state - a monstrous artificial entity, supposedly the aggregate of the people of the realm, and, in Hobbes's view, preferably embodied in a single person - God's representative on Earth - the sovereign.

Leviathan consists of four parts - an overview of man, a look at the ideal commonwealth (state), a treatise on Christianity, and an anti-Papist fourth segment dealing with the "Kingdom of Darkness." Hobbes takes a mechanistic approach to the nature of man, and after sprouting scores of definitions, concludes that without government, humanity is a gleeful barbaric free-for-all in which men bash each other into a state of poverty, nastiness, and brutality. Hobbes's whole argument rests on this dubious axiom. Two questions arise - first, is the axiom at all true? And second, even if true now, will the axiom always be true? One can argue that one's actions follow one's beliefs, and to a large extent one's beliefs follow the dominant beliefs of the time. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to hypothesize that after a prolonged period of peace and cooperation, people may find it unthinkable to wage war against each other. As to the veracity of Hobbes's assertion, consider the American settlement of the West. Contrary to the popular belief fostered by the pulp fiction industry of the late 19th and early 20th century, and Hollywood's westerns, the Wild West was not that wild. Though official government was weak to non-existent, people respected each other's rights, formed ad hoc courts of arbitration for the settlements of disputes, and generally prospered. See Terry Anderson's paper *The Not so Wild Wild West*.

After announcing that without a government men will bicker forever, Hobbes proposes that men surrender their rights to the sovereign of a commonwealth in order to live in peace. Upon examining the three forms of government - monarchy, oligarchy, and democracy - Hobbes concludes that since in either case sovereign power rests in the hands of some representative assembly, it would be for the best to limit the assembly to one person so as to avoid useless arguments and the paralysis of government.

What powers does Hobbes's sovereign monarch possess? In a word, absolute. Since the people have given the monarch power by their consent, then he is infallible and can do whatever he wants - as long as he does not willingly endanger his ability to "protect" the commonwealth, i.e. as long as he does not surrender his power. Here we find another major hole in Hobbes's argument - namely, how do the newborns willingly surrender their power when they are too young to comprehend the nature of the game? One assumes that, as in our time, at some point the youth is offered the choice between entering the system (via, say, voting), or - or what? Before the advent of strict border controls people could emigrate relatively easily. Today, those who willingly forfeit their formal citizenship exist in a murky pariah condition.⁵ Also note that emigration means the abandonment of one's family, friends, and homestead - a price of freedom many would find too high to pay. The "voluntary contract" notion of citizen-state obligations is therefore something of a scam. You take what you have and you either learn to like it, or endeavour to change it for the better.

Life in Hobbes's state amounts to jumping hoops at the order of the sovereign. Since the sovereign is in charge of everything, his word is law. Whatever he orders or decrees is just. Failing to obey the sovereign, or, worse, attacking his person, is criminal, no matter what the sovereign does.

Moreover, to be completely in charge, the sovereign has to own the whole state. Keep this in mind in reference to Queen Elizabeth II, who, apropos, owns Canada and Australia. Since the sovereign owns the state, then the division of the state's property is to his will, and thus legal. In other words the sovereign can decide to divide the state among a few oligarchical "counsellors" of his, and that would be just fine, and nobody can justly complain.

Justice Hobbes defines thus in Chapter 15: injustice is "the non performance of covenant." Whatever is not unjust is just. The covenant is the subject's transfer of rights to the sovereign. In other words, OBEY.

One particularly remarkable repeated insistence of Hobbes is that "in the state of nature [war]," "covenants extorted by fear are valid." Thus if another sovereign invades your commonwealth and

⁵See the biography of the mercurial chess-master Bobby Fischer.

boots out your sovereign, and announces that he will kill all who do not swear an oath to him, and you swear the oath - guess what - in Hobbes's book you are bound by the oath. Hobbes makes his point explicit in the closing chapter of his work: "conquest is the acquiring of the right of sovereignty by victory. Which right, is acquired in the people's submission, by which they contract with the victor, promising obedience, for life and liberty." To make himself perfectly clear, Hobbes explains that the concept of tyranny is nonsensical, because the "tyrant" and the sovereign can only be one and the same, and therefore "I think the toleration of a professed hatred of tyranny, is a toleration of hatred of commonwealth in general, and [an] evil seed." Note that Hobbes wrote his work in Paris during the English Civil War.

Having established such noble principles, Hobbes spends the latter two-thirds of the book repeating himself over and over in an effort to prove all of his claim by reason or by the authority of the Bible. In Chapter 17, Hobbes recognizes the classical comparison between mankind and the bees or the ants, and laments that men have to resort to an artificial commonwealth, while the bees and the ants enjoy a natural commonwealth. For Hobbes, "man is then most troublesome, when he is most at ease," because then he can think and converse and acquire a high opinion of himself and cause trouble. This is why in Chapter 30, which is one of the most important chapters in the book for our purposes, Hobbes tells us that while the sovereign should take care of the infirm (welfare), "for such as have strong bodies, the case is otherwise: they are to be forced to work." When all else fails and too many unemployed begin to harbour dangerous thoughts, the sovereign should simply declare war: "And when all the world is overcharged with inhabitants, then the last remedy of all is war; which provideth for every man, by victory, or death."

A few pages earlier Hobbes summarily deals with indoctrination. Since the sovereign's first duty is not to give away his rights, it follows that it is furthermore his duty to not fail to explain to his subjects the necessity for his sovereign rights. In other words, it is against the sovereign's duty not to propagandise. Luckily, notes Hobbes, "the common people's minds ... are like clean paper, fit to receive whatsoever by public authority shall be imprinted in them." And that is why we go to school. Like Plato, Hobbes demanded state censure of undesirable literature - "I cannot imagine, how anything can be more prejudicial to a monarchy, than the allowing of such [pro-tyrannical] books to be publicly read, without present applying such correctives of discreet masters, as are fit to take away their venom".

Chapter 29, dealing with the causes leading to the dissolution of a commonwealth, offers other useful insights. The main cause, explains Hobbes, always is "imperfect institution." In other words, commonwealths collapse when the sovereign "wants of absolute power." Among the indirect causes, Hobbes protests against the "private judgement of good and evil" and the problem of "erroneous conscience." Evidently, whatever the sovereign decrees, is good and conscionable. Shut up, stop thinking, and obey already! Another problem is the absurd notion of "absolute private property." No! The sovereign owns all!

Hobbes observes that wealth aggregation and the emergence of populist figures can lead to instability. From the Oligarchical perspective, this means that the people must be given a few morsels now and then to keep quiet, and that the leaders of the people should be dealt with summarily. We point out again to the spat between the populist Huey Long and the Wall Streeter FDR during the Depression. Hobbes takes a shot at the Roman populist reformists the Gracchi brothers, of whom you can read in Michael Parenti's *The Assassination of Julius Caesar*.

Having explained his commonwealth, Hobbes moves on to Christianity and religion in general. This third part of the book is a two-hundred page long exercise in circular reasoning. Hobbes claims that his ideas derive from natural law, which is the will of God, who has also inspired the Bible. By Chapter 43, Hobbes establishes, on the basis of the Bible, that to go to Heaven, one only needs satisfy two non mutually exclusive conditions: to have faith in Christ, and to OBEY the sovereign. However, in Chapter 33, Hobbes notes that he can acknowledge only the Church of England's version

of the Bible. In others words, the state sets the religion. Hobbes establishes this concept clearly in chapters 39-42, whence he explains that the church and the state are one, and the sovereign is in charge. So the sovereign rules on the basis of natural law on the basis of a religion of which he is the head. Just wonderful.

The whole argument is bogus and amounts to the following obvious political lesson - in Hobbes's view, a ruling elite should always invent a doctrine which proclaims that the ruling elite's view of the world is the natural state of affairs. In Chapter 38, Hobbes goes over the Heaven & Hell control mechanism: keep the people in check by telling them that if they obey they will go to Heaven, and if they do not obey they will go to Hell. Simple yet useful. The Hindus employed the reincarnation "karma" contrivance to support their caste system over the centuries. Be good and obedient and you will be reborn as a Brahmin. You are Untouchable now, because you were bad in your previous life. The method is ancient, simple, transparent, and yet efficient.

Hobbes supported England's break with Rome and insisted on the subordination of the Church to the State. By 1715, the religious turmoil on the Albion had settled down, England had shrugged the hindrance of the increasingly obsolete Papacy, and had set to spread Leviathan across the world by "acquiring the right of sovereignty by victory."

Hobbes's also gives his sovereign councillors, explaining that one reaches better decisions under competent advisement than alone. The good councillor has the same interests as whom he councils. The sovereign must choose the people most fit to be councils rather than the richest or most powerful men of the realm; of course, sometimes it happens that the richest and the most powerful, having had the means and opportunity to travel and study, are also the fittest for council.

A couple of other points of interest: in Chapter 22, Hobbes explains that secret societies are good if the sovereign allows them, and bad if he forbids them. In the same chapter he elaborates the principles of what can be called Corporate Law. The BEIC (British East India Company) had already been founded in 1600.

With our benefit of hindsight, we note that the British statesmen of the 18th and 19th centuries must have read *Leviathan*, for their England looked not unlike Hobbes's monster. The German Reichs, both Second and Third, based on Hegel's upgrade of Hobbes, were even more Leviathanical. The concept of the monolithic state as a semi-conscious creature of its own lingers today.

The British model adopted an oligarchical version of the Hobbesian ideal. In the British model, the Queen remains sovereign and as such receives oaths of fealty from the population. However, she is a conduit of power rather than a power unto herself. Her "counsellors" - a heterogeneous oligarchical cabal which may include the Queen's close relatives - rules behind the scenes. Thus, in one sense the Queen is the most powerful individual on Earth, and in another sense she is but a helpless prisoner of her office. On the continent we can find various other examples of rule via the conduit of a weak sovereign: Rasputin's reign in Tsarist Russia; Martin Bormann's role in the Third Reich (see, for example, Louis Kilzer's *Hitler's Traitor*); Cardinal Richelieu's handling of France; Mazarin's regency under the poster boy of absolute monarchy, the Sun King, Louis XIV ⁶; the Nomenklatura's use of the decrepit dotting General Secretaries of the late USSR; and so on.

Leaving absolute monarchy aside, let us examine two of the other important concepts promulgated in Hobbes's book. First, we look at the nature of the "social contract." The general idea is that the people formally enter into a contract between each other in the form of the state. In practice, the Oligarchy figured out that it is easier to govern people *with their consent* rather than through naked force. This is why we have elections. Voting is an implicit contract between the voter and the state. The voter must obey even if a party other than the one he voted for wins. This gives the Oligarchy, which, if it knows its business, controls all the major parties, a legal excuse for doing whatever it

⁶It is worth noting that the Kings of France were short of absolute power; see the transcript of Carroll Quigley's 1976 lecture on *Public Authority and the State in the Western Tradition*

wants. As Charles Bukowski put it,

The difference between a democracy and a dictatorship is that in a democracy you vote first and take orders later; in a dictatorship you don't have to waste your time voting.

Note that I criticize voting in its current form rather than voting in general. Voting on specific issues (referendums) differs from voting for political parties. True democracy and true Christianity may be good ideas. Perhaps we should finally try them out.

The other major idea expressed in *Leviathan* is the notion of the omnipotent state as the best organization of the human community. Statist thinkers see the state as a semi-organic almost conscious collective along the lines of a beehive or an anthill. They generally see the plebeians as cogs in a machine. The problem with this line of thinking is that the state is not organic. It does not feel pain, fear, or remorse. The danger exists that statesmen will govern affairs the way teenagers play computer games. They see the world as a map and they seek to conquer all, never paying attention to the agony of the hapless masses who pay in blood, toil, and horror. Hobbes takes exactly such a view - to him the laws between commonwealths are the "natural" laws, the laws of the jungle - the strongest prevail. What good to slave away in the grimy mills of Manchester, for the supposed benefit of the protection of the state, if the selfsame state can send you to your death in Flanders at the whim of a Lord Grey?

States are but tools, and should be treated as such. One can use a knife to cook dinner, or to commit harakiri. What humanity does to itself, I suppose, is up not to the soulless, artificial states - but to the people, and their free-will, the existence of which Hobbes denied.

3.1.9 Benedict Spinoza

Spinoza(1632-1677) , born Baruch, found Judaic society incompatible with his philosophical inclinations, and hence converted to Christianity under the adopted name of Benedict. In reality, Spinoza was never really a Christian, but believed in what may be called "Pantheism," a notion semi-equivalent to atheism. A man of ascetic tastes, Spinoza spent his life toiling as a lens crafter, and died of lung illness at the age of 44, probably in consequence of inhaling too many fine glass particles.

We focus our attention on Spinoza's landmark *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (1670), and its unfinished addendum *Tractatus Politicus* (1676).

Tractatus Theologico-Politicus consists of two parts, the first a vociferous attack on the superstitions of organized religion, and the second a useful piece of political theory.

In the first half of his work, Spinoza dissects the Bible and declares that it is little more than a collection of myths invented by an imaginative gaggle of prophets and priests. Though he attacks Christianity as well as Judaism, Spinoza operates surreptitiously by concentrating his assault on the Old Testament. Spinoza says that the Bible is useful only inasmuch as it indoctrinates the unthinking many into following the golden rule of "love thy neighbour." Explains Spinoza,

(5.8) Now if human beings were so constituted by nature that they desired nothing but what true reason points them to, society would surely need no laws; men would only need to learn true moral doctrine, in order to do what is truly useful of their own accord with upright and free mind. But they are not so constituted, far from it. All men do indeed seek their own interest, but it is not from the dictate of sound reason; for the most part they pursue things and judge them to be in their interest merely because they are carried away by sensual desire and by their passions (which have no regard for the future and for other things). This is why no society can subsist without government and compulsion, and hence laws, which moderate and restrain desires.

(5.9) ...unless people have been raised from the outset to be subservient to the ruler's

every word, he will find it difficult to institute new laws when they are needed and to take away the people's liberty once it has been granted.

Spinoza then provides the Biblical Jews as an example. Moses took charge of them and introduced new laws,

(5.10) But in all this he took great care to ensure that the people would do [divine virtue's] duty willingly and not through fear.

(5.11) This is why Moses, with his virtue and by divine command, introduced religion into the commonwealth, so that the people would do its duty more from devotion than from fear.

(5.18) The common people, therefore, are required to know only those histories which can most move their hearts to obedience and devotion. But the people themselves are not sufficiently skilled to make judgements about them, since they get more pleasure from stories and from strange and unexpected events than from the actual doctrine of the histories. This is why, in addition to reading the histories, they also need pastors or church ministers [or teachers?] to explain these to them, owing to the weakness of their understanding.

In Chapter 14, Spinoza observes that religious dogma need not necessarily be true to fulfil its purpose.

It bears repeating that true mastery over people can only be achieved by extracting the people's consent via trickery, rather than by pure force. Spinoza makes this point again and again. He also repeats incessantly that most people are hopelessly stupid and violent, and that only 2-3% of the whole population live by reason. Whereas Calvin was frankly anti-human, Spinoza appears wary of the follies of humanity; and whereas Calvin was frankly oligarchist, Spinoza declaims oligarchy as just another human mistake. But then again, in claiming that only one man in fifty is any good, Spinoza demands the by-now-familiar rule by deceit on the part of the rational (in his view) few.

Having established the true purpose of religion, Spinoza criticizes it on two fronts. During the middle and early modern-ages, Europe faced the dual problem of feudalism and religious strife. Feudalism led to petty squabbles and the weakening of the political state. Religion via the supremacy of the Pope further weakened the state and caused bloody conflicts over principles of dogma. As a promulgator of the modern state, Spinoza correctly pointed out that religion must be subordinate to the state for the state to fully exist.

His argument is inherently correct in the presence of a strong supra-national political clerical institution such as the Roman Church. Were one to examine religion as an abstract mindset, however, the idea metamorphoses. By subordinating the abstract properties of religion to the state, Spinoza attributes the property of, in effect, arbitrary brainwashing to the secular governing political authority.

The other problem with religion was that dogmatism seriously impeded philosophical inquiry, or what we would today term science. Spinoza protested that theology and philosophy are completely independent of each other and one should never be subject to the other. His view has largely prevailed today, and to the detriment of true education, theology has vanished from the standard academic curricula.⁷ Theology should perhaps have been divorced from politics; and disproved theological dogma should have been updated rather than enforced; but theology in itself is perfectly compatible with "science" and "philosophy," and has much to contribute to epistemology. I will say no more, because I am rather ignorant of theology - but I do know enough to know what I am missing.

Having established that religion, though useful, should be subordinated to the state, Spinoza suggests in Chapter 14 that the state adopts a simplistic "universal faith" for the purposes of internal cohesion. In general Spinoza is considered to be one of the forefathers of the concept of the civil

⁷See, for example, Dorothy L. Sayers's excellent essay, *The Lost Tools of Learning* (1947).

religion of nationalism. He explicitly argues in *Tractatus Politicus* that the ruling elite should in its entirety belong to the state religion - which was the case in England until the end of the 19th century. Hegel, who came up with the notion of the deification of the state, thought that all "philosophers" had to be Spinozists.

Spinoza's political theory is a milder version of Hobbes's. Like Hobbes, Spinoza considers most of humanity hopelessly dumb, and thinks that the only way out of perpetual warfare is the surrender of natural rights to a powerful state. To Spinoza, following orders does not necessarily contradict freedom, because (Ch. 16) "anyone who is guided by their own pleasure in [doing as he pleases] and cannot see or do what is good for them, is him or herself very much a slave. The only [genuinely] free person is one who lives with his entire mind guided solely by reason." In particular, "If the purpose of the action is not his own advantage but that of the ruler, then the agent is indeed a slave and useless to himself. But in a state and government where the safety of the whole people, not that of the ruler, is the supreme law, he who obeys the sovereign in all things should not be called a slave useless to himself but rather a subject."

Perhaps, what Spinoza wanted was for someone to stop the crazed warfare around him so that he could sleep in peace and dedicate himself to his philosophical inquiries. For those too stupid to see the advantage of such an arrangement - too bad. In the context of the genocidal Thirty Years War, Spinoza's worldview is understandable.

In regard to the arrangement of the state, Spinoza offers a number of now familiar suggestions. In addition to the establishment of a state religion, Spinoza insists on a fully armed citizen army, which receives no pay in peacetime. The lack of a private army protects the population from the perversities of a wayward king. The lack of a standing army prevents the institution of a professional soldier class and its inherent evils - because the *raison d'être* of a warrior class is war. Given no external war, the troops will eventually attack the domestic population. Rome is the classic example of this tendency; let us try to make sure the United States does not become another example.

In examining the reasons for the stability of the Biblical Jewish state, Spinoza observes that virulent nationalism helps maintain stability, as does the accompanying xenophobia. Unfortunately, the price of this internal stability in the 20th century was the period of 1914-1945. Spinoza also advises for the equal division of the state's property among the population, because under equal division people have a greater stake in the state and its prosperity.

As the causes of downfall of the state, Spinoza focuses on sectarianism in its various shapes. Feudalism, and divisions along ideological or religious grounds all sabotage the power of the state. The War of the Roses is an example of the first type of disunity, the American Civil War of the second type, and the French Wars of Religion of the late 16th century of the third type.

Spinoza advises all hopeful revolutionaries to take care. Since removing a despot does not in itself change the mindset of a people, revolutions tend to culminate in the establishment of doubly brutal dictatorships, because the freshly installed despot must make sure that his fate differs in substance from the fate of his predecessor. The notorious French and Russian Revolutions are classic examples of this tragic historical tendency. Revolts against foreign rulers tend to be more successful, as the American Revolution shows.

Spinoza concludes his work with an argument for free speech. Though the state should obviously exercise some censorship to protect itself, reasons Spinoza, trying to overtly control the words of people is counter-productive, since people will continue to think whatever they want to think, and more so because of resentment. In essence, Spinoza argued for his right as a philosopher to present his reasoning for discussion.

In the second tract, Spinoza focuses on the specific structures of the monarchical and aristocratic states - the man died before managing to complete the portion dealing with democracy. One high-

light of the work is its insistence for constitutionality.

Spinoza makes the same observation in regard to tyrants that we made in our discussions of Aristotle and Hobbes:

[6.5] And in fact, those who believe that one man by himself can hold the supreme right of the commonwealth are greatly mistaken. For right is determined by power alone, but the power of one man is far from being capable of sustaining so heavy a load. As a result, the man whom the people has chosen as king looks about him for generals or counsellors or friends to whom he entrusts his own security and the security of all citizens, so that the state, which is thought to be purely a monarchy, is in actual practice an aristocracy - not indeed overtly so, but a concealed one - and therefore of the worst kind.

Spinoza also makes an argument against state secrecy, very much important in the context of the early 21st century:

[7.29] The policies of this state, I admit, can hardly be concealed; but everyone will also agree with me that it is far better for the honest policies of a state to be open to its enemies than for the guilty secrets of tyrants to be kept hidden from the citizens. Those who are able to shroud in secrecy their dealings with affairs of state have the state completely in their hands, and their treatment of the citizens in peace is no less hostile than their attitude to the enemy in war. No one can deny that secrecy is often of service to a state, but no one can ever prove that the same state cannot subsist without it.

When considering federate aristocracy, Spinoza advocates for a policy of interdependence between the provinces of the state, so that no province would be able to secede without destroying itself. The current Globaloney programme with its accent on interdependence follows this exact strategy in the construction of the world government.

In his analysis of the desirable aristocratic state, Spinoza pens the following gem (emphasis mine):

[8.49] **Academies founded at public expense are established not so much to encourage natural talents as to restrain them.** But in a free commonwealth, arts and sciences will be best fostered if anyone who asks leave is allowed to teach publicly at his own expense and with his own reputation at risk.

To augment the wealth of the oligarchic state, Spinoza advises for the promotion of greed in the ruling elite (10.6). He also frankly advises brainwashing: (10.8) "Men should be governed in such a way that they do not think of themselves as being governed but as living as they please and by their own free will, so that their only restraint is love of freedom, desire to increase their property, and hope of attaining offices of state."

Perhaps because Rome banned his works, Spinoza enjoyed wide readership in intellectual circles in the 18th century Enlightenment.

3.1.10 Jeremy Bentham

Next we turn to the utilitarian dogma of the oligarch Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), the author of the immortal tract *Defence of Usury*. A lawyer by training, Bentham found no need to practice his trade, perhaps on account of his incomes from usury. Bentham wiled away his days in utopian revelry. In his 84 years he wrote more than 5,000,000 words, most of which saw the light of day only decades after his death. His three most famous works are *Defence of Usury* (1787), *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1780), and a collection of letters concerning Bentham's favourite hobby, the *Panopticon* (1787).

The Panopticon was a model prison, toward the construction of which Bentham dedicated a good decade of his life. To Bentham's chagrin, the project never got anywhere. We examine the Pantop-ticon below.

Having lived a long and comfortable life, Bentham decide to prove in parting that *plus ca change, plus c'est la même chose*. To that end, Bentham had his deceased body mummified and placed behind a glass door inside the UCL, which he helped create. A stuffed dummy Bentham was, and a stuffed dummy he remained.

Usury's main argument is that laws against usury should be abolished, because it is unjust to prevent two willing parties from engaging in a mutually advantageous usurious contract. Of course, as the Pantopticon proves, Bentham did not object to the enforcement of contracts via governmental police power. Usury has been vilified in all history for the obvious reason that usury is the depredation of the wealthy over the poor. Who but a desperate, weak person will draw a usurious loan? The rich need not loan, because they have the money ("capital") to begin with. And yet the inquisitive reader will easily procure countless essays glorifying Bentham's liberal philosophies. The only liberality Bentham exhibited was his liberality in exploiting the unfortunate.

Another obsession of Bentham's was his cherished concept of utility, formulated in his *Principles*. To the reductionist Bentham, all human actions are governed by pleasure and pain, or P&P for short. Begins Bentham, (Ch. 1) "Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do." Bentham next defines utility: "By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words to promote or to oppose that happiness." In general, "The interest of the community is ... the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it." The words "right," "wrong," "good," and "evil" have meaning only in reference to utility.

Unlike some of his utopianist predecessors, Bentham realizes that his pre-supposition is axiomatic in nature. The impossibility of proving his assumption does not bother Bentham: "Is [the principle of utility] susceptible of any direct proof? it should seem not: for that which is used to prove every thing else, cannot itself be proved: a chain of proofs must have their commencement somewhere. To give such proof is as impossible as it is needless."

Bentham next announces that everybody except him is wrong: (Ch. 2) "If the principle of utility be a right principle to be governed by, and that in all cases, it follows from what has been just observed, that whatever principle differs from it in any case must necessarily be a wrong one." In 2.19 Bentham argues obliquely for the following two principles: 1) treating effects rather than causes, and 2) ignoring sentiment and focusing on hard facts such as utility.

In Chapter 3, Bentham begins the intricate list of classifications and enumerations, which defines most of the *Principles*. The idea is to list all possible crimes and the respective punishments from the perspective of utility. Since utility acknowledges only P&P as motivating forces of human behaviour, all penal law therefore concerns itself with administering pain to provide greater pleasure. The result of Bentham's influential writing is the intricate and intractable legal system which we enjoy today, and which wastes people's time but provides employment for thousands of lawyers. Bentham may not have practiced law, but his shyster instincts were well in place.

Utilitarianism and materialism are closely related, as Bentham makes clear: (Ch. 7) "It is to be observed, that here, as well as henceforward, wherever consequences are spoken of, such only are meant as are material. Of the consequences of any act, the multitude and variety must needs be infinite: but such of them only as are material are worth regarding." Indeed, modern consumerism stems to a certain degree from Bentham's ramblings, as does free-market fundamentalism, which is little more than a rehash of the 18th-19th century BEIC "liberal economic" corporate predation doctrine. Not that Bentham invented utilitarianism - the Greeks were well aware of the idea two thousand years before Bentham was born. For example, the Epicurean school espoused an ascetic philosophy of the avoidance of pain. The mid-18th century philosopher David Hume also wrote along similar lines.

A philosophy as superficial as utilitarianism can be attacked from a number of directions. To begin with, to reduce the complexity of the human consciousness to mere pleasure and pain should be an idea too stupid to seriously consider. But let us run with the concept. When you only concern yourself with P&P, you risk dealing with effects rather than causes. Morphine reduces pain, and therefore a strict utilitarian doctor may end up drugging his patients rather than treating their underlying illnesses. Bentham repeatedly states that since all behaviour stems from P&P, he is not interested in figuring out why people do things, but only in punishing them to increase utility.

The pursuit of pleasure leads to the dubious worldview that the goal in life is to have fun. Fun is transient and addictive. The fun-seeker must always chase new thrills and risks living in a constant state of dissatisfaction. Moreover, the pursuit of fun risks mistaking the necessary for the important. Masturbation can be pleasurable - and likewise dope; but surely no fully realized person will waste his days in masturbation and marijuana?

Neither is it so easy to define pleasure and pain. One useful definition of pleasure is the absence of pain. True joy can be defined as contentment - the feeling of lying on the grass in the breezy afternoon, thinking about a personal project that is going well. To see the contrast between contentment and fleeting fun, define fun in the same context as the few seconds of ecstasy, which follow the scoring of a goal in a soccer game, or the consummation of a successful seduction. The problem is that one can define pleasure, as Bentham does, not as the absence of pain, but as the opposite of pain. To Bentham humans are mere animals, afraid of minor pain and always eager to indulge their various physiological impulses.

One can make the argument that pain is not necessarily an evil. Rather, pain is a warning that things are going poorly. This issue is critical in regard to the field of pharmacological psychology, which tries to drug people into accepting their environment. Such treatment produces zombies. It is obvious that many sensitive, intelligent, well-meaning people can not help but feel like hell inside the oppressive schools and workplaces of the 21st century.

The P&P philosophy begs the question, well, how does one measure utility? Because depending on how one measures such a vague concept, one can procure whatever results one deems desirable. Suppose we express utility as the average of the happiness of the members of the community. In such a scenario, one easy to way to achieve our main goal, namely the increase of utility, could be the banishment or destruction of the unhappiest few. Bentham, however, opts for the raw un-averaged sum. Fine - but what if the man who calculates the total utility (and for Bentham (14) "Men calculate, some with less exactness, indeed, some with more: but all men calculate.") decides that the overall utility of the community would rise in consequence of the destruction of a few undesirables? This is exactly the utilitarian logic behind capital punishment, toward which Bentham advises caution without advising abolition. Following the advent of Darwinism, the idea of flushing out the unfit blossomed until the fiasco of WWII. Always remember that the Hitlerites borrowed compulsory sterilization (the "Indiana procedure") from the Anglo-Americans. Eugenics is still with us today under various covers of camouflage.

Who decides how to calculate utility? In Bentham's opinion, Bentham and the likes of Bentham do. Imagine a society of Panopticons and limitless usury. Wouldn't it be wonderful. In regard to Bentham's prowess in the field of calculation, with our tongue in our cheek we quote the great man himself (Ch. 5, emphasis mine):

Pains and pleasures may be called by **one** general word, interesting perceptions.

If one goes with Bentham's assumptions, much of his *Principles* makes sense, almost self-evidently so. On the basis of that work, Bentham has been hailed as a great legal thinker and a noble social reformer. Evidently, many have failed to read Bentham's *Panopticon*, in which work the man reveals his true colours.

The full title of the *Panopticon* booklet transmits the essence of Bentham's thinking:

Panopticon; or the inspection-house: containing the idea of a new principle of construction

applicable to any sort of establishment, in which persons of any description are to be kept under inspection; and in particular to penitentiary-houses, prisons, houses of industry, work-houses, poor-houses, lazarettos, manufactories, hospitals, mad-houses, and schools

The amusing conflation of prisons, nut-houses and schools comes as no surprise to us.

Bentham's opening sentence must have served many snake-oil peddlers over the ages (emphasis Bentham's):

Morals reformed - health preserved - industry invigorated - instruction diffused - public burthens lightened - Economy seated, as it were, upon a rock - the gordian knot of the Poor-Laws are not cut, but untied - all by a simple idea in Architecture!

And what is the simple idea of architecture? Take a cylindrical building, place a batch of cells at the periphery, and hollow out an observer's lodge along the central axis. Place a one way mirror between the prisoners and the watchman, and you have your Panopticon. Bentham's goal is to provide an atmosphere conducive to (Letter 1) "safe custody, confinement, solitude, forced labour, and instruction."

Enthuses Bentham, with justifiable conceit,

(Letter 5) You will please to observe, that though perhaps it is the most important point, that the persons to be inspected should always feel themselves as if under inspection, at least as standing a great chance of being so, yet it is not by any means the only one. If it were, the same advantage might be given to buildings of almost any form. What is also of importance is, that for the greatest proportion of time possible, each man should actually be under inspection.

...

(Letter 6) I flatter myself there can now be little doubt of the plan's possessing the fundamental advantages I have been attributing to it: I mean, the apparent omnipresence of the inspector (if divines will allow me the expression,) combined with the extreme facility of his real presence.

Such an environment of total surveillance is, of course, the ultimate goal of any self-respecting Oligarchy, and is increasingly becoming a reality in our world of cheap cameras and bogus anti-terrorism. Under constant surveillance, unable to communicate with each other, the inmates of Bentham's hell-house are in a state of utter helplessness. They can only scream in anguish, a problem best solved in Bentham's opinion via indiscriminating *gagging* - emphasis his - "a most natural and efficacious mode of prevention, as well as punishment" (7).

Bentham next proposes the monstrosity of private prisons. Such abominations can obviously exist only in an oligarchical system, where the oligarchs write and enforce the laws which send people to prison, then tax the public in order to subsidize the private prisons which are in fact for-profit forced labour camps. Remember that in 19th century England it was a crime to be poor - read the relevant passage in Dickens's *Oliver Twist* and *David Copperfield*. Bentham was the type of fellow who would drive you to the poor-house with a usurious loan, there to work you to death in order the maximize total, meaning his, utility.

As a good businessman, Bentham intended to force his prisoners to knit sweaters on a strict diet of water and bread, "though as bad as wholesome bread can be." As long as the prison-entrepreneur does not starve the prisoners, says Bentham, "flattering" himself again, let him do as he wishes - "his customers might grumble, but I don't think you would, and I am sure I should not: for it is for that they were put there." (Letter 12)

In Letter 14, Bentham in his folly announces that the freed prisoners would so love the Panopticon, that they would stay there after their terms have expired.

In regard to people incarcerated but not yet tried and found guilty, Bentham says that "Whatever works they may be capable of, there is no reason why subsistence should be given to them, any

more that to persons free from suspicion and at large, but as the price for work, supposing them able to perform it.” This is an obvious fallacy, inasmuch as the free person can go dine with a friend or family. Moreover, are not people innocent until proven guilty? Bentham grudgingly admits this problem, and allows for a few gratis meals, provided the wretches under his command are given the opportunity to work if they should so desire.

Obviously enough, the factories, schools, and prisons of our society follow Bentham’s Panopticon dreams in spirit if not in letter.

In closing, we note that even the choice bunch at the *London Economist* agree that Bentham was a psychopathic nut:

Goodness has nothing to do with it

The Economist, 24th September 2011

Utilitarians are not nice people

[Drs Bartels and Pizzaro of Columbia and Cornell in a study of theirs] found a strong link between utilitarian answers to moral dilemmas and personalities that were psychopathic, Machiavellian or tended to view life as meaningless. Utilitarians, this suggests, may add to the sum of human happiness, but they are not very happy people themselves.

The Economist then hurries to explain that this doesn’t make utilitarianism wrong. On the contrary,

The results... raise questions about the type of people who you want making the laws. Psychopathic, Machievellian misanthropes? Apparently, yes.

3.1.11 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels

We examine Marx (1818-1883) and Engels (1820-1895) in tandem, because it is often unclear which one of them wrote what.

The deeply psychotic and somewhat Satanic good-for-nothing Karl Marx released his co-authored inflammatory tract *Communist Manifesto* just in time for the 1848 destabilization of mainland Europe. That Marx was a psychopath follows from the content of the *Manifesto*, whence Marx and Company plainly stated that the goal of their favourite Communist party was the attainment of power by violent means for the purposes of destroying the family, abolishing God, etc, etc. From an early age, Marx obsessed over the destruction of things, preferably society - his nickname in high school was ”Destroy.”

Marx’s Satanist inclinations are not widely known. Read Richard Wurmbrand’s *Marx and Satan* (1986).

In Chapter 14 of their *Revolution and Counter-revolution* (1852), Marx and Engels explain that the best course for the Czech, Croat and Slovenian Slavs was ”to allow this process of dissolution and absorption by their stronger neighbours [Germanization] to complete itself.” Those three groups, opined Marx and Engels, should have followed the example of the American Indians and died off or assimilated.

One more quote, from an article of Engels’s published in Marx’s newspaper:

From: *The Magyar Struggle*, first published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, about January 8, 1849

Pan-Slavism means the union of all the small Slav nations and nationalities of Austria, and secondarily of Turkey, for struggle against the Austrian Germans, the Magyars and, eventually, against the Turks... In its basic tendency, pan-Slavism is aimed against the revolutionary elements of Austria and is therefore reactionary from the outset.

... The next world war will result in the disappearance from the face of the earth not only of reactionary classes and dynasties, but also of entire reactionary peoples. And that, too, is a step forward.

Let the reader read the article in its entirety. It consist of pre-Darwinian racist drivel about strong races and weak races and the forces of history and so on. Here is some more:

From: *Democratic Pan-Slavism*, by Engels, for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, February 14-15, 1849

...will Bakunin accuse the Americans of a "war of conquest", which, although it deals with a severe blow to his theory based on "justice and humanity", was nevertheless waged wholly and solely in the interest of civilization? Or is it perhaps unfortunate that splendid California has been taken away from the lazy Mexicans, who could not do anything with it? ... The "independence" of a few Spanish Californians and Texans may suffer because of it, in someplaces "justice" and other moral principles may be violated; but what does that matter to such facts of world-historic significance?

Nor were the Jews and the blacks spared. In a 30 July 1862 letter to Engels, Marx described Ferdinand Lassalle as a "Jewish nigger." Marx himself was the descendant of a long line of rabbis - but that is another story. Wrote Marx of Lassalle, "It is now quite plain to me - as the shape of his head and the way his hair grows also testify - that he is descended from the negroes who accompanied Moses flight from Egypt (unless his mother or paternal grandmother interbred with a nigger). Now, this blend of Jewishness and Germanness, on the one hand, and basic negroid stock, on the other, must inevitably give rise to a peculiar product. The fellows importunity is also nigger-like." Perhaps Marx was merely having some ironic fun? You decide. It is easy to find plenty of "anti-Semitic" statements in Marx's writings.

Much more in the same vein can be quoted, but this will have to suffice.

Another useful indication of Marx's character was the man's performance as a father. Four of Marx's seven legitimate children died of malnutrition, because the great man did not have it in him to work to support his family. You see, Marx was for the proletariat but not of the proletariat. Two of the remaining three children of Marx - Eleanor and Laura, committed suicide. Marx also sired a bastard, whom he did not acknowledge. Appropriately enough, Engels assumed responsibility for the boy, before revealing the secret at his death-bed.

Nor should we ignore the colossal hypocrisy of the dynamic duo, in inveighing against capitalism while profiting from the self-same. Engels supported himself and Marx by working for a Manchester sewing mill, in which his father held shares. After some years of white-collar work, Engels became a partner in the firm, and retired.

It is also of interest that the great revolutionary Marx married the daughter of a baron and profited from her inheritance. Speaking of profit, Marx played on the stock market - and lost.

And what did Marx and Engels say in their *Manifesto*? We examine their points one by one.

The dynamic duo saw history as a struggle between oppressors and oppressed. They saw two classes in the 19th century - the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The other classes - nobility, professionals, soldiers, craftsmen, "petty" bourgeoisie (shop keepers and the like), peasantry, and so on, were doomed for extinction. The fall of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletariat were considered inevitable.

Marx and Engels saw their Communist gang as the vanguard of the proletarians. The two dreamed of seizing power by violent means, in order to institute their programme, the main point of which was the abolition of private property: (Ch. 2) "the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property." In such an arrangement, those who control the state own everything. Moreover, the enforcement of the abolition of private property would necessitate harsh police measures. So who would control the state? Evidently, the Communist party and whoever controls the Communist party would. Thus, Communism amounts to another, more insidious yet, version of oligarchism.

Communism was also to abolish "bourgeois individuality."

(Ch. 2) You must, therefore, confess that by individual you mean no other person than

the bourgeois, than the middle-class owner of property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way, and made impossible.

So the privately employed craftsman and the farmer were to be swept out of the way.

The Communists also intended to abolish the family. To Marx and Engels the proletarian family did not exist anyway, and the bourgeois family merited only eradication.

In regard to education, the Communists wanted to "rescue education from the influence of the ruling class." The statement is an absurdity, since under Communism, education would be in the hands of the state, and thus in the hands of the Communist bureaucratic ruling elite. Marx and Engels explicitly intended to "replace home education by social." Of course, "education" in this context means indoctrination.

The Communists also wanted to force women into the workforce - under the pretext of liberating women from the subjugation of men.

In general, Marx and Engels wanted to conquer the world by abolishing nations and nationality to make the communist state a worldwide affair. For them, "The working men have no country." What does one say of such a non-sequitur? The *Manifesto* bloats with such statements. What do we make of "Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common"? Or this: "[urbanization has] rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life." Why is rural life idiotic? Or what of this:

(Ch. 1) The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history.

To Marx and Engels all anti- or non-Communists are reactionaries. Of course, since small manufacturers and peasants depend on their small properties, they would never be Communists.

Communism also sought to destroy religion. At the same time, Marx and Engels established their philosophy on dogmatic grounds: (Ch. 2) "The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and, generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious examination." In effect, Communism consciously sought to supplant organized religion.

To get to Communism, Marx and Engels advocated for the pursuance of a list of ten goals, most of which amounted to the centralization of power and property into the arms of the state. Point 9 argued for "Equal liability of all to labour." In other words, the Communist party would order people to go to work. A person would no longer be allowed to support his close relatives - they have to work - after all, the family has been abolished. Point 10 suggested the "Combination of education with industrial production," i.e. a school-to-work program, which channels indoctrinated children into narrow "careers."

In regard to other parties,

(Ch. 3) In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

This professed *modus operandi* of Communism, combined with the goal of the destruction of the nation-state, means that the Communist party in every nation is by definition treasonous.

The *Communist Manifesto* amounted to a call for a new and better oligarchy - a worldwide oligarchy over a totally dispossessed brainwashed people bereft of property, family, and personal liberty. As we have seen, there was nothing new in Communism. Plato had formulated the Communist doctrine more than two millennia before Marx crawled the Earth. In fact, Communism, in mode of action and in form of dogma, is identical to the 18th century doctrine of Illuminism, which we will discuss later.

Moreover, Communism was not inimical to the interests of the global Oligarchy, for two main reasons.

First, the end-goal of Communism - the establishment of a worldwide super-oligarchical state - coincided with the goals of the Oligarchs, who were in the mid-19th century busily conquering the world through their proxies of England and France.

Second, Communism provided the Oligarchs with the ultimate boogie-man. The so-called "capitalists" simply introduced the Communism VS Capitalism false dichotomy, and proceeded to justify the obvious evils of their system as necessary evils in a system inherently superior to the Communist alternative. Better yet, imperialism could assume the guise of anti-Communism.

It is therefore hardly surprising that throughout its history, "Communism" has existed almost solely at the behest of Wall Street and the City of London. We will discuss the details of this phenomenon in a later chapter. For now we ask the reader - where did Communism find finance? As Robert Heinlein observed (see *Revolt in 2100* (1953)), revolution is big business. A party as large as the Communist party required massive capital - so where did the Communists find the dough? Was the capitalist communist Engels the exception or the norm?

It is for a reason that Marx and Engels resided in London - the capital of capital. It is also for a reason that the 1848 destabilization wave wrought major changes on mainland Europe, but barely touched the Albion.

But it is worse than that. In an 1982 interview with Edward Griffin, Norman Dodd of Reese Committee fame, said that he had been informed by the then-president of the Ford Foundation, Rowan Gaither, that the major tax-exempt foundations were "operating under directives, the substance of which is that we shall use our grant-making power so to alter life in the United States that it can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union."

This leads us to the Hegelian Dialectic, which was a method for the manufacture of history devised by the philosopher Hegel in the early 19th century. In essence, the Dialectic amounts to the following: create a problem. Guide the reaction to the problem toward a solution of your own devise. Or, formulate a thesis, and then an antithesis, and merge them to obtain the synthesis, which was your original goal.

The goal of world controllers, therefore, was, and by all appearances still is, the merger of corporate capitalism and Marxist communism into a brave new world of imperturbable all-powerful Oligarchy. Look at the world: communism and capitalism already merged in Eastern Europe, with dire results. In Western Europe, we see a synthesis of pseudo-free-trade capitalism and "social democracy," and the emergence of the Sovietic European Union. China is not quite communist and not quite capitalist, but it is fully oligarchic.

How much of the Communist Manifesto is already in effect? We saw that the system of publicly funded indoctrination was already in place by the late 19th century. Today, "school-to-work" is a mainstream term.

What of the family? We observe the following trends in Western society: 1) People have fewer children and marry later or not at all; 2) The old are put away to old people's homes; 3) Children spend more time at school than at home. As a result, the classic extended family and the 20th century nuclear family models are becoming obsolescent. The atomized people of the 21st century increasingly favour temporary one-on-one relationships instead of old-fashioned familial relations. For more on this subject, see, for example, Alvin Toffler's *Future Shock* (1970) and *The Third Wave* (1980).

The gradual abolition of the nation-state we have discussed.

In regard to private property, if you think that you own your house, try not paying the property taxes. Environmentalist fanaticism is one of the premier avenues of the attack on private property. The United Nations via its World Wildlife Fund controls a sizeable portion of the Earth's choice lands. The illusion that the United Nations is a harmless or benevolent organization quickly vanishes once one looks at the founders and the historical controllers of the UN. Does the reader remember electing someone into the UN?

One other point of the Communist Manifesto that has come to pass is the "heavy graduated income tax." In general, that tax is an attack at the self-employed - farmers, small manufacturers, shop keep-

ers, and so on. The concentration of the various types of properties is taking place surreptitiously via the various banks and corporations, which are becoming indistinguishable from the state, because of the power of the "lobby" (bribery) groups, and the revolving door between the leadership of the top corporations and the various governmental agencies. The ultra-rich do not really pay taxes. The blatant example of this tendency was the 2011 revelation that GE had paid no taxes for 2010.⁸ Wall Street pays no sales tax on its turnover. The tax-exempt foundations, examined in Chapter 6 of the present work, are another standard way, in which the wealthy avoid taxation. In principle, progressive taxation is a good idea - but its weight must fall "equally" across the spectrum, rather than mostly on the professional and self-employed classes.

Organized religion is in a decline today. Atheism is on the rise, as are various barbaric or idiotic cults, such as the religion of witchcraft "Wicca." The Catholic Church is self-destructing. American religiosity has turned into a grotesque fanatic heresy. Of course, people being what they are, the old religions have been supplanted by various new pseudo-scientific dogmas and ideologies, of which "Communism" is one.

We will subsequently examine the structure of secret societies (of which the Communist party was an example), the true nature of revolution, and certain crucial historical aspects of communism.

3.1.12 H.G. Wells

Wells (1866-1946) was a spokesman for the Oligarchs, and almost certainly a full member of the Oligarchical club. As a young man, he failed in his apprenticeships in various crafts. After each fiasco, Wells went back to Uppark House, where his mother was a maid, and read books, including our favourites Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia*. Fortunate in having had the opportunity to read, Wells managed to obtain a scholarship for the Normal School of Science, where he attended Thomas Huxley's lectures. After a couple of years, Wells failed a geology examination and lost his scholarship. At some point he must have been recruited into the English Oligarchical network - he was tied with the Fabian Society, though he left after a clash of egos with the Webbs. It is hard to tell whether the English Oligarchy dictated ideas to Wells, or if they merely promoted his works because they found them amicable. I suspect the former case held. The two key features of the Wellsean literary canon are an atrocious style and a profound hatred for humanity. It takes help from powerful publishers and reviewers to succeed on such foundations.

The content of Wells's first and most famous novel, *The Time Machine* (1895), sums up the man's ideological outlook. In the distant future, Wells sees a humanity divided into two races - languorous superhuman elves who loaf about all day, having conquered the world, science, and everything else; and subhuman industrious subterranean troglodytes, who silently labour in the darkness of the underground. Observes Wells,

At first, proceeding from the problems of our own age, it seemed clear as daylight to me that the gradual widening of the present merely temporary and social difference between the Capitalist and the Labourer, was the key to the whole position. No doubt it will seem grotesque enough to you - and wildly incredible! - and yet even now there are existing circumstances to point that way... I saw a real aristocracy, armed with a perfected science and working to a logical conclusion the industrial system of to-day. Its triumph had not been simply a triumph over Nature, but a triumph over Nature and the fellow-man... Once, life and property must have reached almost absolute safety. The rich had been assured of his wealth and comfort, the toiler assured of his life and work. No doubt in that perfect world there had been no unemployed problem, no social question left unsolved. And a great quiet had followed.

⁸From the New York Times - *G.E.'s Strategies Let It Avoid Taxes Altogether* by David Kocieniewski, published on March 24, 2011; <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/25/business/economy/25tax.html?pagewanted=all>, accessed on Jan 25, 2012.

It is a law of nature we overlook, that intellectual versatility is the compensation for change, danger, and trouble. An animal perfectly in harmony with its environment is a perfect mechanism. Nature never appeals to intelligence until habit and instinct are useless. There is no intelligence where there is no change and no need of change. Only those animals partake of intelligence that have to meet a huge variety of needs and dangers.

Wells, like many fellow deluded Darwinists, really thought that an outcome like the one he described in his book, was inevitable. Bertrand Russell was a similar case; perhaps so was Quigley. Wells's book is not a warning to humanity, most of which does not read. No, Wells sent a warning to the upper class, with which he identified. He warned the Oligarchs of letting their guard down and allowing the goblin-like lower class to gobble them up - literally.

For a more satisfying - and human - novel dealing with time-travel, we recommend Heinlein's *The Door Into Summer* (1956).

The Time Machine not being enough, Wells wrote *The Island of Dr Moreau* (1896), which dealt with genetic engineering and trans-humanism - two of the favorite topics of the English Oligarchs including Julian Huxley, the grandson of Wells's mentor Thomas Huxley.

Throughout his life, Wells propagandised for the New World Order (global government), for compulsory socialism along Fabian lines, and for relentless eugenicism. Here are the titles of some of the more relevant works of Wells: *A Modern Utopia* (1905), *The New World Order* (1939), *The Open Conspiracy* (1928), and *The Shape of Things to Come* (1933). The books recycle more or less the same drivel, so let us focus on the first title.

In *A Modern Utopia*, our good friend and worshipful servant Herbert takes a trip to a utopia of his liking. Hopeless hack that he was, Wells did not even bother to properly frame his story. Herbert and a friend of his, who serves as Herbert's punching bag for most of the book, are walking around Switzerland, when - wham! - they find themselves in a parallel Earth - the utopia.

What sort of utopia is Herbie's Neverneverland? To begin with, it has a friendly-fascist/communist world government. People speak a common language, presumably English. The whole population of the planet is "migratory ... beyond any earthly precedent." State Parks make up for industrial deserts. In short - picture-perfect fraudulent Globaloney.

As we would expect, in Wells's paradise, "Bacon's visionary House of Saloman will be a thing realised, and it will be humming with this business." Herbert's version of the priesthood is a class of self-appointed supposedly superior people in the image of Plato's Guardians, the *samurai*, a "voluntary nobility," of whom, of course, Herbert's alter ego is a part.

The utopian currency is either gold or energy credits - in our world we are moving toward the latter, for example in the form of carbon credits or even the current oil-backed fiat Dollars. All land belongs to the Utopian World State.

Wells hits full steam when he explains the glories of eugenics.

And what will it do with the man who is "poor" all round, the rather spiritless, rather incompetent low-grade man who on earth sits in the den of the sweater, tramps the streets under the banner of the unemployed, or trembles - in another man's cast-off clothing, and with an infinity of hat-touching - on the verge of rural employment?

These people will have to be in the descendant phase, the species must be engaged in eliminating them; there is no escape from that, and conversely the people of exceptional quality must be ascendant. The better sort of people, so far as they can be distinguished, must have the fullest freedom of public service, and the fullest opportunity of parentage.

...

No longer will it be that failures must suffer and perish lest their breed increase, but the breed of failure must not increase, lest they suffer and perish, and the race with them.

...

There remain idiots and lunatics, there remain perverse and incompetent persons, there are people of weak character who become drunkards, drug takers, and the like. Then there are persons tainted with certain foul and transmissible diseases. All these people spoil the world for others. ... So soon as there can be no doubt of the disease or baseness of the individual, so soon as the insanity or other disease is assured, or the crime repeated a third time, or the drunkenness or misdemeanour past its seventh occasion (let us say), so soon must he or she pass out of the common ways of men.

All of these people, along with their children, Wells, being averse to killing, plans to dump on a remote island and forget about.

People can mind their own business in the utopia, "after [they have] earned the minimum wage," meaning they have fulfilled whatever duties the "voluntary noble" Wells invented for them. Not easy being a voluntary noble, but someone has to do the work.

Herbert wants the world population at below the 1.5 billion level. Every citizen is to have a detailed dossier.

In Wells's view, Malthus "proved for all time" that unchecked hanky-panky is bad. Therefore, Wells proposes subtle state interference in the affairs of human reproduction. Childbearing sans permit is a crime in Herbert's utopia.

On marriage:

From the point of view of a statesman, marriage is the union of a man and woman in a manner so intimate as to involve the probability of offspring, and it is of primary importance to the State ... that these unions should not be free, nor promiscuous, nor practically universal throughout the adult population.

In effect, only those in Wells's good books may marry and have children.

We note that Wells does offer a number of reasonable suggestions, but his overarching lunacy overshadows his lapses into sanity.

The Open Conspiracy, also known as *What Are We To Do With Our Lives?*, is Wells's heartfelt call to arms to fellow-minded voluntary nobles. As Gatto notes, the problem with the more idealistically minded arm of the Oligarchical machine is the problem of the true believer. The G. B. Shaws and H. G. Wellses sincerely believed in the Darwinian claptrap and saw themselves as servants and helpers of poor silly humanity.

The road to hell is paved with good intentions.

3.1.13 Other utopianist literature

For lack of space we omit some other significant utopianist pieces, such as: St. Augustine's *City of God* (5th century AD); David Hume's proto-Utilitarian writings (mid-18th century); BEIC's John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* (1859); Rousseau's comments on education and the social contract (mid-18th century); John Locke's ideas (17th century); Thomas Paine's writings (late 18th century); Hegel's promotion of statism (early 19th century); the anarchist writings of Bakunin and Kropotkin (mid-to-late 19th century); William Morris's *News from Nowhere* (1890) and Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1887); Colonel House's *Philip Dru* (1912); Ursula Le Guin's excellent anarchist novel *The Dispossessed* (1974); Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged* (1957) and *The Fountainhead* (1943); B.F. Skinner's behaviorist drivel *Walden Two* (1948); and so on.

We lump utopianism and political science together, since the two are often indistinguishable.

Today, utopianism has been instituted into a pseudo-science called Futurology. "Future Studies" pretend to forecast the future on the basis of present discernible trends; but they still amount to good old utopianism. A survey of Futurological literature is of interest but beyond our scope.

3.2 The Big Plan Today

A number of themes recur in the utopianist literature.

Many of the authors we examined found that most of humanity is inherently degenerate, and that therefore the few sane humans should rule for the good of everybody. Some, like Aristotle, thought that nature had created some humans to be slaves and others to be masters. The fanatic Calvin came up with a religious argumentation for the superiority of the select "righteous" few, and the hereditary degeneracy of the rest. Spinoza regarded the bulk of humanity as hopelessly demented. In the 19th century, Darwin invented a pseudo-scientific argument for the alleged *hereditary* depravity of the many.

Well before Darwin, authors like Plato and Campanella wanted to implement breeding programs for humans. The eugenics craze took off spectacularly in the late 19th century, and reached a crescendo in Nazi Germany. In the aftermath of WWII, eugenics had to go underground.

The concepts of natural superiority and eugenics go hand in hand. Plato, Calvin, and Darwin's successors explicitly made the argument for the hereditary transmission of personal excellence. The problem is that because of the nature versus nurture conundrum, hereditary excellence is, to a large degree, an example of circular thinking. Clearly, the progeny of the rich and the powerful tend to be smarter, stronger, and more beautiful than most people, not because of inherent qualities, but because they eat better and have more time and incentive for exercise and for study. But what if, as one can show, the founders of dynasties attain their achievements via ruthlessness and good fortune? Aristotle, among others, said that this process is merely a manifestation of natural superiority. But perhaps the attainment of power is often mere applied psychopathy.

In view of this unfortunate division of humanity into superhumans and dolts, most authors concluded that the smart few should govern the stupid many. Practically without exception, the writers we examined said that rulers can and should lie to retain power; or that rulers lie even though they should not. Plato extolled the Big Lie as a necessary evil; and Spinoza condemned state secrecy as a scam; but both agreed that lying is a fact of life. Those who rule, lie - this is axiomatic and has been understood for millennia. The lying is blatantly obvious in our age of information overload, and it takes Orwellian Doublethinking to ignore the unending incongruities between the lines of the official propaganda, and reality. Why do the Western governments harbor so many state secrets, many of which relate to domestic policy only? The argument that the release of those secrets would jeopardize national security is weak, for the governments of the mighty United States and its allies do not realistically have anyone to fear on the globe - anyone but their own disgruntled citizens. Moreover, the secrets pertaining to domestic matters can only be secret, because they are antithetical to the interest of the majority of the population - or else why keep them secret? So obvious are these points, yet so remote are they from the mentality of the majority of the population, that one sometimes wonders if Spinoza was not right - perhaps most people really do not think. The problem is that most people today and throughout history have been subjected to such overwhelming propaganda and brainwashing, that it is not fair to chastise them for their illusions. It is easy for the nobleman Aristotle, who was raised to rule, to think, and to govern, to say that some are born slaves. What would have happened to him, one wonders, had he been born a slave or a labourer?

For their system of government, many of the utopian thinkers favoured rigid hierarchical structures, in which the subjects would know their places, and would do their duties of working and dying for the state without undue complaints. The metaphors of the beehive and the anthill recurred. Some authors, in their efforts of reducing humans to bees, presented the human being as some type of a mechanistic animal, susceptible only to the basest of stimuli. Bentham comes to mind; the 20th century behaviourists brought this mechanistic doctrine to new lows, as we will see later. Darwin's immense contribution in bringing humanity down to the level of the animals stands without parallel. For all of its supposed and existing faults, Christianity regarded the humans as made in the image of God and blessed with an intellect. Nor was Christianity overtly inimical to animals - in fact, in the medieval ages ecclesiastic courts occasionally tried aberrant animals - suggesting that animals

were considered God's creatures, endowed of free will, and subjects to just trial. E. P. Evans's *The Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Animals*, which I have not had the time to read, is reputed to be a good work on the subject.

Plato and Bacon advocated invisible government. As we saw, Hobbes's proposed system of absolute monarchy was accommodating to string-pulling from behind the scenes. In general, since the noble plans of the select few may prove unacceptable to the stupid many, it is advisable that the true wielders of power hide in shadows, behind a screen of manipulable politicians and other puppets.

Each author extended the limits of his government as far as the political situation of his era would allow. Plato spoke of cities; Bacon of an island; Hobbes of an entire nation; and by the 19th century, authors like Marx and Wells called for the establishment of a world government. Serious utopianist thinkers today would work with nothing smaller than a subcontinent.

The idea of indoctrination via public education appears in the writings of many of the utopianists. Brainwashing is supposedly necessary for the stability of society. Spinoza and Plato wrote eloquently and at great lengths on the topic. People are stupid and will believe anything, the argument goes, and therefore the rulers should make sure to make the people believe things that will contribute to the common good. Fine and dandy reasoning this is, but I ask - how can you feed drivel into people's minds and then complain that they are stupid?

Indoctrination ties in with the idea of extracted consent. As we and a number of our philosophers pointed out, rule by mutual consent is inherently stabler than rule by force. An oligarchical cabal, therefore, will try to use lies and guile to trick people into going along predetermined desirable paths. Sham democracy is one of the most potent oligarchical inventions yet - let the people vote every four years, let them kick the rascals out, let them blow off some steam - as long as all the names on the ballot are oligarchs or the puppets of oligarchs.

All of the utopian books examined above were highly influential, with the proviso that Wells's writings were perhaps representative rather than formative of the thinking of the man's era. The Big Plan is an old plan. One may argue that little of note has been invented since Plato penned his *Republic*. Bertrand Russell's fellow mathematician and philosopher A.N. Whitehead famously remarked that (emphasis mine)

The safest general characterization of **the European philosophical tradition** is that it **consists of a series of footnotes to Plato**.

As the reader must have long figured out by now, the Big Plan calls for the creation of a hive-like total world-state, in which scientific indoctrination, relentless propaganda based on the principle of the noble/big/necessary lie, and merciless punishment ensure the proper behaviour of the subjects of the state. A more or less self-appointed and self-policed intellectual elite is supposed to govern the state from above - above the law and above conventional morality. Eugenic programs are to be promoted for the breeding of perfect workers.

Most of our writers could not conceive compulsion by psycho-chemical means. The push toward the conquest of the human brain is a natural consequence of the Big Plan and will be examined later.

Should you doubt the validity of the proposed thesis, dear reader, rest assured - the evidence is coming, and in avalanches.

At this stage, we turn to the issue of "over-population." Before the 19th century, over-population was only occasionally officially considered a serious problem. Aristotle and More mentioned the control of population but briefly. The population explosion that went along with the industrial revolution spawned among the Oligarchy a psychotic obsession with curtailing the growth of the human population of the planet Earth. The creeds of Social Darwinism and eugenicism reinforced the incipient genocidal tendencies of the population fearmongers. Those tendencies persist to this day. We proceed to examine the dogma of the supposed evils of imaginary "over-population."

3.3 Malthusianism

For some reason, the Oligarchy entertains an irrational obsession with the dynamics of the human population of the planet. As far as I can tell, the Oligarchs consider the entire planet theirs to possess and administer, and loathe to share the riches of the land with the "useless eaters," who in fact clothe and feed the haughty Oligarchs. Many oligarchical spokesmen are on the record stating that the population of the planet should be curtailed - I quote some of them here. This genocidal propensity is, apart from its moral repugnance, contrary to reason. The Malthusian argument claims that the bounties of the Earth are like a finite pie, and that each new useless eater cuts into everybody else's portion. This is obviously wrong, since the more people there are, the more work can be done, and the more stuff there will be for everybody. Adam Smith expressed the same opinion in 1776, pre-empting the murderous Malthus:

From *The Wealth of Nations*, Chapter 1.8:

But though North America is not yet so rich as England, it is much more thriving, and advancing with much greater rapidity to the further acquisition of riches. The most decisive mark of the prosperity of any country is the increase of the number of its inhabitants.

...

The liberal reward of labour, therefore, as it is the effect of increasing wealth, so it is the cause of increasing population. To complain of it is to lament over the necessary effect and cause of the greatest public prosperity.

Smith was also a conspiracy theorist (emphasis mine):

From *The Wealth of Nations*, Chapter 1.8:

The masters, being fewer in number, can combine much more easily; and the law, besides, authorizes, or at least does not prohibit their combinations, while it prohibits those of the workmen. We have no acts of parliament against combining to lower the price of work; but many against combining to raise it. In all such disputes the masters can hold out much longer.

...

We rarely hear, it has been said, of the combinations of masters, though frequently of those of workmen. But **whoever imagines, upon this account, that masters rarely combine, is as ignorant of the world as of the subject.** Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform combination, not to raise the wages of labour above their actual rate. ... Masters, too, sometimes enter into particular combinations to sink the wages of labour even below this rate. **These are always conducted with the utmost silence and secrecy**, till the moment of execution, and when the workmen yield, as they sometimes do, without resistance, though severely felt by them, they are never heard of by other people.

Marx could not have said it better, and did not! And this from Adam Smith, the darling of the capitalists. If only people bothered to read the great texts that they hail and praise. We advise the reader to look up and read the entire chapter 1.8 of Smith's *Wealth of Nations*.

Smith was of course right on both counts: 1) increasing population is a symptom of prosperity; and 2) "masters" conspire. Smith also notes that high wages are indicative of increasing prosperity, and that (Ch. 1.9) "Our merchants and master manufacturers complain much of the bad effects of high wages in raising the price, and thereby lessening the sale of their goods both at home and abroad. They say nothing concerning the bad effects of high profits. They are silent with regard to the pernicious effects of their own gains. They complain only of those of other people." A more categorical rebuttal of Globaloney could hardly be thought of.

As Tarpley and the LaRouche crew have observed, the specious theory of the problem of overpopulation in its modern form can be traced as far back as to the late 18th century writings of the

Venetian Giammaria Ortes (1713-1790). We turn now to the man who popularized the notion of population control in the Anglo-American setting: Thomas Malthus.

3.3.1 Thomas Malthus

The abominable inbred Thomas Malthus (1766-1836) - and "mal" means "evil" in the French - was the sixth child of the landed aristocrat Daniel Malthus. After Cambridge, Thomas settled for the leisurely life of the cloth. The hare-lipped Malthus refused to spare his progeny the evils of inbreeding, and accordingly married his cousin Harriet. Ironically and tragically, of Malthus's three children, two married and died childless, and one never married.

Malthus wrote on economic issues, with a particularly accent on what he termed "the principle of population." The man's most famous work was *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, published first in 1798, and in a sixth edition in 1826.

(Wikipedia) "His students affectionately referred to him as "Pop" or "Population" Malthus. In 1818 Malthus became a Fellow of the Royal Society."

In the first edition of his *Population*, Malthus observes that 1) people have to eat, and 2) people like to have sex, and proceeds to deduce a number of genocidal conclusions.

Malthus thought that population increases geometrically (1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, ...), but food supply increases only arithmetically (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6...). To the discrepancy between these two rates of increases, said Malthus, we owe all misery and vice. In Malthus's opinion, over-population is always the #1 problem, and also we are all doomed.

(Ch.1) This natural inequality of the two powers of population and of production in the earth, and that great law of our nature which must constantly keep their effects equal, form the great difficulty that to me appears insurmountable in the way to the perfectibility of society. All other arguments are of slight and subordinate consideration in comparison of this. I see no way by which man can escape from the weight of this law which pervades all animated nature.

Was Malthus right? No. Food production has increased geometrically along with population in the last two centuries. This great feat has been accomplished because of 1) advancements in human social arrangements via the modern state; 2) advancements in the use of energy sources other than raw muscle power; and 3) tied with the first two points, an advancement in technology. Dedicated Malthusians will say that the last two hundred years have been an aberration, and that the Earth is still finite. I say that 1) humanity can easily feed itself at this time, except for the meddling of powerful Malthusian murderers; 2) we live in a science fiction era and can invent various new sources of food if we put our minds to it; and 3) we can colonize space. So much for the arithmetic progression in the production of food. In regard to demographic vicissitudes, I already pointed out that the population of Eastern Europe has been contracting spectacularly in the last 20 years. The cruel and fallacious argument that the Eastern Europeans have themselves to blame for messing up their economies can be made. However, the native (non-immigrant) population of Western Europe - one of the most prosperous regions on Earth - has also been declining, or heading toward a decline, over the last two decades. Therefore: 1) social, cultural, and economic factors exert enormous influence on demographic trends; and 2) in particular, population does not necessarily always rise geometrically. Now, as we will see, the Malthusians have exerted themselves to cause the decreases related above - but even accounting for this interference, fertility rates *have dropped*.

So Malthus was already wrong by the time he set up his axioms. What else did he say?

A dedicated conspiracy theorist, Malthus explained that the rich combine to drive down the wages of the workers.

(Ch.2) The true cause of the advance in the price of labour is thus concealed, and the rich affect to grant it as an act of compassion and favour to the poor, in consideration of a year of scarcity, and, when plenty returns, indulge themselves in the most unreasonable

of all complaints, that the price does not again fall, when a little rejection would shew them that it must have risen long before but from an unjust conspiracy of their own.

For once, Malthus was correct!

Malthus thought that the best way of fighting over-population was through "positive" economic checks. He thought that poor people would avoid having children if they could not afford to have children. To keep the poor from multiplying too fast, Malthus argued against welfare. In reality, welfare is merely a palliative of corporate capitalism. Under a sensible social system, we would not have desperately poor people, or we would all be desperately poor and would therefore have bigger problems than welfare reform. Welfare exists to soften the transition from job to job for the members of the underclass. Other functions of welfare include the disarmament of lower class anger and the purchase of the allegiance of the underclass by the state. Welfare is a necessary adjunct of the type of socio-economic system that we have. The hardcore socialist view that welfare is intrinsically good is as faulty as the hardcore pseudo-libertarian view that welfare is always bad. Welfare is a necessary evil - given the choice between letting people die and putting them on welfare, the state has to opt for welfare, and move on. Ultimately, the goal should be the removal of the causes of poverty, which causes necessitate welfare laws.

Malthus was for pure industrialist gonzo rape - take the workers for all they have - and if they starve, blame nature and the workers themselves.

Thomas Robert claimed that raising the wages of the poor would not help the poor, because raising wages will not increase the overall economic pie. The hypocrite Malthus was wrong again. Raising the wages of the poor will allow them to buy food. Suppose we cut the wages of the poor. Then they can not buy as much food and goods. What do the capitalists do next? They complain about over-production, cut down on the supply to keep prices up, and lower wages further, because business is going poorly. Again, this was exactly the process that took place during the Great Depression.

Welfare and high wages, explains Malthus, echoing Calvin and Plato, also destroy the people's will to work, which is a problem, because for Malthus "sobriety and industry" are "happiness." And this from a man who enjoyed a life of leisure. Malthus also wanted to smash the unions: (Ch.5) "Every endeavour should be used to weaken and destroy all those institutions relating to corporations, apprenticeships, etc., which cause the labours of agriculture to be worse paid than the labours of trade and manufactures." In the stead of welfare, Malthus wanted workhouses, in which (Ch.5) "The fare should be hard, and those that were able obliged to work."

Malthus also explains at length that the class division of society is natural and necessary.

(6th Ed., Ch. 4.13) It has been generally found that the middle parts of society are most favourable to virtuous and industrious habits, and to the growth of all kinds of talents. But it is evident that all cannot be in the middle. Superior and inferior parts are in the nature of things absolutely necessary; and not only necessary, but strikingly beneficial.

Of course, Malthus himself was of the "middle," or what we would call lower-upper, class. At one point (1st Ed., Ch.18) the man informs us that second-born brothers are superior to first-born brothers, because, due to primogeniture, younger brothers have to work harder. Thomas was a sixth of seven children. This is the type of person that we are dealing with.

Toward the end of the first edition of his *Essay*, Malthus announces that the problem of over-population was created by God to keep people industrious. In Chapter 10, the parson explains that the problems of humanity are natural and not the effects of governmental mismanagement. Malthus also argues against industrialization. In his view, people should flock to the land to produce more food. We note with some disgusted mirth that Malthus also authored a pamphlet by the name of *An Inquiry into the Nature and Progress of Rent* (1815), which said that agricultural rents are beneficial to society, and that the government should subsidize domestic corn production. And this

from the scion of a lander aristocrat. But by now we are aware of Malthus's shenanigans. In fairness, nation-states should indeed protect their domestic agricultural productions, and at the same time should protect the populace from the depredations of the latifundista oligopolists.

Malthus was a big promoter of "self-love": (Ch.15) "The proper office of benevolence is to soften the partial evils arising from self-love, but it can never be substituted in its place." Not only did Malthus enjoy the sinecure of his priestly office, but he did not even do his job properly. True Christianity is charitable. Malthus was as good a parson as he was a philosopher.

For the truly memorable Malthusian quotes, we need to turn to the 6th edition of the *Essay on Population*. In chapter 4.3 of that work, Malthus explains that to improve the condition of the poor, society should strive to raise the wages of the poor. So far so good. Except that Malthus wants to raise wages by constricting the supply of labour. In other words, improve the condition of the poor by killing the poor. In chapter 4.5 Malthus explains how this improvement should be done:

To act consistently therefore, we should facilitate, instead of foolishly and vainly endeavouring to impede, the operations of nature in producing this mortality; and if we dread the too frequent visitation of the horrid form of famine, we should sedulously encourage the other forms of destruction, which we compel nature to use. Instead of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits. In our towns we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, and court the return of the plague. In the country, we should build our villages near stagnant pools, and particularly encourage settlements in all marshy and unwholesome situations. But above all, we should reprobate specific remedies for ravaging diseases; and those benevolent, but much mistaken men, who have thought they were doing a service to mankind by projecting schemes for the total extirpation of particular disorders.

Later, Malthus explains that the pricing of housing should be kept artificially high, because "One of the most salutary and least pernicious checks to the frequency of early marriages in this country is the difficulty of procuring a cottage, and the laudable habits which prompt a labourer rather to defer his marriage some years in the expectation of a vacancy, than to content himself with a wretched mud cabin, like those in Ireland."

Speaking of Ireland, we should note that the British acted with Malthusian aplomb when they caused the 1845-1852 Great Famine of Ireland, during which the British exported Irish potatoes left and right. In fact, the British assistant secretary to the Treasury at the time, Charles Trevelyan (1807-1886), who was put in charge of the Irish famine relief, was a disciple of Malthus. Naturally, Trevelyan was BEIC material.

Ireland-bashing was a favourite sport of the 19th century British Oligarchy, as we will see when we discuss Darwin.

The implications of Malthusian philosophy in regard to the British rule of India are obvious.

The importance of Malthus's writings can not be over-stated. Malthus provided one of main columns of the dominant oligarchical worldview of the last two centuries. Darwin acknowledged Malthus as a major influence, as did Alfred Russel Wallace. The Fabian Society, which is the backbone of British socialism, was overtly Malthusian. Peak Oil and Global Warming are Malthusianism in disguise.

3.3.2 Darwin and Galton

Darwin's torpid drivel cemented Malthusianism as a normative creed. The naturally selected Darwin (1809-1882) was a thoroughly inbred oligarchical creature. In compliance with the family tradition, Darwin married his cousin Emma Wedgwood. Emma happened to be a younger daughter of the father of Darwin's mother. Darwin married his mother's sister. What could possibly go wrong? Darwin's firstborn son died without issue. His next two children died in infancy. The fourth child, Henrietta Emma, died without issue. The sixth, Elizabeth Darwin, never married and had no children. The eighth, Leonard Darwin, had no children. The tenth, Charles Waring, died in infancy.

Once you go beyond the mumbo-jumbo, Darwinism amounts the following statements: 1) humans are animals; 2) some humans are better than others; 3) those in charge are obviously the best ones and should remain in charge; and 4) killing the weak races (where "race" is not necessarily defined on the basis of skin color) and humans is good for humanity; 5) God is dead; the universe and the more "evolved" men are now gods. At this stage, the lovers of Darwin (most of whom know nothing of Darwin beyond the high-school propaganda) usually retort with indignation, along the following lines: "Darwin never said that!" or "Darwinism does imply Social Darwinism, but that does not mean that Darwin was wrong," or even (mistakenly) "Social Darwinism was a Spencerian aberration and bad science! Darwin was against Social Darwinism!" We will discuss the veracity of Darwinism later. For now we just point out that Darwin was a genocidal maniac:

(Descent of Man, Ch. 1.5) With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilised men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick; we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment. There is reason to believe that vaccination has preserved thousands, who from a weak constitution would formerly have succumbed to small-pox. Thus the weak members of civilised societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man. It is surprising how soon a want of care, or care wrongly directed, leads to the degeneration of a domestic race; but excepting in the case of man himself, hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed.

...

In the breeding of domestic animals, the elimination of those individuals, though few in number, which are in any marked manner inferior, is by no means an unimportant element towards success. This especially holds good with injurious characters which tend to reappear through reversion, such as blackness in sheep; and with mankind some of the worst dispositions, which occasionally without any assignable cause make their appearance in families, may perhaps be reversions to a savage state, from which we are not removed by very many generations. This view seems indeed recognised in the common expression that such men are the black sheep of the family.

...

...the reckless, degraded, and often vicious members of society, tend to increase at a quicker rate than the provident and generally virtuous members. or as Mr. Greg puts the case: "The careless, squalid, unambitious Irishman multiplies like rabbits: the frugal, foreseeing, self-respecting, ambitious Scot, stern in his morality, spiritual in his faith, sagacious and disciplined in his intelligence, passes his best years in struggle and in celibacy, marries late, and leaves few behind him. Given a land originally peopled by a thousand Saxons and a thousand Celts - and in a dozen generations five-sixths of the population would be Celts, but five-sixths of the property, of the power, of the intellect, would belong to the one-sixth of Saxons that remained. In the eternal 'struggle for existence,' it would be the inferior and LESS favoured race that had prevailed - and prevailed by virtue not of its good qualities but of its faults."

...

If the various checks specified in the two last paragraphs, and perhaps others as yet unknown, do not prevent the reckless, the vicious and otherwise inferior members of society from increasing at a quicker rate than the better class of men, the nation will retrograde, as has too often occurred in the history of the world.

Darwin was also a sexist and a racist, though not in the usual sense of the latter term:

(Ch. 6) It is generally admitted that with woman the powers of intuition, of rapid

perception, and perhaps of imitation, are more strongly marked than in man; but some, at least, of these faculties are characteristic of the lower races, and therefore of a past and lower state of civilisation.

The chief distinction in the intellectual powers of the two sexes is shewn by man's attaining to a higher eminence, in whatever he takes up, than can woman - whether requiring deep thought, reason, or imagination, or merely the use of the senses and hands. If two lists were made of the most eminent men and women in poetry, painting, sculpture, music (inclusive both of composition and performance), history, science, and philosophy, with half-a-dozen names under each subject, the two lists would not bear comparison. We may also infer, from the law of the deviation from averages, so well illustrated by Mr. Galton, in his work on 'Hereditary Genius,' that if men are capable of a decided pre-eminence over women in many subjects, the average of mental power in man must be above that of woman.

The hypochondriac Darwin rarely left his house, so the task of promoting Darwinism fell to his cousin Francis Galton (1822-1911), and to Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-1895), called "Darwin's Bulldog." It should be noted here, in reference to our discussion of Francis Bacon, that Charles Darwin in his work was merely updating the thoughts of his grandfather Erasmus (1731-1802), who was a member of various secret societies, including the Lunar Society. For that matter, the basic tenets of Darwinism can be found in *The Republic*. Furthermore, the naturalist Alfred Russel Wallace (1823-1913) invented "natural selection" in parallel with Darwin, and even published his ideas earlier than did Darwin. Wallace's name has all but been erased from history, because Darwin was "independently wealthy," while Wallace barely made ends meet. The Illuminist Goethe (1749-1832) had postulated doctrines similar to those contained in Darwinism in the early 19th century.

Galton invented modern statistics while trying to "prove" that some people are better than others. Despite popularizing the concept of eugenics, and writing a book called *Hereditary Genius* (1869), Galton sired no children. The Galton family had been famous for banking and arms production. Such likeable fellows.

Like certain other Oligarchical Britons of the same era who had been bred to succeed (notably John Stuart Mill and Julian Huxley), Galton had been a "child prodigy," and had experienced a massive mental breakdown in his early adulthood. For this crisis, Galton merits neither blame nor acrimony; Galton's subsequent deeds and writings, however, lead one to doubt the man's sanity. Francis knew his own predicament, and famously said that for men of his ilk, the distance to insanity is measurable.

Francis Galton in his own words:

From: *Africa For The Chinese* by Francis Galton, letter to the Editor of *The Times*, June 5 1873.

My proposal is to make the encouragement of the Chinese settlements at one or more suitable places on the East Coast of Africa a par of our national policy, in the belief that the Chinese immigrants would not only maintain their position, but that they would multiply and their descendants supplant the inferior Negro race. I should expect the large part of the African seaboard, now sparsely occupied by lazy, palavering savages living under the nominal sovereignty of the Zanzibar, or Portugal, might in a few years be tenanted by industrious, order loving Chinese, living either as a semi-detached dependency of China, or else in perfect freedom under their own law.

...

...the opinion of the present day repudiates the belief that the negro is an extremely inferior being, because there are notorious instances of negroes possessing high intelligence and culture, some of whom acquire large fortunes in commerce, and others become considerable men in other walks of life. The truth appears to be that individuals of the mental caliber I have just described are much more exceptional in the negro than in the

Anglo-Saxon race, and that average negroes possess too little intellect, self-reliance, and self-control to make it possible for them to sustain the burden of any respectable form of civilization without a large measure of external guidance and support. The Chinaman is a being of another kind, who is endowed with a remarkable aptitude for a high material civilization.

...

The Hindoo cannot fulfil the required conditions nearly as well as the Chinaman, for he is inferior to him in strength, industry, aptitude for saving, business habits, and prolific power. The Arab is little more than an eater up of other mens produce; he is a destroyer rather than a creator, and he is unprolific.

We also turn the attention of the reader to the April 20th 2011 article in *The Economist*, *The Chinese in Africa / Trying to pull together / Africans are asking whether China is making their lunch or eating it*.

And so, Darwin's cousin and faithful defender, Galton, invented eugenics. The one to invent Social Darwinism (a.k.a. Nazism - the idea of "civilizing" the coolies by killing and enslaving them, and stealing their stuff) was Herbert Spencer (1820-1903). Though his name has fallen into disrepute and disuse, Spencer was the most popular "philosopher" of his age.

An avid Darwinist, Spencer was reputedly the man to coin the tautological term "survival of the fittest." Spencer's father, George, had ran a school founded on the methods of indoctrination of the Illuminist Pestalozzi. Spencer's father had been a member of the Derby Club ("Philosophical Society") founded by the granddad of both Charles Darwin and Francis Galton, Erasmus. Between 1848 and 1853, he was an editor for the ultra-free-market rag *The Economist*. The parallels between economic free-marketeering of the Classical Liberalist Malthusian-Benthamite-Ricardian tradition, and "natural" free-marketeering of the Malthusian-Darwinian-Galtonian tradition, should be obvious.

Engrossed in his work, Spencer never married. He was a hypochondriac like Darwin.

Herbert Spencer was interred in Highgate, in front of Karl Marx's grave.

Attempts have been made to clear Spencer's name of the stigma of "Social Darwinism." But then, "Social Darwinism" really is Malthusianism, and Spencer was a Malthusian, inasmuch as he rejected the governmental provision of public education (which can consist of cheap books and a classical education as opposed to compulsory schooling) and welfare (i.e. legislated as opposed to private - and hence unreliable - help for the starving poor). These are genocidal views, and hence Spencer deserves all the venom he has received.

3.3.3 Into the 20th Century

For obvious reasons, the Anglo-American Oligarchy received Darwin's doctrine with open arms. Ancestry has always been a big deal for oligarchs, but after Darwin, tracing one's lineage became an obsession for the "well-bred." Eugenics societies were formed in all "civilized" countries, and a push toward the purification of the white races began. Compulsory sterilization laws were instituted, which stayed in many countries, including Sweden and the US, until well into the 1970s. In the United States, blacks and Puerto Ricans were targeted with particular zest. Without going into the gruesome details, we note before moving on, that 1) the theory of eugenics permeated the ruling circles of the Anglo-American world before World War II; and 2) extensive eugenicist programs were carried out in the Western nations. Again, remember that the Germans defended themselves at Nuremberg by saying that they had merely copied the doctrine of compulsory sterilization - the so-called Indiana Procedure - from the West.

The term "eugenics" is a concoction from the Greek and means something like "good breeding." In effect, the terms *eugenics*, *Malthusianism*, and *Social Darwinism* are near-synonymous. In prac-

tical terms, eugenics amounts to the slaughter (or sterilization) of the poor and the weak.

Now, for obvious reasons, the "right" wing of the ruling class was totally enamoured with the eugenicist dogma. A look at the membership of the American Eugenics Society provides sufficient proof. The AES roster featured J. P. Morgan, Jr. the banker, Mrs. Mary Duke Biddle - tobacco money, Cleveland H. and Cleveland E. Dodge and their wives - copper money, Robert Garrett - banking and railroads, Miss E. B. Scripps - newspaper money, Dorothy H. Brush - electric lights, Leon F. Whitney - cotton money, Frank L. Babbott - textiles, Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins and John H. Kellogg - cereals, a few Rockefellers, some Harrimans, Bernard Baruch, a few of the Georgia Russells, a selection of Whitneys, a bunch of Browns of Jack Daniels fame, a few Burrs - banking, plenty of Cheney's, and so on. This is a who's who of the Robber Barons. Apart from the industrialists and the financiers, the AES included a gaggle of scientists, particularly from the fields of biology, psychology, and anthropology. Many of those scientists were considered top academics, but of course, since the industrialists owned the universities, one could hardly become a top academic, i.e. obtain a prestigious position, without being a eugenicist - particularly in the pertinent fields of biology and psychology. Since eugenicism is such an elitist philosophy, there always have been many eager devotees to the cult of good breeding.

On the other side of the drink there was the Eugenics Education Society, which has, more recently, been renamed to the Galton Institute. Members of the GI: John Maynard Keynes the economist, Arthur Neville Chamberlain the appeaser of Hitler, William Beveridge the inventor of the British welfare state, Arthur Balfour the Prime Minister and later Foreign Secretary, Julian Huxley the founder of Unesco, the IQ loving pedophilia-proponent Chris Brand, the Nazi hygienist Alfred Ploetz, a few Darwin scions, James Meade the economics Noble Prize winner, Peter Medawar the biology Noble Prize winner, various feminists, hordes of biologists, and so on.

The Anglo-American establishment was at the turn of the 20th century, and still is, obsessed with Social Darwinism.

It is important to understand, however, that the so-called "left" wingers also by and large espoused eugenicism.⁹

Consider the highly influential British Fabian Society: its most important early members were George Bernard Shaw, Sydney and Beatrice Webb, and Herbert Wells. The latter's views we have already examined.

G.B. Shaw (1856-1950) in his own words:

(*On The Rocks: Christianity and the Sixth Commandment*) The notion that persons should be safe from extermination as long as they do not commit wilful murder, or levy war against the Crown, or kidnap, or throw vitriol, is not only to limit social responsibility unnecessarily, and to privilege the large range of intolerable misconduct that lies outside them, but to divert attention from the essential justification for extermination, which is always incorrigible social incompatibility and nothing else.

(GBS on film on YouTube) I don't want to punish anybody, but there are an extraordinary number of people who I might want to kill... I think it would be a good thing to make everybody come before a properly appointed board just as he might come before the income tax commissioner and say every 5 years or every 7 years... just put them there and say, 'Sir or madam will you be kind enough to justify your existence... if you're not producing as much as you consume or perhaps a little bit more then clearly we cannot use the big organization of our society for the purpose of keeping you alive. Because your life does not benefit us and it can't be of very much use to yourself.'

(*The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*) Under Socialism, you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught, and

⁹Also see Diane Paul's paper *Eugenics and the Left*, from the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1984), pp. 567-59 .

employed whether you liked it or not. If it were discovered that you had not character and industry enough to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner; but whilst you were permitted to live, you would have to live well.

Shaw was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature.

The two Webbs were also enthusiastic eugenicists. Beatrice (1858-1943) in particular was a protege of Herbert Spencer. As she herself reported in her autobiographical *My Apprenticeship* (1926), Spencer had told her on his deathbed that "You and I have had the same ends. It is only in methods we have differed." It is up to the reader to decipher the riddle of Spencer's words.¹⁰

The Fabians' influence has been extreme. The Webbs were the major contributors toward the creation of the British welfare state - think not of the free-this and free-that, but of the many families that clung to life on the dole, while Thatcher and her likes hollowed out the British economy, as the caste system perpetuated itself.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the true believer Margaret Sanger (1879-1966) bettered humanity by promoting birth control and "planned parenthood." Ironically, "sang" means "blood" in the French. In an October 1921 article for the *Birth Control Review*, entitled *The Eugenic Value of Birth Control Propaganda*, Sanger explains that achieving true eugenic orgasm will be impossible until the masses have been taught to police themselves via birth control methods. The "fit" can not out-breed the "unfit," says Sanger, and so the "unfit" should be taught not to breed like pesky Irishmen or Australian rabbits. But birth control is not a panacea!

Possibly drastic and Spartan methods [mass infanticide] may be forced upon society if it continues complacently to encourage the chance and chaotic breeding that has resulted from our stupidly cruel sentimentalism.

Another interesting Sanger article is the April 1932 entry into the *Birth Control Review*, *A Plan for Peace*. Thence Sanger argued for the creation of an international Population Congress, which, among other things, would aim "to apply a stern and rigid policy of sterilization and segregation to that grade of population whose progeny is already tainted, or whose inheritance is such that objectionable traits may be transmitted to offspring"; "to give certain dysgenic groups in our population [Negroes, Injuns, and Puerto Ricans?] the choice of segregation or sterilization"; "to apportion farm lands and homesteads for these segregated persons where they would be taught to work under competent instructors for the period of their entire lives."

The Rockefellers were always enthusiastic about and supportive of Planned Parenthood. John D. Rockefeller III (1906-1978) was particularly enthusiastic about reducing population, and was one of the winners of the PP's Margaret Sanger Awards, which was inaugurated in 1966. Other medallists include: Katharine Hepburn, Jane Fonda, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Ted Turner, LBJ, and, curiously, MLK.

It is no wonder that Sanger, who kept babbling about "racial regeneration," was a favourite speaker at KKK rallies.

Some claim that Sanger wanted to get rid of the blacks. People proffer the Sanger quote "we do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population." This quote is taken out of context. Sanger did indeed believe that whites are better than blacks, but she did not explicitly want to exterminate the Negroes.

Margaret Sanger belonged to the class of true believer useful idiots, who are given free rein in pursuing their goals, should the goals prove amicable to the plans and ambitions of the oligarchical kingpins. Perhaps Sanger truly believed that birth control would liberate and help women. Whether that was the case, and whether birth control is good or bad, is beyond the point. What matters is that the massive promotion of birth control among the population, and particularly among the underclass,

¹⁰Thanks to John Taylor Gatto and the fellows of tragedyandhope.com for the reference.

is an explicitly Malthusian/ eugenicist scheme, orchestrated from above (Planned Parenthood has always enjoyed the generous support of the Rockefeller Foundation). Whether or not Sanger was a racist, the Blacks in America have been heavily targeted by eugenicist fronts. This is easy to see through the prism of the specious War on Drugs, which has landed something like one out of ten 30 year old black American males in jail, even though almost as many per capita whites smoke dope as per capita blacks.

Like the British Fabians, some (many!) of the members of the American Progressive Movement of the early 20th century favoured eugenics. See Thomas C. Leonard's article for the *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, called *Eugenics and Economics in the Progressive Era*.

3.3.4 Bertrand Russell, the Huxleys, and C.G. Darwin

We move now to a brief selection from the writings of the landmark 20th century mathematician, philosopher, socialist, pacifist, and activist Bertrand Russell. Note that Russell was one of the most influential thinkers of the 20th century, and had access to the top levels of the international political and intellectual Oligarchy.

Bertrand Russell was the godson of BEIC's J.S. Mill, the grandson of a two-time British Prime Minister of the early Victorian era, and a member of a variety of clubs and societies, including the Coefficients Club. The Coefficients Club also featured Alfred Milner the Round Table puppet master; Clinton Edward Dawkins, who was J.P. Morgan's pal and the great-great-great-uncle of the current Darwinist front-man Richard Dawkins; Edward Grey the Foreign Secretary, who holds the most responsibility of all men in Europe, save, perhaps, for Edward VII, for the manufacture of World War I; H.G. Wells; the Webbs; Halford Mackinder the inventor of geopolitics and the Heartland Doctrine; the influential Round Table member Leo Amery; and others. In time, Russell resigned from the club over an argument with Edward Grey. The point remains that Russell was personally acquainted with the key figures of the British establishment of his era. The Round Table people and H.G. Wells were unabashed one-worlders; Mackinder was a British imperialist; and the various Fabian elements, among others, were vociferous eugenicists. Russell was himself both a one-worlder and a Malthusian eugenicist, as his writings prove.¹¹

Russell's 1951 oeuvre *The Impact of Science on Society* sparkles with eye-popping passages. The book is masterful though somewhat anti-human, and should be at the top of one's to-read list.

In Chapter 2, Russell points out that communications form one of the main impediments to the growth of empires. The 19th-20th century explosion in communications is what made the British and American empires possible. Russell is explicit on the subject of One World Government: "Since war is likely to become more destructive of human life than it has been in recent centuries, unification under a single government is probably necessary unless we are to acquiesce in either a return to barbarism or the extinction of the human race." People will not readily accept such a government, notes Russell, before proceeding to say that "the passions that inspire a feeling of unity are hate and fear. These depend upon the existence of an enemy, actual or potential. It seems to follow that a world government could only be kept in being by force, not by the spontaneous loyalty that now inspires a nation at war." These are the same points that we have been making. In particular, we nod toward the spectre of terrorism, and the possible future fabrication of a threat from space.

Russell next says that the population of the world must be made stagnant for the purposes of world peace. He then talks about the genetic modification of food, and observes that at some point humans will be subjected to genetic "improvements" as well. The objections to the "scientific breeding of humans" will be overcome by the threat of war - the argument will be that we must develop super-soldiers, or someone else will. Russell, being privy to insider plans, has proved a prophet. In a March 2008 paper entitled *Human Performance*, the top Pentagon think-tank, JASON, explicitly warns of an upcoming arms-race in bio-technological human "enhancements." Journalist Mark Stencel of the *Congressional Quarterly* reported in March 2009 in an article called *Futurist: Genes Without Bor-*

¹¹Also see the first essay of Cambridge's recent publication *Russell Revisited* (2008).

ders that a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee chaired by Brad Sherman discussed "the diplomatic and security implications of the spread of 'genetics and other human-modification technologies.'" We will examine Transhumanism in more depth later; for now it suffices to note that 1) Russell knew what he was talking about, and 2) the genetic "improvement" of humans is a hot topic at the highest levels of government.

The most important subject politically, in Russell's view, was mass psychology. Says Russell,

[Mass psychology's] importance has been enormously increased by the growth of modern methods of propaganda. Of these the most influential is what is called "education." Religion plays a part, though a diminishing one; the press, the cinema, and the radio play an increasing part.

...

We now know that limelight and a brass band do more to persuade than can be done by the most elegant train of syllogisms. It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything if he can catch the patient young and is provided by the state with money and equipment.

This subject will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship. ... The social psychologists of the future will have a number of classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakable conviction that snow is black. Various results will soon be arrived at. First, that the influence of home is obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten. Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective. Fourth, that the opinion that snow is white must be held to show a morbid taste for eccentricity. But I anticipate. It is for future scientists to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black, and how much less it would cost to make them believe it is dark gray.

Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated. When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen. As yet there is only one country which has succeeded in creating this politician's paradise.

This is one of the most popular thinkers of the 20th century speaking! In regard to "education," Russell spoke from experience: in 1927 he established the experimental Beacon Hill School.

The "only one country" that Russell speaks of can only be the United States. Also see Brzezinski's *Between Two Ages*.

In Chapter 3 Russell speaks out against oligarchy. At the same time he seems to consider the approach of a new form of oligarchy inescapable: "narcissistically hypnotized by contemplation of their own wisdom and goodness, [the "progressive" would-be oligarchs] proceeded to create a new tyranny, more drastic than any previously known. It is the effect of science in such a system that I wish to consider in this chapter." He then lambastes Soviet Communism. Notes Russell, (emphasis mine)

Scientific societies are as yet in their infancy. It may be worth while to spend a few moments in speculating as to possible future developments of those that are oligarchies. It is to be expected that advances in physiology and psychology will give governments much more control over individual mentality than they now have even in totalitarian countries. Fichte laid it down that education should aim at destroying free will, so that, after pupils have left school, they shall be incapable, throughout the rest of their lives, of thinking or acting otherwise than as their schoolmasters would have wished. But in his day this was an unattainable ideal: what he regarded as the best system in

existence produced Karl Marx. In future such failures are not likely to occur where there is dictatorship. **Diet, injections, and injunctions** will combine, from a very early age, to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves happy, because the government will tell them that they are so.

The point about diets and injections must be stressed in light of the recent rise in GMO foods and the move toward compulsory annual "immunizations" against the flu. We also point out again the connection between the positive thinking cult, Aldous Huxley's *Soma*, and people "believing themselves happy, because the government tells them they are so."

Next,

Any nation which adopts this practice will, within a generation, secure great military advantages. The system, one may surmise, will be something like this: except possibly in the governing aristocracy, all but 5 per cent of males and 30 per cent of females will be sterilized. The 30 per cent of females will be expected to spend the years from eighteen to forty in reproduction, in order to secure adequate cannon fodder. As a rule, artificial insemination will be preferred to the natural method. The unsterilized, if they desire the pleasures of love, will usually have to seek them with sterilized partners.

...

Gradually, by selective breeding, the congenital differences between rulers and ruled will increase until they become almost different species. A revolt of the plebs would become as unthinkable as an organized insurrection of sheep against the practice of eating mutton.

...

To those accustomed to this system, the family as we know it would seem as queer as the tribal and totem organization of Australian aborigines seems to us.

...

Apart from the danger of war, I see no reason why such a regime should be unstable. After all, most civilized and semicivilized countries known to history have had a large class of slaves or serfs completely subordinate to their owners. There is nothing in human nature that makes the persistence of such a system impossible.

...

... I do not believe that dictatorship is a lasting form of scientific society - unless (but this proviso is important) it can become world-wide.

Indeed, in his *Evolution of Civilizations*, Quigley points out that decaying civilizations sometimes linger in the purgatory for centuries before an outside force finally drives them into collapse. A worldwide civilization will have no external enemies; moreover, in the old days it was impossible to monitor all people at all times. Today, we are likely already past the stage at which most of humanity can be surreptitiously and constantly monitored. In short, if a totalitarian world state comes into being, it may prove unassailable - which is why it is imperative that people act at this crucial juncture of history.

In Chapter 6, Russell calls for Christian love - a sentiment I wholeheartedly agree with. Russell is hard to piece together. Some abominate him, a not unreasonable reaction to the things the man wrote. I get the impression that Russell suffered badly in his life - he was suicidal in his adolescence and clung to mathematics as a defence against reality - and searched for something to believe in, but only on rational terms. Kurt Gödel's discovery to the effect that not everything in mathematics can be proved hurt Russell badly. Multiple divorces marred Russell's personal life. We also note that Russell was heavily influenced by the British pseudo-intellectuals of the ilk of Malthus, Bentham, and Darwin, whose pernicious theories caused what is called cognitive dissonance in Russell's mind. It seems that Russell wanted a decent world, but could rationally only see the incipient totalitarian One World State of which he speaks. Consider this:

Mankind is in the position of a man climbing a difficult and dangerous precipice, at the summit of which there is a plateau of delicious mountain meadows. ... Does the exhausted climber make one more effort, or does he let himself sink into the abyss? In a few years those of us who are still alive will know the answer.

Clearly, Russell speaks of the Big Plan. But what are his understanding and attitude toward the Big Plan? Does he think that the arrival of a perpetual oligarchical world state is inevitable? Does he think that idealistic democracy stands some chance? Is he afraid of nuclear self-destruction? These are interesting questions; but we must move on.

The last chapter, seven, deals with the question of the stability of a supposed scientific world state. Russell insures himself by saying that "I am not considering whether it is better to be stable or to be unstable; that is a question of values, and lies outside the scope of scientific discussion." Fair enough!

It is with trepidation that I advance my next thesis, which is this. Medicine cannot, except over a short period, increase the population of the world. ... In China, European and American medical missions do much to diminish the infant death rate; the consequence is that more children die painfully of famine at the age of five or six. The benefit to mankind is very questionable. Except where the birth rate is low the population in the long run depends upon the food supply and upon nothing else.

Malthusianism again; but one point is valid - medical missions are a semi-absurdity. The third world should be rapidly industrialized so that it can provide itself with the basics of modern civilization - sewage, electricity, decent housing, sufficient nutrition, and so on. This is an obvious point, and we should beware of any do-gooders who want to "help" the third world with vaccines (see above) and pills. Cheap food imports are detrimental to third world nations, except in the cases of famines, because such imports tend to ruin the domestic agricultural economy. Import tractors and machine tools, not grain.

What is the inevitable result if the increase of population is not checked? There must be a very general lowering of the standard of life in what are now prosperous countries.

More Malthusian drivel - in the last two centuries, both the population of the world and the standard of living of most people have increased drastically, with the caveat that the industrial misery inflicted upon factory workers could and should have been avoided.

Says Russell, "Are mere numbers so important that, for their sake, we should patiently permit such a state of affairs to come about? Surely not. What, then, can we do? Apart from certain deepseated prejudices, the answer would be obvious." He then advises birth control propaganda. Next, Russell says that in lieu of birth control, "high-minded" people may use war or artificial plagues to periodically cull the population.

War, as I remarked a moment ago, has hitherto been disappointing in this respect, but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could be spread throughout the world once in every generation survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. ... The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of that? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people's.

There are three ways of securing a society that shall be stable as regards population. The first is that of birth control, the second that of infanticide or really destructive wars, and the third that of general misery except for a powerful minority. All these methods have been practiced.

...

All that follows directly from what has been said is that, unless there is a world government which secures universal birth control, there must from time to time be great wars, in which the penalty of defeat is widespread death by starvation. ... Unless, at

some stage, one power or group of powers emerges victorious and proceeds to establish a single government of the world with a monopoly of armed force, it is clear that the level of civilization must continually decline until scientific warfare becomes impossible—that is until science is extinct.

Russell concludes that

My conclusion is that a scientific society can be stable given certain conditions. The first of these is a single government of the whole world, possessing a monopoly of armed force and therefore able to enforce peace. The second condition is a general diffusion of prosperity, so that there is no occasion for envy of one part of the world by another. The third condition (which supposes the second fulfilled) is a low birth rate everywhere, so that the population of the world becomes stationary, or nearly so. The fourth condition is the provision for individual initiative both in work and in play, and the greatest diffusion of power compatible with maintaining the necessary political and economic framework.

And this is where we are heading. Point two is Globaloney - a reduction in the living standard of the West rather than a worldwide elimination of poverty. Point three we will momentarily get to. Point four is what we have - people can play games, dress like space aliens, watch TV, and have all the sex in the world, as long as they do not bother the ruling class and as long as they do not have too many children.

As to point one, the world state - any serious person can see it coming.

Russell wrote much more in the same spirit. I have quoted him so extensively, even though his writings only repeat what I have been saying, because he is an extremely credible source, and because he epitomizes one of the archetypes of the global oligarchy - the true believer. Russell, unable to overcome his Malthusian Benthamite oligarchical brainwashing - for the oligarchs are brainwashed, too - really thought that what was being done was for the benefit of humanity. Such a worldview is necessary for the more ethical members of the oligarchy. Rest assured that, as the Russo interview suggests, many oligarchs know exactly what the whole game is about.

Russell was also awarded the Noble Prize for literature.

Also see Lyndon LaRouche's 1994 paper *How Bertrand Russell Became An Evil Man*.

Let us now look at the Huxley brothers - Aldous and Julian. Aldous wrote the remarkable 1932 dystopian novel *Brave New World*. The book portrays a technocratic one world society, in which: 1) people are artificially bred into five castes - alphas (perfect elites), betas (manager class), gammas (white collar), deltas (blue collar), and epsilons (a troglodytic simian-like underclass); 2) children undergo extreme indoctrination from birth; 3) promiscuity is rampant, but conception, the family, and the idea of paternity have been eliminated; 4) people have free access to the potent yet harmless drug Soma, which, along with the regular orgies and the brainwashing, keeps the society stable; 5) individualism is considered semi-criminal; 6) rebels from the top two classes are shipped off to reservations.

At first, I thought that *Brave New World* was just a trashy pulp novel and could not understand why it was supposed to be a classic. Later, I began to notice that our own world resembles Huxley's fantasy too closely for comfort. We already have the class divisions, and though not rock-solid, they are quite tight. It is also hard not to notice that in the last thirty years the members of the underclass have become short, fat, and inarticulate, while the elites busy themselves with plastic surgeries. Wells and Russell also predicted that humanity may split into two sub-races; and in 2006, Oliver Curry of the London School of Economics (a Fabian haunt) said that the racial split is already under way. The problem of indoctrination we have discussed at length. Promiscuity permeates our society to the extent that most TV resembles soft porn. At the same time, the traditional family model is falling apart. Soma is not yet here, though not for a lack of effort. The psychotropic drugs explosion of the last two decades is an attempt at producing Soma. So is the promotion of the use of marijuana. Alcohol tends to be both energizing (to a certain degree) and harmful. Marijuana, on

the other hand, is soporific and harmless.

The topic of individualism is complex; I will only note that today, the schools promote collectivism and groupthink. Individualism is on the decline throughout the world.

Aldous (1894-1963) was the grandson of Thomas Huxley, "Darwin's Bulldog." After Eton and Balliol, Aldous mingled with the influential Bloomsbury set (Virginia Woolf, John Maynard Keynes, E. M. Forster, Lytton Strachey, et al), where he met Bertrand Russell. Aldous's brother, Julian, was intimate with H.G. Wells. We see that Aldous was connected with several of the personages we have so far encountered.

Around 1930, Huxley also acquainted the notable kook Aleister Crowley.

In 1937, Huxley moved to California, where he became one of the key founders of the 1960s drug culture. Aldous loved his LSD and died high as a kite. His *Doors of Perception* was one of the cornerstone pro-drug texts of the Beat era. Evidently, LSD was an attempt at producing Soma. One wonders, as with Timothy Leary, how an upper class intellectual suddenly became an exhibitionistic pill-popper without any significant complaint from the establishment. The jailing and daring escape of Timothy Leary surely were a farce.

The astute but secretive writer John Coleman has claimed that Aldous was an insider of the Big Plan and an agent of the world's premier brainwashing agency, the Tavistock Institute (see Coleman's *The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations*). The problem with Coleman is that he does not document his books. He claims to be a former MI6 agent, and many of his sources are supposedly secret. By and large, the verifiable claims of Coleman's check. Whatever the case, Aldous Huxley was indeed 1) an insider to the Anglo-American oligarchy, and 2) an expert on psychology.

To convince yourself of the validity of the second point, read Huxley's 1958 essay *Brave New World Revisited*, and listen to his famous two surviving interviews - the 1958 interview with Mike Wallace, and 1962 Berkeley interview entitled *The Ultimate Revolution*. Both interviews can be found on YouTube.

In both the interviews and *Revisited*, Huxley looks at the strides that have been taken toward the realization of his Brave New World, and concludes that society is indeed moving in the direction forecasted by him in 1932. Huxley's tone in both the interviews is rather startling - it seems as if the man felt satisfaction in seeing his predictions come true. One gets the impression that Huxley was happy not because a guess of his fell in place, but because a plan to which he was privy was proceeding apace. I challenge the reader to listen to the interviews and form his own opinion.

The *Brave New World Revisited* essay is as important as the book. Some editions of *BNW* also contain *Revisited*. The essay covers many of the points we have been making. Huxley stipulates that over-population, over-organization, and advances in modern propaganda, are inevitably leading toward scientific dictatorship. He also promotes eugenics. In regard to the mass media and the PR industry, Huxley says "To parody the words of Winston Churchill, never have so many been manipulated so much by so few." Another interesting observation relates to sex:

(Ch.3) It is worth remarking that, in *1984*, the members of the Party are compelled to conform to a sexual ethic of more than Puritan severity. In *Brave New World*, on the other hand, all are permitted to indulge their sexual impulses without let or hindrance. ... By crusading against sexuality the bosses are able to maintain the required tension in their followers and at the same time can satisfy their lust for power in a most gratifying way. ... The society described in *Brave New World* is a world-state, in which war has been eliminated and where the first aim of the rulers is at all costs to keep their subjects from making trouble. This they achieve by (among other methods) legalizing a degree of sexual freedom (made possible by the abolition of the family) that practically guarantees the Brave New Worlders against any form of destructive (or creative) emotional tension. In *1984* the lust for power is satisfied by inflicting pain; in *Brave New World*, by inflicting a hardly less humiliating pleasure.

Huxley's insight is extremely relevant today. Aldous repeatedly parroted the now familiar refrain that true control must necessarily rest on consent rather than pure terror. Thus, while the methods described in *1984* have their place, the methods of *Brave New World* are more efficient and therefore more likely to transpire.

The second half of the *Revisited* essay deals mostly with propaganda, on which Huxley was an expert. Wrote Huxley, "Thanks to compulsory education and the rotary press, the propagandist has been able, for many years past, to convey his messages to virtually every adult in every civilized country. Today, thanks to radio and television, he is in the happy position of being able to communicate even with unschooled adults and not yet literate children." In regard to the "free press": "In the totalitarian East there is political censorship, and the media of mass communication are controlled by the State. In the democratic West there is economic censorship and the media of mass communication are controlled by members of the Power Elite."

Of pharmacy, Huxley wrote:

Under a dictatorship pharmacists would be instructed to change their tune with every change of circumstances. In times of national crisis it would be their business to push the sale of stimulants. Between crisis, too much alertness and energy on the part of his subjects might prove embarrassing to the tyrant. At such times the masses would be urged to buy tranquilizers and vision-producers. Under the influence of these soothing syrups they could be relied upon to give their master no trouble.

In our society we are under dual pharmacological attack. Like the Masons say, "as above, so below." On the one hand, illegal drugs are heavily promoted via the music industry, mainstream literature, the reverse psychology of the ridiculous War on Drugs, and other methods. Illegal drugs mean big money for the big boys, and, when abused, mean brain damage, narcosis, and chemically induced imbecility for the underclass.

At the same time, we suffer under an onslaught of legal psychotropic drugs in the form of anti-depressants, Ritalin, and so on. These also mean big money and the zombification of the population. We will later examine both legal and illegal drugs in detail.

Here it suffices to note that the LSD mania of the 1960s was a mass experiment at the production and promotion of a Soma-type drug, as Huxley surely knew. For a look at the murky spook-infested history of LSD, see Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain's masterful *Acid Dreams* (1994).

Aldous Huxley also pointed out that various experimental results suggest that about 20% of the population is ready to believe anything, while another fifth is resistant to brainwashing, hypnosis, and propaganda. The remaining three fifths of the population can be brainwashed after some effort. Huxley concluded that anyone who knows his business and has access to mass audiences will be able to hold a fifth of the population in his pocket. A following of that size suffices for the establishment or maintenance of control over the population under the guise of demagogic pseudo-democracy. Consider, in this light, the 60 million or so fundamentalist Christians in America, who are not real Christians but vicious heretics, and who love the flag of America rather than the country itself.¹²

Having explained how things work, Huxley asks: "At this point we find ourselves confronted by a very disquieting question: Do we really wish to act upon our knowledge? Does a majority of the population think it worth while to take a good deal of trouble, in order to halt and, if possible, reverse the current drift toward totalitarian control of everything?" His answer is: "Perhaps the forces that now menace freedom are too strong to be resisted for very long. It is still our duty to do whatever we can to resist them."

My impression of Aldous Huxley is that he had enough access to the top levels of the British oligarchy, and enough intelligence, to be able to figure out the Big Plan with some precision. I feel that, perhaps, like Russell, Huxley did not particularly like the Big Plan, but did consider its realization inevitable. He tried to delicately warn the public of what was coming via his writings and public

¹²See Chris Hedges's *American Fascists* (2007).

speeches.

Let us leave Aldous after one last quote (emphasis mine):

(*The Ultimate Revolution* Berkeley '62 Speech) It seems to me that the nature of the ultimate revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: That we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable **the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably will always exist** to get people to love their servitude.

This is exactly what we have been saying from the beginning; with the added weight of Huxley's insider status and intellectual credentials. Aldous was so certain of the existence of the Oligarchy, because he knew its members personally. We know, because Quigley divulged some of the names of the turn of the century British controllers in his *The Anglo-American Establishment*, at which we look later.

For now we turn to Aldous's brother, Julian (1887-1875), the grandson of Darwin's Bulldog, a premier 20th century biologist, a major eugenicist, one of the founders of the UN, and one of the creators of the environmentalist movement. The main point here is that Julian Huxley offers a clear example of the connections between eugenicism, the UN, and the Green Movement.

Julian, like Aldous, followed the Eton - Balliol route. Note that at the turn of the 20th century, Balliol was a major haunt of the Milner/Rhodes Round Table gang. On the eve of the Great War, plagued by depression following a bad break-up, Huxley spent some time at a resting home along with his brother Trevenen, who, tragically, committed suicide by hanging. During the war, Julian joined the Army Intelligence Corps, which means that he was connected to the spooks as well as to the Milner gang; of course, the two groups must have overlapped significantly.

Wikipedia tells us that "In 1931 Huxley visited the USSR at the invitation of Intourist, where initially he admired the results of social and economic planning on a large scale. Later, back in the United Kingdom, he became a founding member of the think tank Political and Economic Planning." Keep in mind this guy founded Unesco. Also from Wikipedia: "In 1959 [Julian] received a Special Award of the Lasker Foundation in the category Planned Parenthood - World Population. Huxley was a prominent member of the British Eugenics Society and its president from 1959 to 1962." Moreover, Julian was one of the founders of the proto-environmentalist fascistic World Wildlife Fund.

Let us look at Julian's writings.

In 1939 Huxley signed the document *Social Biology and Population Improvement*, also known as *The Eugenics Manifesto*. This Manifesto said that to "most effectively genetically improve the population," humanity should: 1) install communism / technocracy; 2) install one world government; 3) have the state help in the raising of children so a woman's "reproductive duties do not interfere too greatly with her opportunities to participate in the life and work of the community at large." 4) legislate and universally disseminate both positive [the pill] and negative [abortion] birth control tools; 5) propagandise eugenics and Darwinism; 6) regulate marriage to promote mating among the healthy, the "intelligent" [measured how?] and the social rather than ambitious people [i.e. good worker bees].

In other words, Julian called for a milder version of his brother's *Brave New World*.

Eight years earlier, in 1931, Huxley wrote an article for *Harper's* entitled *The Vital Importance of Eugenics*:

There is only one immediate thing to be done - to ensure that mental defectives shall not have children. Whether this should be achieved by the prohibition of marriage or, as many believe, by combining the method of segregation in institutions with that of sterilization for those who are at large, is not our present concern.

...

There are tenderminded people and liberal doctrinaires who will argue that the qualities

which make for success are on balance not particularly good, or even that they are evil. Ruthlessness, egotism, vulgarity, double-dealing, subservience, the limitations that are willing to concentrate on dull routine - all these only too often make for success, and it is a good thing that the race should be purged of them.

Granted; but we must not forget that brains, energy, concentration, special gifts, devotion to ideals - these, too, in general make for success. And most people would, I think, agree that this second list more than counterbalances the first; for even if vulgarity and ruthlessness and the rest are unpleasant, they can be combated; but without brains, energy, and special talents the world would both collapse and cease to be worth living in.

Julian complains that "successful" people are not having enough children, because children are expensive and time-consuming. As a solution to this problem, Huxley proposes a progressive tax-break for having children, i.e. high-earning professionals receive, say, \$ 2,000 per year for having children, while minimal wage workers, who pay almost no income tax, receive nothing.¹³ At the end, Julian gets into Transhumanism: "Finally there remains the question of what I have styled long-range eugenics - the attempt to alter the character of the human race out of its present mold, to lead it on to new evolutionary achievements."

In fact, in 1951 Huxley published an entire article entitled *Transhumanism*: "[Man's understanding of evolution] has defined man's responsibility and destiny to be an agent for the rest of the world in the job of realizing its inherent potentialities as fully as possible." Also, "quality of people, not mere quantity, is what we must aim at, and therefore that a concerted policy is required to prevent the present flood of population-increase from wrecking all our hopes for a better world". Unfortunately, instead of helping nations develop industrially, so that their populations can have the time and the opportunity to turn to study and enlightenment, the international oligarchy has demonstrably been suppressing economic development in accord with the Malthusian principle of suppressing population growth by economic ("positive") checks. The hypocrisy is overwhelming.

While we are at it, let us ask what "mental defectives" are. Suppose Julian had been born into a working class family. Instead of a classical education, he would have been given a compulsory indoctrination for slavery, and then would have been shipped to a factory. After his mental breakdown, Bedlam would have awaited Julian in the stead of a rest home. The great Julian would have been a mental defective, to be compulsorily sterilized. Or what of Julian's brother Trevenen, the suicide? Was he a mental defective? If so, then why should Julian, the carrier of mentally defective genes, be allowed to have children? Or what of Aldous, who was half blind as a result of an illness? Not too healthy, our Aldous! Off with his balls!

What hypocrites, by all that is good, what bloody hypocrites...

We may at this juncture ask the inevitable question: Is eugenics valid in the technical sense?

We answer: No! Of course not! How do you determine which human is genetically "good" and which one is genetically "bad"? How do you distinguish genetic inferiority from misfortune during carriage?

Take the writer and poet Charles Bukowski (1920-1994). Raised during the Depression in a working class family, beaten by his father, hit by an industrial-scale case of acne, Bukowski was disgusted with life and drank himself into a hospital by the age of 35. The doctors saved his life with massive blood transfusions. At that stage of his earthly existence, Bukowski was a deadbeat drunk who could not hold a job to save his life. Should he have been exterminated? Bukowski eventually recovered, and began to write in earnest at the age of 50. Today he is regarded as one of the pre-eminent American poets of the 20th century. Moreover - and this point can not be stressed enough - until the age of fifty, Bukowski supported himself by working at backbreaking jobs of all imaginable sorts.

¹³See IRS's Child Tax Credit, which dishes out \$1,000 per child as long as 1) you have taxes to pay, i.e. you are not too poor; and 2) you are not reasonably affluent - income above \$75,000 - in which case you would not, perhaps, need such a tax break quite as much.

Also look up Elizabeth Warren's *Two-Income Trap*.

<http://www.irs.gov/newsroom/article/0,,id=106182,00.html>, 24 October 2011.

The man did real, hard work, unlike the Julians and the Aldouses. After fifty, Bukowski supported himself with his writing.

Or what of Sylvia Plath? In her suicide, did society rid itself of a degenerate neurotic, or did the world lose a talented poet?

The history of American literature consists almost entirely of alcoholics and depressives: Edgar Allan Poe, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, Sylvia Plath, Hunter Thompson, Bukowski, William Faulkner, Robert E. Howard, John Kennedy Toole, David Foster Wallace, Jack London, John O'Hara, Dorothy Parker, the over-rated beatniks, H.P. Lovecraft, Frederick Exley, Anne Sexton, Raymond Carver, Raymond Chandler, Dashiell Hammett, and Phillip K. Dick were to the last of them addicts or depressives or both. Far too many committed suicide directly or indirectly (by drinking themselves to death). The list, though it composes the major body of American letters, is short of complete. Were those people defectives? If not, are depression and alcoholism "desirable" traits? Or is it the case that, perceptive people, disgusted with the villainousness in the world, which can be directly attributed to the ruling elite and the naivete of the masses, despair of the horror and assuage their suffering with drink and other double-edged palliatives?

Was Malthus a great philosopher, or was he a parasitic "country gentleman" sprouting drivel to justify his comfortable existence? Let there be country gentlemen, but could they not at least have the decency not to preach genocide?

Or what of Bentham and his Panopticons and usury? Was that swine an exemplar of "superior" "genes"?

To repudiate eugenics one need only point toward the promoters of eugenics, who, in their folly, kept arranging incestuous marriages, with predictable results. Oligarchies love incest, because incest keeps the inheritance within the family. At the same time, incest remains a taboo across the world, because incest leads to true degeneration. What greater irony than the extinction of the Thomas Malthus and Francis Galton lines! The dedicated eugenicist will say that eugenics is not synonymous with incest - fine, but do take a look at the founders of the dogma.

Then we come to the issue of stupidity - how do you measure that, and how can you pretend to measure stupidity in a society poisoned by compulsory indoctrination and incessant corporate advertisement? How does one define stupidity and intelligence, anyway? What can you measure by silly standardized multiple choice tests? I can tell you exactly what - multiple choice test measure one's ability to take multiple choice tests.¹⁴

It should suffice to note that modern IQ tests were fabricated by none other than Francis Galton. Historically, extensive testing was developed by the Mandarin gang in China, with the express purpose of producing obedient bureaucrats. I personally gave up on IQ testing after taking an IQ test as a child. The only question I got wrong asked one to explain what a certain shapeless blob was supposed to represent. It turned out that the blob was a bathtub. I realized that, having grown up with only a shower, I had never seen a bathtub. That was it for me as far as IQ tests went. Those who think that better questions would solve the problem are missing the point.

Neither are credentials any sure measure of the worthiness of a human being. For example, Samuel A. Cartwright was an honoured 19th century American physician and psychiatrist, who happened to believe that slaves sometimes suffered from "drapetomania," the desire to run away, best cured by whipping and patronizing treatment. Now, was Cartwright an outstanding member of society, or was he a deranged psychotic nut? In the 20th century we can throw a wrathful gaze at Walter Jackson Freeman II the lobotomizer. In 1945 Mr Freeman poked at an orange with an icepick. Eureka! In 1946 Mr Freeman began to stick icepicks into the frontal lobes of mental hospital inmates, one of whom Julian Huxley but for the grace of God may well have been. By 1951 almost 20,000 Americans had been lobotomized.

From the Wikipedia article on Rosemary Kennedy, the famous lobotomy victim:

James W. Watts, who carried out the procedure with Walter Freeman, described what happened:

¹⁴See Mark J. Garrison's *A Measure of Failure*.

"We went through the top of the head, I think she was awake. She had a mild tranquilizer. I made a surgical incision in the brain through the skull. It was near the front. It was on both sides. We just made a small incision, no more than an inch." The instrument Dr. Watts used looked like a butter knife. He swung it up and down to cut brain tissue. "We put an instrument inside," he said. As Dr. Watts cut, Dr. Freeman put questions to Rosemary. For example, he asked her to recite the Lord's Prayer or sing "God Bless America" or count backwards. ... "We made an estimate on how far to cut based on how she responded." ... When she began to become incoherent, they stopped.

Instead of the hoped-for result, Rosemary was left with urinary incontinence and an infantile mentality staring blankly at walls for hours. Her speech became unintelligible.

...

Kessler conducted the only interview with Watts before he died, who "told the author that, in his opinion, Kennedy had suffered not from mental retardation, but from a form of depression."

Rosemary kept a coherent diary and could do basic mathematics. She was not "retarded." Was Walter Freeman a true practitioner of medicine sworn to the Hippocratic Oath, or was he a deranged psychotic hypocrite? Was Rosemary, the daughter of the US Ambassador to London, the sister of two senators and a president, a defective?

During the early 20th century, in their efforts to find some measurement of intelligence, the eugenicists - would you believe this! - measured the cranial capacities of famous people. Ian Taylor in his *In the Minds of Men* points out that Anatole France's cranial capacity was but half of Ivan Turgenev's. Another dead end for the eugenicists, though one can not blame them for a lack of effort.

We can continue to produce examples and rhetorical questions ad nauseam; and nausea is never far away when one researches eugenics. Eugenics is a complete fraud, a bad joke, a hideous oligarchical pseudo-science. Human beings are too complex to be compared like pieces of fruit. Eugenics leads to inbreeding, caste differentiation, and pathology. The sooner we get rid of the pernicious cult of eugenics, the better.

And now back to Julian. In 1946, he helped set up Unesco, whose stated goal is: "to contribute to the building of peace, the eradication of poverty, sustainable development and intercultural dialogue through education, the sciences, culture, communication and information. The Organization focuses, in particular, on two global priorities: Africa, Gender equality." What "gender equality" means remains unclear, though one would not be surprised if Julian in his dreams sought to create unisex neohumans. Do not take the last sentence lightly. One of the currents of the Transhumanist movement is the "Postgenderism" movement. Julian, whether he wanted to eradicate gender or not, coined the "Transhuman" neologism.

A lover of manifestos, Julian penned one for Unesco: *Unesco - Its Purpose and Its Philosophy*. The purpose of Unesco, according to Julian, is "to foster and promote all aspects of education, science, and culture, in the widest sense of those words" for "the ends and objects of the United Nations, which in the long perspective are world ends, ends for humanity as a whole." In other words, Unesco is the brainwashing agency of the UN.

Huxley explains that Unesco can not be founded on religious or economico-politically ideological principles; it must be founded on the principles of "humanism" and "evolution." We look at humanism later. Unesco is frankly Malthusian: "Again, even knowledge that appears to be wholly beneficent can be applied in such a way that it does not promote progress. Thus, the application of medical science may increase the number of human beings in a given area but lower their quality or their opportunities for enjoyment of life : and if so, in the light of our basic criterion of evolutionary direction, it is wrong." And "There is one other general implication of the fact of evolutionary progress, which Unesco must take into account-the importance of quality as against quantity. ... there is an optimum range of human population density, and of total population in the world."

Unesco is for one world government: "First, that the more united man's tradition becomes, the more rapid will be the possibility of progress : several separate or competing or even mutually hostile pools of tradition cannot possibly be so efficient as a single pool common to all mankind. And secondly, that the best and only certain way of securing this will be through political unification." It should be understood that the "unification of culture" means the eradication of culture by conglomerating the world cultures into a sterile mish-mash susceptible to manipulation by - by whom? By Unesco. The doings of Unesco may seem strange, but they are for the best: (emphasis mine) "The encouragement of variety of genius, of quality in general, **however incomprehensible to the multitude**, must be one of the major aims of Unesco."

Julian next explains that Unesco is for "democratic equality of opportunity," but that, unfortunately, biologically some men are better than others. "...the full implications of the fact of human inequality have not often been drawn and certainly need to be brought out here, as they are very relevant to Unesco's task."

...there is difference in quality or level. Human beings are not equal in respect of various desirable qualities. Some are strong, others weak ; some healthy, others chronic invalids ; some long-lived, others short-lived ; some bright, others dull ; some of high, others of low intelligence .; some mathematically gifted, others very much the reverse ; some kind and good, others cruel and selfish.

It is usually not so easy to say how much of this second sort of inequality is due to heredity and therefore relevant for our purpose, how much only to the effects of physical or social environment. But in most cases we now know, and in almost all can be reasonably sure, that some at least of the difference is genetic.

Huxley then explains that Unesco should try to squeeze as many good genes as possible from all the races into the common gene pool of humanity. This means that your local oligarch or eugenicist biologist will be receiving grants and subsidies from the UN while you starve in your kind contribution toward the achievement of "optimal population density."

Continues Julian in the same vein,

it is a fact, however disagreeable, that a considerable percentage of the population is not capable of profiting from higher education ; to this point we shall return later. It is equally a fact that a considerable percentage of young men have to be rejected for military service on grounds of physical weakness or mental instability, and that these grounds are often genetic in origin.

Is that true? About half of the children of wealthiest 10% of the population of America have attended a four-year college; compared to about a tenth for the bottom 10% . Moreover, the rich can afford to pursue their goals without bothering with college - look at Bill Gates, Michael Dell, Mark Zuckerberg, and their many fellow successful entrepreneurs. The eugenicists will say that the bottom 10% have garbage genes anyway. But how can you tell if you measure gene quality by one's economic success? How can one succeed, if one is brainwashed, and then deprived of both money and access to college?

In regard to the military disqualifications, I am reminded of the Vietnam war stories of people ingesting every drug known to man before going to the draft board. Could physical weakness have been caused by malnutrition stemming from Malthusianism and oligarchical depredation? What about the GMO infestation of today and the concurrent obesity crisis, which came as if out of nowhere?

Let us suppose that we lived in a Unesco-governed society of true equal opportunity. To get to college, one has to pass Unesco exams, in which one has to parrot Malthus, Darwin, and - why not? - Julian himself. If you disagree with Malthus and Julian you are stupid and you do not go to college and you are removed from the gene pool.

Exaggerating, am I? Let the reader peruse the remaining two thirds of the *Unesco Manifesto* for himself and draw his own conclusions.

One of Unesco's programmes is the International Baccalaureate Diploma project. Having gone

through the program, in retrospect I can testify with certainty that the IB is a program of indoctrination for prospective low to mid level World State functionaries. Sharp minds have been at work in devising the curriculum - the brainwashing is subtle but powerful. For further details, look up Debra K. Niwa's paper *International Baccalaureate (IB) Unravelled*.

It should be understood that Unesco and Julian were not a bizarre aberration in an otherwise impeccable United Nations. How could such a thing happen? Huxley was allowed to do what he did and say what he said, because he was in agreement with everything the UN stood for - or he would not have been put in charge of Unesco. The UN was created to become a Malthusian eugenicist World Government. We will provide information on the UN as we move along.

For example, it is well-known that, quite literally, the Rockefellers built the UN. The New York UN headquarters was built on land "donated" by the Rockefellers. Of course, the idea of the ultra-acquisitive Rockefellers "donating" anything out of good will is too absurd to entertain. They did not get where they are by magnanimity. If old John D. ever "donated" money to any church, he did it in an effort to bribe God.

More than that, the Rockefellers founded the educational arm of Unesco - the International Bureau of Education of Geneva (founded in 1925), which grew out of the Jean-Jacques Rousseau Institute of Geneva (founded in 1912). Influential in both institutions was the Swiss behaviorist (and "behaviorism" means animal training applied to human children) Jean Piaget (1896-1980). For example, this Piaget founded a center for "Genetic Epistemology in Geneva" in 1955 with a Rockefeller Foundation grant. This is one instance, in which "genetic" blatantly means "eugenic."

That the IBE of Geneva was founded via a direct Rockefeller Foundation grant, one can verify directly from Unesco.¹⁵

To Julian's consternation, eugenicism lost its appeal in the aftermath of the Hitlerist fiasco. But as all true believers well knew, eugenics was the real deal, the only thing that mattered. Eugenics had to continue - but under new covers. The British Eugenic Society became the Galton Institute. The term "eugenics" itself was dropped in favour of the more palatable "genetics." Note that while "eugenics" and "genetics" are not synonymous, and not all geneticists are eugenicists, genetics does by and large operate as a front for good old eugenics.

"Bioethics" is another cover-term for eugenics.

Another front was the environmental movement, one of the vanguards of which - The World Wildlife Fund - Julian helped found in 1961. Julian's views we have seen. What of the co-founders of the WWF? The first president of the organization was none other than the illustrious Prince (of the Netherlands) Bernhard (1911-2004), who also happened to spawn the Bilderberg gang. In his youth, Bernhard was a Nazi and a member of the SA.¹⁶ In the '70s, Bernhard was implicated in a massive bribery scandal. In the '80s, Bernhard embezzled WWF funds to finance a private army to fight International [i.e. Bernhard & Co's] Reserve poachers and to smuggle ivory. More can be said of Bernhard, but I think we have had enough.

Another key founder was Godfrey A. Rockefeller (1924-2010). Godfrey's father had been a Bonesman.

The president of the WWF between 1981 and 1996 was Prince Philip (1921-), the consort of the queen of England. In the foreword to Fleur Cowles's book *If I Were an Animal*, Prince Philip announced that

¹⁵http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/FERNIG_2.PDF, accessed on Jan 25, 2012.

¹⁶"Annejet van der Zijl, a Dutch historian, has found membership documents in Berlin's Humboldt University that prove Prince Bernhard, who studied there, had joined Deutsche Studentenschaft, a National Socialist student fraternity, as well as the Nazi NSDAP and its paramilitary wing, the Sturmabteilung."

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/netherlands/7377402/Dutch-Prince-Bernhard-was-member-of-Nazi-pa.html>, accessed on 24 October 2011

I just wonder what it would be like to be reincarnated in an animal whose species had been so reduced in numbers that it was in danger of extinction. What would be its feelings toward the human species whose population explosion had denied it somewhere to exist... I must confess that I am tempted to ask for reincarnation as a particularly deadly virus.

This is not a momentary lapse in sanity or a misquote - Philip's Malthusian's views are on the record of his various speeches. Philip's family had strong connections with the Nazis; as did his wife's uncle. The WWF has cordoned off huge swaths of land across the world to the detriment of the territorial sovereignty of numerous states. The princes and the Rockefellers and Julian do want to "save" the planet - for their own keeping and amusement. For example, what does one make of the fact that Philip is a fanatical big game hunter? How does one escape the conclusion that the medieval-minded Philip wants to keep the peasants far away from his hunting grounds? That he wants to save the "wildlife" in order to shoot the poor critters?

Hunting to put food on the table is perfectly reasonable. But that is not what Philip's monomania is about.

Charles Galton Darwin (1887-1962), grandson of the original, was a participant in the Manhattan Project and a eugenics enthusiast. His 1952 futurological piece *The Next Million Years* reiterates the by now familiar Malthusian themes. True to his name, Darwin explains that the only thing that matters is survival - which is the tenet that the oligarchy reserves for itself. The commoner must be a good Christian who turns the other cheek and a good citizen of the planet who does not overpopulate. The "naturally" superior oligarchy, on the other hand, retains the right of lying and cheating and killing to preserve itself.

Says Darwin, immune to irony, "...some highly successful modes of life - such as that of the parasite - would not be regarded as admirable, no matter what human standard they are judged by." What do we make of his "independently wealthy" (and Charles Darwin was a very rich man) grandfather and Malthus, then? Charles Galton at least helped produce nuclear energy - by way of the atomic bomb.

Charles Galton foretells that most people will end up living in cities:

Already there are many who prefer this crowded life, but there are others who do not, and these will be gradually eliminated. Life in the crowded condition of cities has many unattractive features, but in the long run these may be overcome, not so much by altering them, but simply by changing the human race into liking them.

Indeed, the world is becoming increasingly urbanized; to the point that many smaller villages and towns are shrinking and vanishing. Observe that mass urbanization reinforces the impression of over-population.

Darwin spends one chapter explaining that to control mankind one must control its creeds.

He next explains, via a parable, that the oligarchy should try to tame humanity, but keep itself "wild": "[The director in the parable] had tamed men into being domestic animals, but he could not tame anyone into being a director, because a director must be a wild and not a tame animal." The point is made clear a few pages later: "therefore though it might conceivably be possible to tame the majority of mankind, this could only be done by leaving untamed a minority of the population. Moreover, this minority would have to be the group possessing the most superior qualities of all." Through a heavy-handed simile, Darwin states his views on eugenics. Dr. Strangelove would have been proud of Charles Galton.

If by analogy one wished to improve the breed of racehorses, one might accomplish a little by always slaughtering the horse that finished last in every race, but it would be a much slower process than the actual one of sending the winner to the stud farm.

Like our more extreme utopianist friends, Darwin thinks that humanity should be set up like an ant's nest. To that end,

...the control of the numbers of the two sexes may become possible, and with the knowledge of the various sexual hormones it might also become possible to free the majority of mankind from the urgency of sexual impulse, so that they could live contented celibate lives...

This suggestion of Darwin's has been partly realized, as we will find out shortly.

Darwin echoes Aldous's caste system: "There is no prospect of man's nature imitating an insect's, but it is much more nearly imaginable that his development should go, like that of the dogs, into a set of breeds each specialized for a particular purpose." This would be only be possible under certain conditions: "In order to create such specialist breeds there would have to be a master breed at the summit, and this would be a totally different kind of thing from all the other breeds, because it would have to create itself."

Consider the last remark in the context of Transhumanism. If humanity "betters" itself via technological means, those means will be expensive. Who will be "improved"? Those who can afford to buy the gadgets and serums.

Darwin finally concludes that no master breed can be established, because men will always be wild. Perhaps some of Darwin's brethren were not of the same mind, and perhaps he himself was being disingenuous.

Darwin also hopes for Soma and beehives: "For example, there might be a drug, which, without other harmful effects, removed the urgency of sexual desire, and so reproduced in humanity the status of workers in a beehive. Or there might be another drug that produced a permanent state of contentment in the recipient."

Of World Government, Darwin speaks plainly:

If then there is ever to be a world government, it will have to function as governments do now, in the sense that it will have to coerce a minority - and indeed it may often be a majority - into doing things they do not want to do.

In the end, Charles Galton succumbs to Malthusian gloom and pictures the next million years as a reversion to barbarity.

3.3.5 NSM200 and Club of Rome

We now look at the notorious *National Security Study Memorandum 200*, completed under the direction of Hank Kissinger in late 1974, and adopted as national policy by the unelected stooge Gerald Ford in 1975. The document was declassified in the early 1990s.

Heinz Alfred "Henry" Kissinger (1923-) was born in Bavaria to a schoolteacher and a housewife. In 1938, the family repaired for New York. Hank was drafted in the Army in 1943. He fought in the Ardennes. The spooks made use of Kissinger's knowledge of German, and so young Henry acquired connections with the intelligence community. After the war, Kissinger obtained a PhD from Harvard. Somewhere along the line, the top elements of the East Coast Establishment recruited Kissinger. By the mid-1950s, he was a ranking member of the Rockefeller-dominated Council on Foreign Relations. Explicitly, Kissinger worked for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund between 1956 and 1958. He was an "advisor" (i.e. protege) of Nelson Rockefeller, who kept shooting for the presidency in the 1960s and 1970s. In 1968, another protege of Nelson's, Dick Nixon, became president - and Hank became the National Security Advisor. Toward the end of the Nixon administration, Kissinger completely dominated the White House. His (and by proxy Rockefeller's) influence on American foreign policy during the Nixon era is incalculable.

By all indications, Kissinger is the original Doctor Strangelove of the eponymous Stanley Kubrick motion picture.

Since 1976, Kissinger has been quietly effective in manipulating America's foreign policy. He is a member of various top-level secret societies.

Naturally, Hank was awarded a Noble Prize for his efforts.

NSM200 explains that population growth is a serious problem, for both 1) the developing countries: (Ch.4) "Rapid population growth adversely affects every aspect of economic and social progress in developing countries"; and 2) the West: (Ch.5) "It seems well understood that the impact of population factors on the subjects already considered – development, food requirements, resources, environment – adversely affects the welfare and progress of countries in which we have a friendly interest and thus indirectly adversely affects broad U.S. interests as well."

Never mind that the the increase of the US population from 5 million in 1800 to 150 million in 1950 went hand in hand with almost constant economic growth and improvement of living standards. It can be claimed that the US had room to grow. Then what about Japan, whose population went from 35 million at the eve of the Meiji Restoration in 1872, to 73 million in 1940, to a stagnant 127 million today? The standard of living in Japan is among the highest in the world. Japan is not even particularly rich in mineral resources, and most of the Japanese islands are mountainous. One can bask in the glory of Fuji-San on clear days in Tokyo.

The "leaders" of the developed countries, whose populations were and remain near-stagnant, viewed the population explosion in the third world with horror. After all, the profits and political dominance of the Western oligarchs depended in large part on their control and exploitation of third world raw materials. What if the millions of "useless eaters" should try to use their own resources to help themselves? Unthinkable!

NSM200 mentions in Ch.2, that

Climatic changes are poorly understood, but a persistent atmospheric cooling trend since 1940 has been established. One respectable body of scientific opinion believes that this portends a period of much wider annual frosts, and possibly a long-term lowering of rainfall in the monsoon areas of Asia and Africa.

A third of a century later, Al Gore began his crusade against the unholy "global warming." The global cooling alarmism of the 1970s has been conveniently forgotten today. Strange how the scientific "consensus" shifted from cooling to warming. Perhaps the next threat will be the threat of climate stagnation. Unless the climate changes soon, we are all doomed! We must change the climate right now!

One awaits the future development of climate thought with eager curiosity.

The paper also repeatedly refers to various UN projects and plans for dealing with the population "problem." Cited in particular is the 1974 *World Population Plan of Action*. The *WPPA* is a weaker, and, being public, more carefully worded version of *NSM200*.

To curb undesirable population growth in the developing countries, *NSM200* advises the following tactics: 1) get women into the workforce so that they do not have time for childbearing and child-caring; 2) provide old-age pensions so that old people do not depend on their children for support; 3) propagandise contraception and "family planning"; 4) provide easy access to abortion; 5) indoctrinate the young.

For the last point, the verbatim quote is: (Part II, Ch. 1.E) "concentrating on the education and indoctrination of the rising generation of children regarding the desirability of smaller family size." Another suggestion involved conditioning US aid on the creation of population control programs. In other words, blackmail.

Kissinger's *NSM200* also recommends that the government channels funds into the research for better contraceptives. For example: (emphasis mine)

Sterilization of men and women has received wide-spread acceptance in several areas when a simple, quick, and safe procedure is readily available. Female sterilization has been improved by technical advances with laparoscopes, culdoscopes, and greatly simplifies

abdominal surgical techniques. Further improvements by the use of tubal clips, trans-cervical approaches, and simpler techniques can be developed. For men several current techniques hold promise but require more refinement and evaluation.

...

Injectable contraceptives for women which are effective for three months or more and are administered by para-professionals undoubtedly will be a significant improvement.

...

...an effective and safe male contraceptive is needed, in particular **an injection** which will be effective for specified periods of time. Fundamental research must be done but there are reasons to believe that the development of an injectable male contraceptive is feasible.

Were the policies suggested by *NSM200* actually followed? Yes, of course! Or else why write the paper and then adopt it as national policy?

William Engdahl examines the *NSM200* in Chapter 4 of his *Seeds of Destruction*. For the duration of the 20th century, the eugenicist Rockefellers, Kissinger's patrons, spared no effort in developing contraception methods and promoting "family planning."

One of the countries that *NSM200* explicitly targeted was Brazil. As Engdahl relates, in the late 1980s, a Brazilian government investigation discovered that "an estimated 44% of all Brazilian women aged between 14 and 55 had been permanently sterilized."

Most of the older women had been sterilized when the program started in the mid-1970's. The Government found that the sterilizations had been carried out by a variety of different organizations and agencies, some Brazilian. They included the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the US Pathfinder Fund, the Association for Voluntary Surgical Contraception, Family Health International—all programs under the aegis and guidance of the US Agency for International Development (USAID).

In Chapter 5 of his book, Engdahl examines the Rockefeller sterilization whirlwind in Puerto Rico:

JDR III made Puerto Rico into a huge laboratory to test his ideas on mass population control beginning in the 1950's. By 1965, an estimated 35% of Puerto Rico's women of child-bearing age had been permanently sterilized, according to a study made that year by the island's Public Health Department.

Similar stories leaked from the Philippines and Mexico in the mid-'90s.¹⁷

So there you have it: the oligarchs talked about sterilizing people - surreptitiously by vaccine if necessary; they formed organizations for the sterilization of people, and they sterilized people. They use war as much as they can - as the massacres in Korea and Vietnam show - but public opinion can handle only so much war. Thus, the oligarchs prefer to depopulate via clandestine economic warfare in the stead of outright bombing. The IMF has killed more people than has the Pentagon.

War and economic predation also happen to bring profits and power. But truly moral people are above such things. Truly moral people, like the Rockefellers, need the money and the power in order to save the world from its Malthusian predicament. And that is how it goes.

Having examined the WWF, let us turn to one other pioneering environmentalist organization - the Club of Rome. This club was founded by Aurelio Peccei and Alexander King in 1968 on David Rockefeller's Italian estate. Peccei (1908-1984) was another example of the strange communist-capitalist type we keep encountering. In his 20-ies, he travelled to the USSR on a scholarship; in the 1930s, he went to pre-communist China as an agent of Fiat. After some trouble with the fascists during the war, Peccei became one of the most influential postbellum Italian industrialists.

¹⁷<http://www.pop.org/content/anti-fertility-drug-experiments-1709>, accessed on October 28, 2011

Alexander King (1909-2007) was one of those secretive technocrats who do much behind the scenes but of whom we hear little. Among other works, King co-authored the 1993 *The First Global Revolution*, one of the two main Club of Rome publications, the other one being the immortal Malthusian classic *The Limits to Growth* (1972).

Alexander Dugin (1962-, Russian "politologist") in his *Conspirology* (Ch. 3.1) examines the Club of Rome's shadowy connections with the USSR. Jermain Gvishiani, nomenklatura bigshot, husband to the daughter of the influential in the Brezhnev-era Alexander Kosygin, and graduate of the elite Molotov-founded Moscow Institute of International Affairs (probably connected with the Royal Institute of International Affairs), was a member of the Club of Rome and the person in charge of the Russian branch of the CoR think-tank the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis. Gvishiani's sister was the wife of Eugene Primakov, a member of Gorbachev's inner circle. Gorbachev is on the record calling for a "new world order" and blabbing about sustainability and eco-mumbo-jumbo - we will look at his insipid writings later. In the 1990s, Gvishiani was put in charge of the San Francisco based Gorbachev Foundation. Gorbachev himself was a member of the Club of Rome.

Another member was the communist-connected Pierre Trudeau of Canada. The royalty of Europe - Sophia & Carlos of Spain, Beatrix of the Netherlands, and others - and some of the post-1989 Eastern European leaders - Shevernadze, Havel - are also honorary members of the Club of Rome. The list of members includes various high-level industrialists, academics, politicians, and bankers. Together with its two offshoots, the Clubs of Madrid and Budapest, the Club of Rome also features Bill Gates, George Soros, Clinton, Carter, Tony Blair, Maurice Strong, Deepak Chopra the New Age charlatan - in short, a choice selections of the stars of the Planet Earth Reality Show.

So what did *The Limits to Growth* say? The authors announce that they have developed a model for the future of human civilization, and no matter what they do, their model always predicts impending doom for humanity - unless, of course, all growth stops.

Here I can state as a professional mathematician and statistician with experience in computer programming and mathematical modelling, that one can easily write a model that will produce whatever results one desires. For example - if one were to model population growth on the basis of current fertility rates, the model will predict that in a few hundred years there will be 20 (or however many) human beings per meter squared on the planet Earth. If one goes a step further and throws in one more derivative - the current rate of change in worldwide fertility rates, which is negative - the model will say that in a few hundred years there will be 20 humans left on the planet.

Obviously, if the author of the model plays around and introduces a few more parameters, he can obtain any result imaginable.

The *Limits to Growth* model is nothing but a cruel hoax. Moreover, the powerful Club of Rome suffers not from the Curse of Cassandra, but from the "blessing" of being able to fulfil its own prophecies.

A few quotes from the abridged version of *The Limits to Growth*:

The model we have constructed is, like every model, imperfect, oversimplified, and unfinished.

...

We can thus say with some confidence that, under the assumption of no major change in the present system, population and industrial growth will certainly stop within the next century, at the latest.

...

(emphasis theirs) **Faith in technology as the ultimate solution to all problems can thus divert our attention from the most fundamental problem - the problem of growth in a finite system - and prevent us from taking effective action to solve it.**

...

If we relax our most unrealistic assumption - that we can suddenly and absolutely stabilize population and capital, replacing them with the following:

- The population has access to 100 percent effective birth control.
- The average desired family size is two children.
- The economic system endeavours to maintain average industrial output per capita at about the 1975 level.

And that is our future, dear reader. It is not a coincidence that real wages in the US have been declining since at least the mid-'70s, when the process of de-industrialization began in earnest. Given its backing, it is not surprising that *The Limits to Growth*, following a massive media campaign, sold millions of copies and generated a major controversy.

The Club of Rome proposed that humanity curtails industrial growth and reverts to a static state of "equilibrium." Pure Malthus.

Now, it would certainly be a good idea to do away with advertisement, which creates artificial demand, and the short-sighted idiotic for-profit dogma, which has given birth to the truly insane idea of planned obsolescence. The Club of Rome pretends to call for something along those lines; but that is mere window dressing. We know, because the same bankers and industrialists who brainwash people into buying low-quality made-to-break useless gadgets are the ones behind the Club of Rome. What the Club of Rome actually propagates is Malthusianism. Under the Club of Rome, the undeveloped countries will never be allowed to blossom industrially - on the contrary, the industry of the West is to be dismantled. And that is exactly what we see. The end goal appears to be techno-feudalism.

Again, one is left with the impression that the powerful members of society sincerely believe that the world belongs to them, and that they need not share it with the billions of "useless eaters" unlucky enough not to be members of the psychopathic global Oligarchy.

The Limits to Growth is also one of the key scriptures of the Peak Oil Cult.

Alexander King's 1993 *First Global Revolution* opens up with Philip the Virus (Germ?) lauding the efforts of the Club of Rome. Then, in the introduction, King tells us that:

The topic of recent Club of Rome meetings has been 'The Great Transition': we are convinced that we are in the early stages of the formation of a new type of world society which will be as different from today's, as was that ushered in by the Industrial Revolution from the society of the long agrarian period that preceded it. The initial but by no means the only motor force of this change has been the emergence of a cluster of advanced technologies, especially those made possible by microelectronics and the new discoveries of molecular biology. These are creating what is variously called the information society, the post-industrial society, or the service society, in which employment, life-styles and prospects, material and otherwise, will be very different from those of today for every human being.

...

Only if all the inhabitants of the planet realize that they are facing immediate and common dangers, can a universal political will be generated for united action to secure the survival of humanity. This is why we call for the creation of world solidarity.

...

(Ch.1) Much of what is counted as growth is probably not growth at all. For example, in the United States of President Reagan, growth figures concealed overconsumption and public disinvestment, deterioration of the infrastructure, decay of the inner cities, and social degradation.

...

... many smaller countries already have very little control over their own affairs because of decisions taken outside their territories, such as the establishment of commodity prices or interest rates, or due to by economic policies modified to obtain IMF funding. Erosion

of sovereignty may be a positive move towards the new global system for most countries, in which the nation state will, in all probability, have diminishing significance.

King observes that "humanitarian interventions" are but a tool for destroying the sovereignty of nations. He notes that the upsurge in tribalism is, likewise, a phenomenon malignant to state sovereignty. King states that the US debt is "a dark stormcloud on the economic horizon." He also explains that "sophisticated models" show that Global Warming is very scary. He notes that "the aggressive feminism of the seventies..., in demanding an artificial equality with men, rather than a role which is essentially complementary," has produced women who "reproduce the sterile male logic which has led the world into its present state of malaise." The most-successful go-getter women have become "male-hearted instead of developing the virtues of the female mind which society so badly needs." King then rejoices that "this phase seems to be passing," and that "there is increasing recognition among both men and women of the significance of female qualities and values." In other words, men are becoming wimps. So we have manly women and girlie men - all of them getting prepped for the transhumanist leap.

(Ch.5) The need for enemies seems to be a common historical factor. Some states have striven to overcome domestic failure and internal contradictions by blaming external enemies. The ploy of finding a scapegoat is as old as mankind itself - when things become too difficult at home, divert attention to adventure abroad.¹⁸

Can we live without enemies? ... New enemies have to be identified, new strategies imagined, and new weapons devised.

...

(Emphasis King's) In searching for a common enemy against whom we can unite, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famines and the like, would fit the bill. ... But in designating these dangers as the enemy, we fall into the trap [of] mistaking symptoms for causes. All these dangers are caused by *human* intervention in natural processes, and it is only through changed attitudes and behaviour that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself.

The properly brainwashed reader will try to double-think around the last quote. King's words should be taken literally. The oligarchs need some kind of an excuse to maintain control and to set up world government, and they have opted for the nebulous spectres of terrorism and climate change. Their enemy is humanity itself.

Democracy is not a panacea. It cannot organize everything and it is unaware of its own limits. These facts must be faced squarely, sacrilegious though this may sound. In its present form, democracy is no longer well-suited for the tasks ahead.

Since "democracy" cannot cope with the "limits to growth," King calls, in effect, for the establishment of a technocratic world government, replete with an energy-credit based currency, conservationist fanaticism, population control, permanent indoctrination, and the rest of it. Who would be in charge of such a utopia? Why, who else but the members of the Club of Rome!

Let us conclude this section with the wisdom of Mikhail Gorbachev (1931-), who, along with the lush Yeltsin (1931-2007) and the murderous gaggle of neo-liberal economists and various other thugs, managed to destroy Russia in less than a decade. Where Napoleon and Hitler failed, Gorbachev and Yeltsin - surely puppets or brainwash jobs the both of them - succeeded.

From: Mikhail Gorbachev's *The Search For a New Beginning: Developing a New Civilization*

(emphasis Gorby's)

(p.13) *Between the old order and the new one lies a period of transition that we must go*

¹⁸See the 1997 film *Wag The Dog*. Note that the film was released a week *before* the Lewinski scandal broke.

through...

(p.27) The future is challenging us. But humanity is capable of meeting the challenge. *We will meet the challenge if we become aware of the world's unity, of humankind's common destiny,* and of the responsibility of every one of us for the preservation of life on Earth.

(p.33) *The greening of politics is a new view of the problem of consumption and its rationalization.* The raising of people's living standards must not be done at the cost of exhausting nature.

Among the platitudes in Gorbachev's tiny oeuvre one discerns, vaguely, because the whole "book" is vague, the ideas of 1) world unity, and 2) the promotion of some type of Gaia-type religion. The Gaia-type religion is in fact the New Age religion that has been heavily promoted since the '70s. Many people suffer from the delusion that "consumers" drive production, or that the viewers of television dictate the specifics of television programming. This is absurd. In the world of advertisement and corporate media control, the ones who own the means of production and mass communication set the tone. Oprah does not babble New Age nonsense because the New Age is popular - on the contrary, people flock to the New Age cult, because it is promoted by people like Oprah. Deepak Chopra's drivel is sold not because it is any good, but because the oligarchs want people to read Chopra. Put a book at the front of the book-store, have the *NYT* and *Time* publish rave reviews, and the book will sell. Put certain music on MTV, and the young will scuffle to buy records. This, unfortunately, is how things work in our world. We look at the New Age Cult in detail later.

3.3.6 *Agenda 21* and Other Recent Developments

The journalist James Dellingpole has recently published a book on the Malthusian origins of the environmental movement: *Watermelons* (2011). I have not yet read the work, but judging by Dellingpole's articles, he covers much the same matters as we do here - but, likely, in greater detail.

In 1992, the UN published the landmark document *Agenda 21*, which, in effect, comprises the UN programme for the future. The man behind *Agenda 21* was Maurice Strong (1929-). Who is Maurice Strong? The man's background is murky, but it emerges that he established a connection with the Rockefeller syndicate in 1947 at the age of 18, when he worked as a doorman (or rather, security officer) at the UN. At that time Strong was already a member of the Secretariat of the United Nations in New York, and lived with Noah Monod, the treasurer of the UN. It looks like Strong was groomed from an early age for service in the employ of the Rockefeller gang. Strong's connections ensured his spectacular success in business and government. By the 1970s, Strong was a major industrialist. In 1976 Pierre Trudeau gave Strong Petro-Canada. Both men were members of the Club of Rome. Strong held other paramount positions in the structure of the Canadian government - he is "Chairman of the Canada Development Investment Corporation, the holding company for some of Canadas principal government-owned corporations" (Wikipedia) and a member of the Royal Society of Canada. Since at least the 1970s, Strong has been a major influence in the UN. For a time, Strong acted as the personal handler ("under-secretary general") of Kofi Annan. Strong is also one of the key figures behind the global warming farce. Strong is a New Age Gaia-loving kook - perhaps in earnest, perhaps for show. In fact, the only temple in the UN Building is a New Age temple.

To sum up, *Agenda 21* was concocted under the jurisdiction of a man who is 1) a Rockefeller agent, 2) a member of the Club of Rome (i.e. Malthus Central), 3) a big industrialist, 4) a pre-eminent political figure in Canada. Remember that the Rockefellers 1) are eugenicists, 2) literally founded both the UN and the Club of Rome, 3) are major players in the crucial financial and oil industries.

The UN pencil-pushers and grey men made sure to write *Agenda 21* in immaculate double-speak. Vague and full of pleasant-sounding euphemisms, the document submits to proper analysis only

through the prism of a historical investigation of the type we have just, though perfunctorily, conducted. We object to the anti-intellectual poison of the post-modernist movement, which insists on reading documents in vacuum, as if ideological and historical considerations are of no consequence. Well-meaning people must absolutely make sure to investigate the roots of the movements and creeds that they espouse, or risk becoming useful idiots.

Agenda 21, which is little more than the UN sanitized version of *The Limits to Growth* implemented as a plan for action, amounts to the following points:

- Everything must be "sustainable;" the document never clearly defines the meaning of the word "sustainable" - but we know it means "Malthusian."
- Chapter 2 explains that Globaloney, neo-liberalism, and the Washington Consensus are the official UN policy for the world economy. The UN approves of good slaves: (2.29) "The actions of low-income countries with substantial debt burdens which continue, at great cost, to service their debt and safeguard their creditworthiness are commended."
- Chapter 3 focuses on poverty, with the proviso that "Poverty is a complex multidimensional problem with origins in both the national and international domains. No uniform solution can be found for global application." I know a solution! How about the oligarchy stops the neo-liberal neo-colonialism and lets the "developing" nations finally develop? The UN only allows "sustainable" development, which means no development, or undevelopment. "Sustainable" development means buying expensive solar panels, which barely provide trickles of electricity.
- Throughout the document, the UN preaches its favourite mantra of promoting "women's rights." This is another undefined concept. In theory, women's rights means being nice to women - silly, but that's what it means. And I am all for a quasi-chivalric - that is, kind and respectful rather than worshipful and paternalistic - attitude toward women. Sadly, in practice, "women's rights" is a cover phrase for the promotion of birth control, for the forcing of women into the wage market, for breaking up the family, and for the brainwashing of women. In general, women are considered to be more amenable (than men) to brainwashing. Adam Weishaupt explicitly talked about this in the 18th century. The language used in *Agenda 21* in regard to women is similar to the language one sees in *NSM200*.
- Chapter 4 explains that consumption is bad and that in the long run the people in the West will have to consume less.
- Chapter 5 states in veiled terms that population is bad.
- Chapter 6 deals with health issues, with an accent on vaccines.
- Chapter 7 deals with "human settlement." The paper assumes that more and more people will be living in the large cities. We find again a call for technocracy: (7.23) "Developing countries should, with appropriate international assistance, consider focusing on training and developing a cadre of urban managers, technicians, administrators and other relevant stakeholders who can successfully manage environmentally sound urban development and growth and are equipped with the skills necessary to analyse and adapt the innovative experiences of other cities. For this purpose, the full range of training methods - from formal education to the use of the mass media - should be utilized, as well as the "learning by doing" option." Point 7.52 argues for the gradual transition from private means of transportation (personal automobiles) to public or non-motorized means of transportation.
- Chapter 8 announces that the implementation of *Agenda 21* will radically change human society: (8.2) "Prevailing systems for decision-making in many countries tend to separate economic, social and environmental factors at the policy, planning and management levels. This influences the actions of all groups in society, including Governments, industry and individuals, and

has important implications for the efficiency and sustainability of development. An adjustment or even a fundamental reshaping of decision-making, in the light of country-specific conditions, may be necessary if environment and development is to be put at the centre of economic and political decision-making, in effect achieving a full integration of these factors.”

- Chapter 9 promotes ”green” energy and so on. We should note here that those deluded socialists who pursue *Agenda 21*-type goals with the idea of sabotaging the corporations are wasting their time. The oligarchs, being the authors of *Agenda 21*, know exactly what they are doing. Do not worry about them. As long as they can get you to do your 40 hours a week and pay your taxes, they will find ways to fleece you. Do you think that they care in any way if their profits come from oil or from ”green” energy sources? A few minor big businessmen who do not belong to the club will suffer, but so much for the better. They will be bought out. One other argument in favour of ill-understood environmentalism that I have encountered is the idea that since big business is against global warming and ”sustainability”, we should be for the latter two. In reality, regardless of what they say, the biggest ”businessmen” are the authors of global warming and sustainability. They know what they are doing.
- Chapters 10-13 deal with the ”preservation” of the planet. The plan amounts to the implementations of tight systems of control over the entire planet. In conjunction with the WWF protected zones, the UN intends to cordon off much Earth, concentrate the population inside the cities, and get on with the business of depopulation. This is already happening, as a few online searches will show.¹⁹ For example, see *The New American’s* February 2011 article *Your Hometown & the United Nations Agenda 21*.²⁰
- The next few chapters promote bio-engineering and GMOs. The UN loves GMOs, which is hardly a surprise, since the people who developed the GMOs (yep, the long tentacles of the Rockefellers dangle out of this one as well) are the people who own the UN.
- Chapter 18 deals with water and the conservation of water. This means the privatization and appropriation of water. In an uncharacteristic slip, the authors write: (18.8, emphasis mine) ”In developing and using water resources, priority has to be given to the satisfaction of basic needs and the safeguarding of ecosystems. Beyond these requirements, however, *water users should be charged appropriately.*”
- One major theme of *Agenda 21* is the shrill insistence on the promulgation of massive worldwide pro-”sustainability” brainwashing programs. The observant reader will have noticed that lately the ”sustainability” indoctrination has entered into higher gears. We also note in passing that one can not say ”sustainability” without saying ”stain.”
- In chapters 27-31 the authors urge for the involvement of every level of society into the implementation of *Agenda 21*. Business and the NGOs are to be given a heavy share of responsibility. Sure, let the wolves guard the herd - what could possibly go wrong? The authors also want to advance sustainability both from the federal level, and from the local level - as above, so below. Moreover, attacking the issue from the local level bypasses and therefore undermines the sovereignty of the national governments. Unsurprisingly, we read that the UN ought to have more clout: (38.8.d) ”[It is our objective] To encourage interaction and cooperation between the United Nations system and other intergovernmental and non-governmental subregional, regional and global institutions and non-governmental organizations in the field of environment and development.”

¹⁹Look up the series of documents entitled *United Nations List of Protected Areas*. From the 2003 edition - Region / Percentage of area ”protected:” Australia and New Zealand - 39.8; North Africa and Middle East - 62; North America - 36.7; etc.

²⁰<http://thenewamerican.com/tech-mainmenu-30/environment/6235-your-hometown-a-the-united-nations-agenda-21>, accessed October 29, 2011

- (32.14.a) "Governments should, in the light of each country's specific situation: Create the institutional and legal mechanisms to ensure effective land tenure to farmers. The absence of legislation indicating land rights has been an obstacle in taking action against land degradation in many farming communities in developing countries." In other words, all land should be put out on the market, so that the bankers or their UN fronts can "buy" the whole planet with the bankers' magically created money.

The UN brags that "over 178" nations, including the United States under Clinton, have adopted *Agenda 21* as official policy.

Follow some illustrative quotes from Maurice Strong's opening speech at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the birthplace of *Agenda 21*. We are particularly interested in Strong's definition of sustainability.

The concentration of population growth in developing countries and economic growth in the industrialized countries has deepened, creating imbalances which are unsustainable, either in environmental or economic terms.

...

...overall, this growth [i.e. population growth] cannot continue. Population must be stabilized, and rapidly.

...

The same processes of economic growth which have produced such unprecedented levels of wealth and power for the rich minority and hopes of a better life for everyone have also given rise to the risks and imbalances that now threaten the future of rich and poor alike. This growth model, and the patterns of production and consumption which have accompanied it, is not sustainable for the rich; nor can it be replicated by the poor.

...

Perhaps the most important common ground we must arrive at in Rio is the understanding that we are all in this together. No place on the planet can remain an island of affluence in a sea of misery. We're either going to save the whole world or no-one will be saved. We must from here on in all go down the same path. One country cannot stabilize its climate in isolation. No country can unilaterally preserve its biodiversity.

In perusing Strong's website²¹, we encounter articles with interesting titles such as: *Let China buy Detroit, Making the UN more businesslike, Climate crisis – a radical change needed by governments*. From Strong's Rio closing speech:

The New World Order, Mr. President, must unite us all in a global partnership which, of course, has to respect national sovereignty as a basic tenet, but must also recognize the transcending sovereignty of nature, of our only one Earth.

A New World Order indeed! And why should the unelected Maurice Strong wield such colossal power in both Canada and the United Nations? Is that democracy? And what right has Maurice Strong, the Chairman of Petro-Canada, the man who made his money from the notorious oil sands of Alberta, to talk about "sustainability"?

Strong is the purveyor of the Platonic Big Lie. The manufactured - and in some instances simply imagined - worldwide Malthusian environmental crisis is the twin brother of the fraudulent terrorist threat. Gaia's Revenge and terrorism are but the tools for the implementation of the Big Plan, the concomitant parts of which are the utopian technocratic all-powerful world government, and the Malthusian depopulation of the planet.

The criminally insane John Holdren (1944-) was one of Bill Clinton's science advisors, and is the

²¹<http://www.mauricestrong.net/articles/articles/>, October 29, 2011

current White House "science czar" ("advisor to the President for Science and Technology"). Holdren, along with his fellow lunatics Anne and Paul Ehrlich (members of the Club of Rome), penned the 1978 thousand-page monstrosity *Ecoscience*. And we quote:²²

(p.786) One way to carry out this disapproval might be to insist that all illegitimate babies be put up for adoption especially those born to minors, who generally are not capable of caring properly for a child alone. If a single mother really wished to keep her baby, she might be obliged to go through adoption proceedings and demonstrate her ability to support and care for it. Adoption proceedings probably should remain more difficult for single people than for married couples, in recognition of the relative difficulty of raising children alone. It would even be possible to require pregnant single women to marry or have abortions, perhaps as an alternative to placement for adoption, depending on the society.

...

(p.787) A program of sterilizing women after their second or third child, despite the relatively greater difficulty of the operation than vasectomy, might be easier to implement than trying to sterilize men. This of course would be feasible only in countries where the majority of births are medically assisted. Unfortunately, such a program therefore is not practical for most less developed countries (although in China mothers of three children are commonly "expected" to undergo sterilization).

The development of a long-term sterilizing capsule that could be implanted under the skin and removed when pregnancy is desired opens additional possibilities for coercive fertility control. The capsule could be implanted at puberty and might be removable, with official permission, for a limited number of births. No capsule that would last that long (30 years or more) has yet been developed, but it is technically within the realm of possibility.

...

Adding a sterilant to drinking water or staple foods is a suggestion that seems to horrify people more than most proposals for involuntary fertility control.

...

(p.837) Indeed, it has been concluded that compulsory population-control laws, even including laws requiring compulsory abortion, could be sustained under the existing Constitution if the population crisis became sufficiently severe to endanger the society.

...

(p.838, Holdren's emphasis) If some individuals contribute to general social deterioration by overproducing children, and if the need is compelling, they can be required by law to exercise reproductive responsibility - just as they can be required to exercise responsibility in their resourceconsumption patterns - *providing they are not denied equal protection*. Individual rights must be balanced against the power of the government to control human reproduction. Some people - respected legislators, judges, and lawyers included - have viewed the right to have children as a fundamental and inalienable right. Yet neither the Declaration of Independence nor the Constitution mentions a right to reproduce. Nor does the UN Charter describe such a right, although a resolution of the United Nations affirms the "right *responsibly* to choose" the number and spacing of children (our [Holdren's] emphasis).

...

(p.917) If this [convincing humans not to fight each other] could be accomplished, security might be provided by an armed international organization, a global analogue of a police force. Many people have recognized this as a goal, but the way to reach it remains obscure in a world where factionalism seems, if anything, to be increasing. The first step

²²Thanks to Zombietime: http://zombietime.com/john_holdren/, accessed October 29, 2011; I have verified Holdren's quotes from the original source.

necessarily involves partial surrender of sovereignty to an international organization. But it seems probable that, as long as most people fail to comprehend the magnitude of the danger, that step will be impossible. ...

(p. 942) **Toward a Planetary Regime**

International attempts to tackle global problems - or at least to start a dialogue among nations - have proliferated in recent years. ... Superficially, it usually appears that such conferences do little more than highlight the political differences between rich and poor countries ... But an important step often is to obtain agreement that a problem exists, first of all, and, second, that international action is appropriate and necessary. ... Perhaps those agencies, combined with UNEP and the United Nations population agencies, might eventually be developed into a Planetary Regime - sort of an international superagency for population, resources, and environment. Such a comprehensive Planetary Regime could control the development, administration, conservation, and distribution of all natural resources, renewable or nonrenewable, at least insofar as international implications exist. ... The Regime might also be a logical central agency for regulating all international trade, perhaps including assistance from DCs to LDCs, and including all food on the international market.

The Planetary Regime might be given responsibility for determining the optimum population for the world and for each region and for arbitrating various countries' shares within their regional limits. Control of population size might remain the responsibility of each government, but the Regime should have some power to enforce the agreed limits.

Holdren has "distanced himself" from what he wrote thirty years ago in an article for the *Washington Post*. Too late, Holdren, you nut! Except that he did not get fired and he is still the science czar of the USA (as of late 2011 - early 2012). This alone should be enough to ring the alarm bell in any thinking person's head.

In 1968, Paul Ehrlich (1932-) published the book *The Population Bomb*. From Wikipedia: "It warned of the mass starvation of humans in the 1970s and 1980s due to overpopulation, as well as other major societal upheavals, and advocated immediate action to limit population growth." And:

Early editions of *The Population Bomb* began with the statement:

The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970s hundreds of millions of people will starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now. At this late date nothing can prevent a substantial increase in the world death rate...

Wrong, Ehrlich! Wrong like the idiot Malthus! Instead of being lampooned as a loon, Ehrlich went on to have a long and prestigious career. In particular, he is in charge of Stanford's "Population Studies" outfit.

From *The London Sunday Times*, May 24, 2009, News, Page 30, John Harlow's article *Billionaire club in bid to curb overpopulation*:

SOME of America's leading billionaires have met secretly to consider how their wealth could be used to slow the growth of the world's population and speed up improvements in health and education.

The philanthropists who attended a summit convened on the initiative of Bill Gates, the Microsoft co-founder, discussed joining forces to overcome political and religious obstacles to change.

Described as the Good Club by one insider it included David Rockefeller Jr, the patriarch of America's wealthiest dynasty, Warren Buffett and George Soros, the financiers, Michael

Bloomberg, the mayor of New York, and the media moguls Ted Turner and Oprah Winfrey, [and Patricia Stonesifer, the former chief executive of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation].

...

They gathered at the home of Sir Paul Nurse, a British Nobel prize biochemist and president of the private Rockefeller University, in Manhattan on May 5. The informal afternoon session was so discreet that some of the billionaires' aides were told they were at "security briefings".

Stacy Palmer, editor of the Chronicle of Philanthropy, said the summit was unprecedented.

...

Taking their cue from Gates they agreed that overpopulation was a priority.

...

Another guest said there was "nothing as crude as a vote" but a consensus emerged that they would back a strategy in which population growth would be tackled as a potentially disastrous environmental, social and industrial threat.

"This is something so nightmarish that everyone in this group agreed it needs big-brain answers," said the guest. "They need to be independent of government agencies, which are unable to head off the disaster we all see looming."

Why all the secrecy? "They wanted to speak rich to rich without worrying anything they said would end up in the newspapers, painting them as an alternative world government," he said.

Change - toward what?

From Bill Gates's TED Talks (available online): *Bill Gates on energy: Innovating to zero!* and *Bill Gates on mosquitos, malaria and education:*²³

I'm going to talk today about energy and climate [i.e. Malthusianism]. And that might seem a bit surprising because my full-time work at the foundation is mostly about vaccines and seeds [GMOs], about the things that we need to invent and deliver to help the poorest two billion live better lives. But energy and climate are extremely important to these people, in fact, more important than to anyone else on the planet.

...

But, as we make [energy] cheaper - ... - we need to meet a new constraint, and that constraint has to do with CO2.

Gates then explains that CO2 is very bad and that unless we bring CO2 emissions to near zero, we are all doomed. We will look at the details of the global warming swindle later. No CO2 means no industry; and in fact it means no humans, because humans emit CO2 when they breathe.

Now, we put out a lot of carbon dioxide every year, over 26 billion tons. For each American, it's about 20 tons. For people in poor countries, it's less than one ton. It's an average of about five tons for everyone on the planet. And, somehow, we have to make changes that will bring that down to zero.

...

This equation has four factors. A little bit of multiplication. So, you've got a thing on the left, CO2, that you want to get to zero, and that's going to be based on the number of people, the services each person's using on average, the energy on average for each service, and the CO2 being put out per unit of energy. So, let's look at each one of these and see how we can get this down to zero. Probably, one of these numbers is going to have to get pretty near to zero.

²³Thanks to William Engdahl for pointing out Gates's slip.

(Emphasis mine.) First we've got population. Now, the world today has 6.8 billion people. That's headed up to about nine billion. Now, **if we do a really great job on new vaccines**, health care, reproductive health services, **we could lower that by**, perhaps, 10 or 15 percent.

The above is from Gates's first talk. The last sentence could have come right out of *NSM200*. The second talk concerns vaccines. Gates mentions that, though he is a college dropout, he is worried about the number of high school dropouts in America and will do his utmost to help those people finish their indoctrination. The GMO industry is totally Malthusian - see Engdahl's *Seeds of Destruction*.

Gates's father served on the board of the eugenicist front Planned Parenthood. A William Gates was a member of the American Eugenics Society - he is either the father or the grandfather of the current iteration of Gates. The Microsoft founder is W.G.III (1955-).

Buffett (1930-) is Gates's buddy and fellow "philanthropist."

On April 1 2008, in an interview with Charlie Rose, Ted Turner (1938-) hysterically called for the implementation of a worldwide one or two-child policy. He commended China's population policy. For Turner, there are too many people on the planet, and unless humanity depopulates, civilization, and indeed the very planetary eco-structure, will collapse. In a July 23, 2004 interview with Rose, Turner complained that Americans consume too much. Turner gave the UN one billion dollars to help the UN cope with the population crisis. There is a quote from a 1996 interview with Audubon Magazine floating around, in which Turner says that "a world population of 250-300 million would be ideal." I have not been able to verify the quote, but I suspect it is genuine. Turner has five children. He explains that when he had his children, the population problem was not as pressing. Turner is (or was for a time) the largest land-holder in the United States.

George Soros (1930-) is a notorious hedge fund corsair and color revolutionary and is probably indirectly responsible for the deaths of, in all likelihood, millions.

Rockefeller we have met and will continue to meet.

Paul Nurse (1949-) is the current President of the Royal Society, a top geneticist, and a winner of the Noble Priz(c?)e. He is the President of the New York Rockefeller University, a major and prestigious eugenicist haunt. Nurse is an outspoken supporter of Darwinism and global warming.

Patty Stonesifer (1956-) was one of *Time*'s 1996 twenty-five most influential people in America. Today, at the age of about 55, she is in charge of the Smithsonian. Her husband is the media figure and Rhodes Scholar Michael Kinsley.

All of the attendees were opulently wealthy.

In June 1979, a person identified by a Rosicrucian pseudonym ordered the construction of the Georgia Guidestones. The massive granite Guidestones propound the following ten principles in the major languages of the world:

1. Maintain humanity under 500,000,000 in perpetual balance with nature.
2. Guide reproduction wisely - improving fitness and diversity.
3. Unite humanity with a living new language.
4. Rule passion - faith - tradition - and all things with tempered reason.
5. Protect people and nations with fair laws and just courts.
6. Let all nations rule internally resolving external disputes in a world court.
7. Avoid petty laws and useless officials.
8. Balance personal rights with social duties.
9. Prize truth - beauty - love - seeking harmony with the infinite.
10. Be not a cancer on the earth - Leave room for nature - Leave room for nature.

It is suspected that Ted Turner either knows the man behind the stones, or is that man himself.

3.3.7 *The Legacy of Malthus*

To add hard data to the findings heretofore presented, follows a selection of figures from Allan Chase's masterwork *The Legacy of Malthus* (1980).

From Ch.1 (p. 16 of my copy):

Most of the compulsory state laws were based on the Model Eugenical Sterilization Law drafted primarily by Harry H. Laughlin, superintendent of Davenport's Eugenics Record Office and co-editor of the *Eugenical News*. The model gelding bill was written some years before it was published in Laughlin's book *Eugenical Sterilization in the United States* in 1922, at which time he was also the official Expert Eugenics Agent of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. The Model Eugenical Sterilization Law called for every state to appoint a State Eugenist, who would direct the compulsory sterilization of all people he judged to be members of the "socially inadequate classes."

According to the model law, "the socially inadequate classes, *regardless of etiology or prognosis*, are the following: (1) Feeble-minded; (2) Insane (including the psychopathic); (3) Criminalistic (including the delinquent and wayward); (4) Epileptic; (5) Inebriate (including drug-habitues); (6) Dis-eased (including the *tuberculous*, the syphilitic, the leprous, and others with chronic, *infectious*, and legally segregable diseases); (7) Blind (including those with seriously impaired vision); (8) Deaf (including those with seriously impaired hearing); (9) Deformed (including the crippled); and (10) Dependent (including *orphans*, ne'er-do-wells, the *homeless*, tramps, and *paupers*)" (italics added [by Chase]). Not every state law included all of these conditions as reasons for eugenic sterilization, but all of them included epilepsy, "feble-mindedness," and "criminality" among the offenses calling for forced sterilization. Between 1907 and 1964, a total of 63,678 people suffered compulsory sterilization in the thirty states and one colony that had passed such laws. Of this number, 33,374, or 52.4 percent of the total, were sterilized against their will for being adjudged feeble-minded or mentally retarded, which in most of these states was defined as having an IQ test score of 70 or lower. These victims of Galton's obsessive fantasies represented, however, the smallest part of the actual number of Americans who have in this century been subjected to forced eugenic sterilization operations by state and federal agencies.'

As Federal District Judge Gerhard Gesell declared in 1974 in a case brought on behalf of poor victims of involuntary sterilization performed in hospitals and clinics participating in federally funded family-planning programs alone: "Over the last few years, an estimated 100,000 to 150,000 low-income persons have been sterilized annually under federally funded programs."

This, of course, equals the rates at which poor people were subjected to compulsory sterilization in Nazi Germany, where two million Germans were sterilized as social inadequates during the twelve years of the Third Reich. The German Sterilization Act of 1933 was derived quite openly from Laughlin's Model Eugenical Sterilization Law.

Harry H. Laughlin (1880-1943) was the director of the Eugenics Record Office between 1910 and 1939 (when Adolf's enthusiasm ruined the whole gig). The ERO sometimes goes by the name of Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory. Laughlin found support from a Harriman, a Kellogg, and the Carnegie Institution of Washington. He earned a Princeton PhD in 1917. In 1937, Laughlin founded the Pioneer Fund foundation, which is still in business today. The 1994 attempt at Galtonistic "IQ" revivalism, *The Bell Curve*, authored by Richard J. Herrnstein of Harvard and the "libertarian" MIT-doctorate holder Charles Murray, drew on Pioneer Fund "research."

To see where eugenics went after the war, it should suffice to note that one John Marshall Harlan II (1899-1971) was a one time Pioneer Fund president, and an Eisenhower Supreme Court "Justice."

The financier of this Pioneer Fund was Wickliffe Preston Draper (1891-1972), a Boston Brahmin heir.

The reader is welcome to peruse available lists of Pioneer Fund associates should he want to discover the names of other influential eugenics enthusiasts, old and new.

As for Haughlin, the man discovered that he was a victim of epilepsy. Whether he sterilized himself or not, his wife bore him no children in 40 years of marriage.

Chase continues to write that:

Although Congress has been insistent that all family planning programs function on a purely voluntary basis, there is uncontroverted evidence in the record that minors and other incompetents have been sterilized with federal funds and that an indefinite number of *poor people have been improperly coerced into accepting a sterilization operation under the threat that various federally supported welfare benefits would be withdrawn unless they submitted to irreversible sterilization.* Patients re-ceiving Medicaid assistance at childbirth are evidently the most frequent targets of this pressure, as the experience of plaintiffs Waters and Walker illustrate. Mrs. Waters was actually refused medical assistance by her attending physician unless she submitted to a tubal ligation after the birth. [Italics added by Chase.]

Judge Gesell, who knows his history well, observed that "the dividing line between family planning and eugenics is murky," and ruled that the inadequate provisions to protect patients are "both illegal and arbitrary be-cause they authorize involuntary sterilizations, without statutory or constitutional justification."

Follow some numbers.

The compulsory sterilizations denounced by Judge Gesell do not begin to include all of the involuntary gonadal surgery presently being committed against equally poor people by nonfederal state and voluntary agencies. In 1974, the Association for Voluntary Sterilization, Inc., estimated that 936,000 American people - 538,000 (57 percent) males, and 398,000 females - had been surgically sterilized during 1973. This represented a drop of 166,000 from the total of 1,102,000 sterilizations in 1972 - but a jump of 13 percent in the *estimated* number of females sterilized. If what a high government official involved in these matters told me off the record proves correct, possibly another 250,000 sterilizations are disguised in the hospital records as hysterectomies in which female sterilization is an unavoidable side effect.

The American population in 1970 was about 200 million souls. Some proportion of those people were not in child-bearing age. Moreover, sterilizing one man or woman can knock a whole couple out of the game. The reader can come up with his own heuristic for the damage done.

I stress that as far as I am concerned, forced sterilization is not much better than murder, rape, and forced lobotomy. Forced sterilization should be a capital crime.

The numbers above, shocking as they are, constitute under-estimates.

(Still Ch. 1) The officially reported hospital sterilization operations represent about half of the actual sterilizations performed each year in America. Most vasectomies - male sterilizations - are performed under local anesthesia in doctors' offices, rather than in hospital operating rooms.

The actual number of Americans who are each year sterilized voluntarily, or under threats of government reprisals, is not known. In his 1973 annual report, Dr. H. Curtis Wood, Jr., the medical consultant for the Association for Voluntary Sterilization, Inc., estimated that, between 1960 and 1972, "the increase in sterilizations in the United States [was]

from around 100,000 per year to 1 or possibly even 2 million a year.” In 1974, Robert E. McGarrah, Jr., the attorney for the Public Citizen’s Health Research Council of Washington, D.C., wrote that “at present rates, a total of two million people undergo surgical sterilization each year and the federal government alone is estimated/ to have paid for 100,000-150,000 low income sterilizations annually.”

”Voluntary sterilization” is an obvious fraud. Would you, reader, undergo ”voluntarily” sterilization? Would any sane, strong person? ”Voluntary sterilization” is double-speak for sterilization by blackmail and deceit. Hence,

Not all sterilizations performed in the United States are involuntary. In 1974, federal agencies estimated, according to *The New York Times*, that ”at least one American couple in six in the main child-bearing years - age 20 to 39 - has had a sterilization operation” for purposes of contraception. On the other hand, a survey of surgical sterilizations in American and Canadian teaching hospitals published in 1970 by Johan W. Eliot and his associates showed that what is known in obstetrical circles as the ”Package Deal” - a variation of the form of compulsory sterilization denounced by Judge Gesell in the cases of ”plaintiffs Waters and Walker” - is now endemic in North American hospitals. As Eliot et al. described it: ”Some women desiring an abortion *were required to have simultaneous sterilization as a condition of approval of the abortion* in from one-third to two-thirds of these teaching hospitals in different regions of the country. This practice was most common in the Mountain States, the Far West, and Canada, and lowest in New England and the Plains States. In all, 53.6 percent of teaching hospitals made this requirement for some of their patients.”

Betty Sarvis and Hyman Rodman, commenting on the above statement in their book *The Abortion Controversy* (1973), write: ”Considering the illegality of the requirement, it is likely that an even higher percentage of hospitals sometimes insist upon sterilization as a condition of abortion... . The large number of hospitals acknowledging that they sometimes practice this form of compulsory sterilization indicates that it is not uncommon and that it has been thoroughly rationalized within the medical profession.”

Much of this was covered by Medicaid. The public paid for its own sterilizations and infanticides. Chase observes that ”From all present information, it is not unreasonable to fear that upward of half of the more than one million sterilization operations performed upon American men and women yearly are quite possibly involuntary.”

All of this lunacy is directly traceable to Galton, Darwin, Malthus, and their opulent admirers on both sides of Atlantic. Moreover, it can not be stressed enough, that:

(Still Ch.1, p. 21, emphasis Chase’s;) Nor were these merely the ravings of some lunatic fringe of the greater society. Drs. Robie and Mallett and Sadler spoke for the *majority* of the educated people of this country in 1932. Two generations of the teaching of Social Darwinism and eugenics as legitimate sciences in most leading American universities had, by 1932, turned Galton’s gonadal obsession into the political solution of choice for thousands of *educated* Americans, many of them in high political, editorial, and academic office. Many of the college graduates of that era who had been thoroughly brainwashed by such ”science” during the critical years in which their lifelong value systems had been formed were, evidently, also the teachers of the succeeding generations of legislators, opinion molders - and voting citizens.

”Educated” indeed. And so, ”A 1972 study made by the Planned Parenthood - World Population Society showed that, in different urban and rural regions of the country, from 30 to 42[?] percent of all doctors polled advocated that mothers on welfare who be-came pregnant should be forced to accept sterilization as a condition of being allowed to remain on the public assistance rolls.”

These ”doctors,” remember, are supposed to do no harm - *to their patents specifically*. Terrifyingly,

In this belief the doctors as a group were in accord with the thinking of the general public.

In 1965, for example, some thirty-three years after Drs. Mallett ... and Sadler had called for the sterilization of the poor, the unemployed, and the unfortunate, the national Gallup Poll put the following question to Americans from coast to coast: "Sometimes unwed mothers on relief continue to have illegitimate children and get relief money for each new child born. What do you think should be done in the case of these women? How about the children?" One in every five Americans replied that the solution was to sterilize[?] the women.

By 1971, the editors of the Philadelphia Inquirer, in the wake of the public impact of the IQ test score and genetic enslavement claims of Professor Arthur R. Jensen, conducted a phone poll on the question: "Should the U.S. Encourage Sterilization among Low I.Q. Groups?" A whopping 69.2 percent of the Philadelphians polled favored the forced sterilization of fellow Americans with low IQ test scores.

Such is the power of brainwashing.

It is remarkable that people tend to always assume that they are not the ones who are going to be sterilized, or, shall we say, depopulated. They always assume that the other fellow will bear the pain! Why, people, why do you think that you are so special? Do you really think that if Ted Turner's dream of decreasing the world population to, say, 1 billion, turns into reality, you and your children will be spared?

Such is the power of brainwashing! One suspects that if some television network inaugurates a Suicide Reality Show, people will demand the legislation of suicide booths on street corners.

As Chase repeatedly points out, both "eugenics" and "Social Darwinism" have been shown, again and again, to be pseudo-science.

It is interesting that one of the early American "prophets" of eugenics - Charles Davenport (1866-1944) - once delivered an address called (p. 161) "Eugenics as a Religion." A religion, eugenics is. A cult of murder and death. Like certain other false creeds, however, eugenics tries to pass itself as a "science."

By the way, the SAT tests were an outgrowth of the WWI ridiculous IQ tests, which tested illiterate Americans and newly-arrived immigrants, and concluded that the bulk of the American population will never surpass the 14 year old mental level. The WWI "Alpha Test" asked questions related to baseball and advertisement. Follow a few examples:

(Ch. 10, p. 245)

Five hundred is played with: *rackets pins cards dice*

The most prominent industry of *Gloucester* is: *fishing packing brewing automobiles*

Sapphires are usually: *blue red green yellow*

The *Rhode Island Red* is a kind of: *horse granite cattle fowl*

Christie Mathewson is famous as a: *writer artist baseball player comedian*

"*There's a reason*" is an "ad" for a: *drink revolver flour cleanser*

Cornell University is at: *Ithaca Cambridge Annapolis New Haven*

Etc. This does not test "intelligence," but one's knowledge of trivia. "Rhode Island Red" - who cares? The "test" checks whether or not one is a good corporate American citizen, who is just "smart" enough to understand the advertisements.

And this wonderful test inspired the SAT:

A Brief History of SAT²⁴

²⁴<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/sats/where/history.html>, accessed Jan 21, 2012.

PBS Frontline

During the First World War, Robert Yerkes, a leading member of the new IQ testing movement, persuaded the U.S. Army to let him test all recruits for intelligence. This test - the Army Alpha - was the first mass administered IQ test. One of Yerkes' assistants was a young psychologist named Carl Brigham, who taught at Princeton.

After the war, Brigham began adapting the Army Alpha (mainly by making it more difficult) for use as a college admissions test. It was first administered experimentally to a few thousand college applicants in 1926.

In 1933, James Bryant Conant, on becoming president of Harvard, decided to start a new scholarship program for academically gifted boys who did not come from the Eastern boarding schools that were the regular suppliers of Harvard's students. He gave Henry Chauncey, an assistant dean at Harvard, the task of finding a test to evaluate candidates for these scholarships. Chauncey met Carl Brigham, and came back to Conant with the recommendation that he use the SAT. Conant liked the test because he thought it measured pure intelligence, regardless of the quality of the taker's high school education. In 1938 Chauncey talked all the member schools of the College Board into using the SAT as a uniform exam, but only for scholarship applicants. In 1942, because of the war, all the pre-existing College Board admissions tests were abolished, so the SAT became the test for all applicants. In 1944, under contract to the Army and the Navy, Chauncey administered the SAT to more than 300,000 people all over the country on a single day. In 1948 the Educational Testing Service was chartered and the SAT was on its way to becoming the basic college admissions device for millions.

The test has changed over the years, but not completely.

Conant was the president of Harvard and a member of the secret-societies gang we will shortly look at. He was also an admirer of the Nazis. Yerkes was an unabashed eugenicist. So was Brigham, the 1923-1926 Chairman of the highly influential College Board.

That is where the SAT comes from. The SAT is as demented as the Alpha Test was, and measures about as much.

(*Tragedy & Hope*, Quigley, p. 1274, emphasis mine) In his farewell report the Chairman of Harvard's Admissions Committee, Wilbur Bender, summed up the problem this way:

"The student who ranks first in his class may be genuinely brilliant or he may be a compulsive worker or the instrument of domineering parents' ambitions or a conformist or a self-centered careerist who has shrewdly calculated his teachers' prejudices and expectations and discovered how to regurgitate efficiently what they want. Or he may have focused narrowly on grade-getting as compensation for his inadequacies in other areas, because he lacks other interests or talents or lacks passion and warmth or normal healthy instincts or is afraid of life. The top high school student is often, frankly, a pretty dull and bloodless, or peculiar fellow. The adolescent with wide-ranging curiosity and stubborn independence, with a vivid imagination and desire to explore fascinating bypaths, to follow his own interests, to contemplate, to read the unrequired books, the boy filled with sheer love of life and exuberance, may well seem to his teachers troublesome, undisciplined, a rebel, may not conform to their stereotype, and may not get the top grades and the highest rank in class. *He may not even score the highest level in the standard multiple choice admissions tests, which may well reward the glib, facile mind at the expense of the questioning, independent, or slower but more powerful, more subtle, and more interesting and original mind.*"

At some point, Gatto went to the Harvard-Princeton-Yale admissions officers, and asked them about SAT. They all said that they regarded SAT scores as more or less useless.

Nevertheless, reader, observe that getting a low score is no reason for pride. Scoring high on the SAT is quite easy. It is like solving a puzzle. If you approach the puzzle the right way, you can complete it

in a relatively short time, and move on to better things. And like completing a silly puzzle, beating the SAT is no great accomplishment.

Many people with low grades are indeed deadbeats of little imagination, and many people with high grades are materialistic-minded compulsives. But then, many people with low grades are exceedingly sharp, as are many people with high grades. The point is that the various "scholastic tests" do not measure anything worth measuring.

But they want (or at least wanted) to sterilize you depending on what you score you get! They are not testing for "intelligence." As Carlin said, the last thing they want are people smart enough to change things for the better. No, they do not want that. They would rather have obedient workers, the more robotic the better.

And so on and on, seven hundred more pages of meticulous research on Galton's thesis of "get them in the gonads." Chase correctly connects the "overpopulation" movement, which kicked off in the late 1960s, and which infests the UN, as a continuation of the cults of eugenics and "Social Darwinism."

Does mass sterilization still occur? Yes. Follows the recent eminent view of two "academics."

Rev Obstet Gynecol. 2008 Winter; 1(1): 2332.

Sterilization in the United States²⁵

Deborah Bartz, MD, MPH, and James A Greenberg, MD

Abstract

Unintended pregnancies are expensive for patients and for society in terms of medical costs, the cost of caring for more children, and the cost to personal and professional goals. Sterilization is the most common contraceptive method utilized by couples in the United States. Given technological advances over the past few decades, male and female surgical sterilization has become a safe, convenient, easy, and highly effective birth control method for the long term. This article reviews current male and female sterilization options.

...

Background

Female or male sterilization is the most common contraceptive method utilized by couples in the United States, with 36% of fertile women using contraception employing this method. According to the National Survey of Family Growth (2002), 10.3 million women (27%) rely on female sterilization for birth control, whereas 3.5 million women (9.2%) rely on vasectomy in their partners for contraception. The next most commonly utilized birth control method among American women is oral contraceptive pills, used by 11.7 million or 30.6% of women using contraception.

About 700,000 female sterilizations are performed annually, half of which are performed within 48 hours post-partum. Sterilization is performed following 10% of all births. Approximately 345,000 female sterilizations are interval procedures that do not occur immediately following pregnancy. Approximately 500,000 vasectomies are performed annually for a rate of 9.9 procedures per 1000 men aged 25 to 49. Overall, the sterilization rates for men and women have remained constant over the past 40 years, although the surgical methods employed have changed with advances in technology and anesthesia.

Conclusions

This is not the whole story; we will see additional notches of the big picture as we proceed with our analysis. Furthermore, let the reader inquire into the subject for himself. The references so far provided should comprise a useful starting point.

²⁵<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2492586/>, accessed Jan 21, 2012.

We have seen that: 1) the Malthusian worldview has dominated oligarchical circles for the last two centuries; 2) the false creed of eugenicism has been and remains an imperative issue for the oligarchs; 3) the United Nations is explicitly Malthusian; 4) Malthusianism and eugenicism today operate under new guises, in particular environmentalism; 5) major global players have repeatedly called for population control.

The Oligarchs have called for population control again and again. They have done their utmost to curb worldwide demographic growth. Only two years ago, some of the richest men and women on Earth gathered "to consider how their wealth could be used to slow the growth of the world's population." They have the means, they have the motives, and they have the resources to manufacture an opportunity. Some - perhaps all - of them are true believers and therefore immune to reason.

Worse, in their folly these people have wasted vast resources on the development of ways of culling and controlling population. The problem of world poverty could have been solved decades ago. Instead, the Malthusians are de-industrializing the West, and preventing many poor nations from developing (though China, Brazil, and Turkey have, for some reason - perhaps strength - been given some leeway). This criminal madness amounts to genocide. Millions starve (some to death) every year - and for what? So that Gates and Rockefeller and their buddies can fly around on private jets and lament the "carbon footprint" of humanity?

Let them have their palaces, let them have their golden toilet bowls, let them eat all the caviare in the world, let them seduce twenty hookers per night, let them order people around, let them glory in their psychopathy... But when the Oligarchs preach and practice genocide, people have to act, or suffer the consequences, which will range from a busted conscience to a departure from this mortal coil.

3.4 Leaks From the Inside

We will see more indirect evidence of the ongoing implementation of the Big Plan as we go along.

When discussing the reality of world affairs with uninformed people, one invariably encounters the following retort: You do not really know that there is a global conspiracy - you are only guessing! No! In principle, one can find enough information in the public domain to build a watertight case for global conspiracy. As we have seen, luminaries such as Machiavelli, Thomas More, Adam Smith, and even Malthus, regarded conspiracies as a fact of life. Many historical figures, such as the Bolsheviks, the Jacobins, the American Founding Fathers, and countless other revolutionaries, were conspirators. History in itself is one conspiracy after another.

The knowledge is out there - unfortunately, most people, for lack of time or lack of interest, will not bother to engage in serious research. We must acknowledge this problem and show leniency toward the ignorant - I know - I was ignorant myself.

But we do not proceed from mere rational grounds. We know there is a conspiracy, not only because it is self-evident to all who care to look, but also because over the decades there have been leaks from the outer rims of the conspiracy. We have already presented the explicit damning statements of Carroll Quigley, Aaron Russo, John Perkins, and Carol Rosin. Let us now look at a few other leaks from the inside.

3.4.1 1938 RIIA Meeting

We thank Alan Watt for mentioning this reference.

The Royal Institute of International Affairs, a.k.a. Chatham House, a.k.a. The Round Table, was founded in 1920 as a front for the Milner gang. Other IIAs were established in the other Commonwealth countries. The United States offshoot was called the Council on Foreign Relations. The RIIA held its second unofficial meeting in September 1938, during the Munich crisis, near Sydney, Australia. Oxford Press published a sanitized overview of the meeting under the title *The British*

Commonwealth and the Future (1939), edited by H.V. Hodson. Three of the key *éminences grises* of the 1930s British Empire (Commonwealth), Philip Kerr - Lothian, Lionel Curtis, and Alfred Zimmern, attended the meeting.

Lothian (1882-1940) was David Lloyd George's private secretary during WWI, and one of the authors of the Paris peace and the covenant of the League of Nations. The man was the ambassador to Washington in the crucial early days of the Second World War, before dying in late 1940. The ancient Kerr family traces its lineage to at least the 12th century.

Lionel Curtis (1872-1955) was perhaps the key architect of the post-WWI British Commonwealth. Zimmern (1879-1957) was an enthusiast for the World Council of Churches (which seeks to amalgamate all religions into one), the coiner of the moniker "British Commonwealth," and one of the founders of both the League of Nations and Unesco.

All three men were avid one worlders.

So what was said at the 1938 RIIA meeting?

(p.117) [Lothian said that] for all the frustration which had overtaken it, the League [of Nations] enshrined an imperishable ideal. The hopes of millions of people in every continent would continue to centre about a system of world unity which would substitute the reign of law for the anarchy of force. ... In the immediate future the problem was to find security, freedom, and a way back towards a tolerable international order. The basis for such a policy could be found in two things; first, the maintenance of the British Empire...

It is tempting to think of Lothian and his ilk as of a group of noble-minded lovers of peace. And yet they are the same people who provoked the Boer War, which saw the enslavement by a powerful empire of a tiny independent nation. The British invented the modern concentration camp in their efforts of subduing the Boers. Various modern historians tend to place the blame for World War I on the British (for example, see Guido Giacomo Preparata's *Conjuring Hitler* (2005)). Note that the RIIA cabal and their American allies have controlled the highest levels of the Anglo-American historical establishment for the duration of the 20th century, as we will see later.

The British Empire has always pretended to stand for peace and civilization. The accepted establishment view on the history of the British Empire is that England acquired its empire almost by mistake, in a sort of a good-natured bumbling with world affairs, and that anyway the Empire was a good thing. (See, for example, Bernard Porter's *The Lion's Share* (1975, 1984, 1996, 2004)) Those Indians who have heard of the Sepoy Rebellion and the Raj may disagree. So may the Chinese who have heard of the Opium Wars. Or the Americans who know of the British support for the South during the Civil War - or of the American Revolutionary War, for that matter! Or the Russians who remember Sevastopol. The Italians may remember the snubbing they received at the end of the carnage of WWI. The French may harbor reserves in regard to British altruism; not to mention the Germans. There is a reason for the existence of the idiom "Perfide Albion" in the major European languages. Not for nothing did de Gaulle call the British "a Trojan Horse in Europe." The Arabs remember the scandalous swindle of World War I - indeed, Lawrence of Arabia deeply resented the breach of faith of his bosses in regard to the promises he had made to the Arabs. Nor can the Arabs ignore the British creation of Israel. Egypt should not forget the Suez Crisis of 1956. The Iranians remember the British-sponsored coup against Mosaddegh. The South Americans, in particular the Argentinians, remember the British "free trade" exploitation of their sub-continent. The Argentinians were slighted again in the 1980s over the Falklands - lest they forget. The Africans remember colonialism. As recently as in the 1950s, the British organized a quaint gleeful genocide in Kenya. The Turks remember the British dismantlement of their empire. There is hardly a place on Earth untouched by the malicious finger of the Beast of the Albion. As George Galloway likes to say, the sun never set over the empire of the English - because God himself would not trust the English in the dark.

The claim that the British Empire has been a force for peace is one of the absurdest and cruellest lies of the modern era.

(p.163) [An unidentified delegate said:] I think... that any break-up of the British Empire would lead to a scramble, and having got one-third of the world under some sort of co-operation it is easier to build up from that into a world order than it is to go back. That is the view, and I think, as one who has now for over thirty years been advocating the United States of Europe, that the only hope of solution of world problems is to allow the integration of Europe.

Here we see the roots of the modern EU. Apropos, the Club of Rome was instrumental in the formation of the European Union. Churchill in 1946 called for exactly "a United States of Europe." The idea was not a new one, and had been espoused by such luminaries as the master conspirator and sometime British puppet Mazzini, and by the BEIC utilitarian J.S. Mill. The goals of Great Britain on the eve of WWII were:

(p.199)[An unidentified speaker stated that the definition of the United Kingdom foreign policy was:] The ultimate objects of Great Britain's foreign policy are: firstly, the attainment somehow or other of a new world order to replace the one which we thought had been effectively established by the Covenant [of the LoN], but which has failed; secondly, to maintain upon the ocean-ways of the world that degree of world order which at present exists, and which is vital to the continued existence of the Commonwealth on its present basis.

The second point is equivalent to the maintenance of Anglo-American worldwide naval supremacy. As to the first point - I think that both the United Nations and the European Union are excellent ideas in principle. The question is, what kinds of unions will those be? Communistic/fascistic/Malthusian unions of the corporations and the bankers and the international Oligarchs? Or popular constitutional Federations existing for the benefit of humanity? This is the crux of the problem.

One British delegate announced that: (p.199) "Liberty not only has to be preserved, it has to expand, and in our day it expands with improving methods of social control." What does that mean? Liberty for whom? What methods of social control? Expand how? Let the reader answer these questions for himself.

Since India was still a British possession in 1938, it is not surprising that one Indian delegate complained that (p.200) a policy based "on the maintenance of peace" might simply mean "preservation by imperialist Powers of the present situation, which is advantageous to them." The word "peace," said the delegate, will seem unreal to the downtrodden.

(p.211) The main discussion on the subject [of a world order] was introduced by a vigorous plea for a strengthening of the present League structure. If the League is to be effective, it must be based on the following principles: the surrender of national sovereignty, the pooling of security, economic co-operation, and the development of machinery for peaceful change.

The role of the British Empire (i.e. the British Oligarchy) in a future "world order" is made explicit on page 221:

The conception of the Commonwealth as the nucleus of a system of world government was discussed from various angles...

...

(p.229) The opening speaker said that he had been asked what he meant by world order:

I mean a world government and I am absolutely certain that it is coming. I mean a real government. I know that it is a divine, far-off event; but as we shall see it, but not now; we shall behold it, but not nigh. My dream is that there are things that we can do now to lead to it and that the British Commonwealth may be the means to that end.

...

(p.267)...the ultimate objective of British policy was the establishment of world order and the retention of a fraction of world order on the world's oceans...

The Round Table gang were instrumental in the Hitler appeasement policy. Lothian was a friend of Nancy Astor of the Cliveden Set, to which belonged Halifax, the Foreign Secretary at the time of Munich crisis. Quigley speculates with some certainty on the motives of the Cliveden Set in his *Anglo-American Establishment*. The point remains that the Round Table people owned British foreign policy, and therefore owned the keys to war and peace on the European continent and in the world. Therefore, the following quote is of some weight:

(p.276) One delegate, with unanswerable realism, said that the future of the Commonwealth was going to depend on the outcome of the next European war. Few others, however, and even he himself, were willing to speculate on what that outcome would be if European war did break out.

War did break out.

In summary, the core of the British Oligarchy, which was, from 1815 to 1945, the most politically powerful faction in the world, was demonstrably working, since at least the late 19th century (when the Milner gang took form), for a British-dominated "world order," sometimes explicitly called "the new world order." So there you have it - there is, indeed, a "New World Order" conspiracy. The biographies, and the secretive methods, of the promulgators of this "world order," speak of the nature of the beast.

The proceedings of the first unofficial RIIA conference, held in Toronto in February 1933, can be found in Arnold Toynbee's *British Commonwealth Relations* (1934), which I have not looked up. Also of interest are the IPR's (Institute of Pacific Relations) publications of the same era. We will learn more of the IPR when we look at the role of the private foundations in world affairs.

3.4.2 Foundation X

On November 1 2010, Lord James of Blackheath (1937-) stood up to speak at the House of Lords.²⁶ Blackheath explained that the way out of the crisis is the traditional "three Is: investment in industry." He said: "One of the great tragedies of our economy at present is that we do not have three Is functioning in that form today. Boy, do we need them." Boy, is he right! Blackheath then observed that "we" (House of Lords) would need at least five billion pounds to get some three Is. Unfortunately, "we do not have 5 billion; we do not have half of 5 billion to put in to the creation of this at the moment, so what do we do about it?"

At that point, Blackheath apologized to his friends Sassoon (the scion of an "Indian family of Iraqi Jewish descent and international renown, based in Bombay, India. It was descended from the famous Ibn Shoshans, one of the richest families of medieval Spain" - from Wikipedia) and Strathclyde for "a subject that I should not raise." Said Blackheath,

For the past 20 weeks I have been engaged in a very strange dialogue with the two noble Lords, in the course of which I have been trying to bring to their attention the willing availability of a strange organisation which wishes to make a great deal of money available to assist the recovery of the economy in this country. For want of a better name, I shall call it foundation X. That is not its real name, but it will do for the moment. ... Its chairman came to me and said, "We have this extraordinary request to assist in a major financial reconstruction. It is megabucks, but we need your help to assist us in understanding whether this business is legitimate"

²⁶<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201011/ldhansrd/text/101101-0003.htm#10110215000101>, accessed October 31, 2011

When Blackheath consulted with Strathclyde on the matter, the latter expressed doubts as to Blackheath's qualifications in handling affairs of the type. Blackheath was indignant:

Yes I do. I have had one of the biggest experiences in the laundering of terrorist money and funny money that anyone has had in the City. I have handled billions of pounds of terrorist money. [laughter in the House of Lords]

Baroness Hollis of Heigham: Where did it go to?

Lord James of Blackheath: Not into my pocket. My biggest terrorist client was the IRA and I am pleased to say that I managed to write off more than 1 billion of its money. I have also had extensive connections with north African terrorists, but that was of a far nastier nature, and I do not want to talk about that because it is still a security issue. I hasten to add that it is no good getting the police in, because I shall immediately call the Bank of England as my defence witness, given that it put me in to deal with these problems.

This is from the public record! Blackheath then observed that his activities have made him a goto person in the City, for which reason Foundation X contacted him. He continued:

I have come to the absolute conclusion that foundation X is completely genuine and sincere and that it directly wishes to make the United Kingdom one of the principal points that it will use to disseminate its extraordinarily great wealth into the world at this present moment, as part of an attempt to seek the recovery of the global economy.

Sassoon and Strathclyde found Blackheath's story hard to believe. Sassoon is a bigwig in the Treasury, and Strathclyde is the man in charge of the House of Lords. The representatives of Foundation X insisted on conversing only with heads of state, or with "someone with an international security rating equal to the top six people in the world." They also said that their money was backed by bullion. Strathclyde complained that this was impossible, since that much bullion has not been minted in the history of the world. Blackheath said that the amount of bullion in the world is unknown, and that the one official figure is likely false. He also pointed out that the Vatican is stuffed with gold. Blackheath's concluding remarks were:

Foundation X is saying at this moment that it is prepared to put up the entire 5 billion for the funding of the three Is recreation; the British Government can have the entire independent management and control of it—foundation X does not want anything to do with it; there will be no interest charged; and, by the way, if the British Government would like it as well, if it will help, it will be prepared to put up money for funding hospitals, schools, the building of Crossrail immediately with 17 billion transfer by Christmas, if requested, and all these other things. These things can be done, if wished, but a senior member of the Government has to accept the invitation to a phone call to the chairman of foundation X—and then we can get into business. This is too big an issue. I am just an ageing, obsessive old Peer and I am easily dispensable, but getting to the truth is not. We need to know what really is happening here. We must find out the truth of this situation.

Note that, in the given context, the reliability of the source is almost as good as one can hope for. Undoubtedly Blackheath kept much to himself, and protected certain interests, but the gist of his story we can take at face value. What can we draw from Blackheath's bizarre speech?

First, top echelon elements from the City and from the British Oligarchy handle terrorist organizations. This fact, as well as the connections between big banking and the international drug traffic, are well documented. Nevertheless, Blackheath's offhand admission is simply stunning.

Second, there exists an opulent shadowy organization of extremely high-level internationalists.

Third, these people are quietly trying to meddle into the affairs of powerful nations. For all that we know, the British may have accepted the offer since November 2010. What does that mean in

regard to British sovereignty? Furthermore, Foundation X may have contacted other nations. Who is behind this Foundation X, and what are the foundation's aims?

Blackheath followed his speech with a six-minute November 4 2010 interview with *Sky News*.²⁷ In the interview, Blackheath said that the foundation representatives described their trust as "a massive super-national accumulation of funds which are not sovereign national foreign funds but are the proceeds of a massive amount of commercial activity, which has accumulated over probably most of a hundred years." The expressed goal of X was to "protect the wealth of the world so that they can continue to survive with their wealth in it." Blackheath insisted that, with his half a century of experience in the City, he was not the victim of a hoax. The X people also wanted to promote renewable energy.

The foundation may well be the vestige of the Rhodes Trust, which was set up about a century ago. Cecil Rhodes's explicit goal was to accumulate the wealth of the world in order to have the means to bring about a one-world British-dominated "aristocratic" government. To that end, Rhodes and his cronies established the De Beers diamond cartel, and the extensive gold mining projects of South Africa. The parameters of the Rhodes trust fit well with the parameters of Foundation X: 1) Anglophilia and Anglocentrism; 2) an accent on bullion; 3) a 100 year history; 4) secrecy and top-level connections. Note that the interconnected network of American foundations - Rockefeller, Carnegie, Ford, and so on, also fit the description to a large degree. The American robber-baron east-coast establishment has historically been heavily Anglophile.

As of Blackheath, my impression is that the man is a high-level courier boy with a patriotic strain, who said more than he should have said in an effort to help his nation. Other than an understandable if not wholly credible denial of allegations from the UK Treasury on November 6 2010, as of late 2011 there have been no updates on the Foundation X story since Blackheath's *Sky* interview.

3.4.3 Lindsey Williams

The pastor Lindsey Williams went to Alaska in 1971 to serve as a chaplain for the Trans-Alaskan Oil Pipeline. There, according to his own frequently repeated story, the good padre fell into the benign graces of a few of the major Oligarchs of the world. Now, these people adhere to a moral code, which commands them to tell the world what they are going to do. They decided to use the padre as one of their mouthpieces. So the padre Williams makes a radio appearance once in a while, and explains what is going to happen in the near future.

We can easily check Williams's credibility. All we have to do is listen to a few of his old talks, and compare his predictions with subsequent events.

In the summer of 2008, Williams released a DVD entitled *The Next 12 Months*. He also made a few appearances on radio talk shows. The respected commentator Bob Chapman critiqued Williams's predictions in a July 26 2008 article.²⁸

The padre made the following predictions: 1) Oil prices would fall to \$50 a barrel. 2) This fall would be brought about by the activation of two new large oil fields, one in Indonesia and one in North Russia. 3) There would be a spectacular financial collapse caused by the mortgage bubble. A new Great Depression would ensue. 4) The faction in contact with the padre supported McCain. In the event of a McCain victory, they intended to target Iran. 5) The collapse of oil prices was, among other things, part of a strategic attack on the Arab World. In the long run, the Oligarchs intended to destroy Arab culture. 6) In the long run, the dollar would be destroyed.

Williams rambled about a number of other things. His comments agreed with the ideas I have presented so far. Though given to soliloquising and repetition, Williams has a good grasp of the global geopolitical situation.

²⁷<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VbLEFrg5ZMI>, accessed October 31, 2010

²⁸http://theinternationalforecaster.com/International_Forecaster_Weekly/Paper_Sold_To_Pools_Of_Liquidity Accessed on October 31, 2011.

In regard to the padre's predictions: 1) In July 2008, a barrel of crude cost about \$130. In December, a barrel cost about \$40. The speculators left the price of crude in the \$70-80 range in 2009 and 2010. 2) The two oil fields were the Cepu field in Indonesia, and the Vankor field in Siberia. Both opened in 2009. Why did the prices go down before the fields opened? I suspect that futures and other such speculative tools came into play. 3) Correct. 4) McCain was not elected. We mentioned in Chapter 2 that there exist at least two factions in the United States. The faction which contains Brzezinski, and which is not too hawkish on Iran, won power. Obama is a Brzezinski cadre.²⁹ 5) The oil price fluctuations and the world economic crisis severely strained some of the Arab economies. In late 2010, the Oligarchs embarked on their 2011 Destruction of the Arab World program, which was hypocritically called the "Arab Spring" by the leftist media. The governments of Tunisia and Egypt fell. Libya, the most prosperous nation in Africa, was destroyed. At the time of this writing (late October 2011), Syria is still holding on. China and Russia recently vetoed US-led embargo sanctions against the Syrian government. Apropos, Williams mentioned in a recent talk of his that Qaddafi has held the Oligarchs for three months longer than expected. This seems to indeed be the case. In his death, the illustrious colonel has bought the Arab world a brief respite.

To those naifs who think that "democratic" revolutions accomplish anything: look at the fate of Eastern Europe after 1989. An entire civilization collapsed. The West brought not "democracy," but corporate slavery. The same has happened in the Middle East. Mubarak was a dictator, and he did bow to US pressure - how could he not and expect to live? - but he was also somewhat of a nationalist. The Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions were classic examples of Colour Coups; we will look at the concept behind those later. Nato's destruction of the prosperous nation of Libya is too egregious an example of imperialism and New World Order hubris to bother with. How can you bomb a people for their own good? Why are some rebels good and other rebels bad? The case of Libya is too disgusting and absurd to talk about. The point remains - the Arab world is being destroyed, as Williams predicted.

6) The American Dollar still exists, but for how long? The price of gold went from \$760 in November 2008 to \$1770 in September 2011. Crude prices went from \$40 in late 2008 to about \$100 in late 2011. With all the speculation going on, it is hard to say what those numbers mean; but there certainly has been some inflation. The Fed's "quantitative easing" policy is an inflationary policy, which fails to tackle the deflationary effects of the crisis. The entire world banking system hangs in the balance. A demise of the dollar in the near future is conceivable, even probable.

Some may object that the Oligarchs would never crash the dollar, because they own so many dollars. No. The Oligarchs own land, factories, palaces, vast warehouses full of stuff, and so on. Money is not wealth - it is merely a claim to wealth. The Oligarchs know their business - do not worry about them. The IMF has a gimmick called SDRs - Special Drawing Rights. Those act as something like a fiat world currency. What if the top Oligarchs exchange their dollars for SDRs, or pull whatever other trick along similar lines? They can do it - they own the IMF, the Basel Bank for International Settlements, and the World Bank.

In short, everything the padre said checks. He is a genuine insider mouthpiece, and he says that, yes, there is a New World Order conspiracy, and so on and so forth. I can provide more examples of accurate Williams predictions, but I think the ones above will suffice. Let the reader look into the matter for himself. It should be mentioned that in his Fall 2011 talks, Williams remarked that 2012 will be an interesting year - and not in a good way. YouTube contains a wide selection of the padre's interviews.

²⁹See Webster Tarpley's *Obama: The Unauthorized Biography*, and *Obama: The Post-Modern Coup*.

3.4.4 *New Order of Barbarians*

In 1988, Dr. Lawrence Dunegan of Pittsburgh recorded a talk on a couple of tapes. The talk deals with Dunegan's recollections of a lecture given by one Dr. Richard Day of Mount Sinai Hospital of New York on a March 20, 1969 meeting of the Pittsburgh Pediatric Society.

The lecture spills out the Big Plan in great details. Overcome by hubris, Dr. Day had decided to confide in his fellow pediatricians, because "everything is in place and nobody can stop us now." No notes were taken during the talk, and most of the attendees presumably ignored the bizarre allegations and ramblings of Dr. Day. Richard Day (c.1905-1989) was a high-level American pediatrician, and, for a while, the national medical director of the eugenicist front Planned Parenthood.

Dunegan's reminiscences agree with what we have seen so far, and with what we will see later. I stress that I found Dunegan's tape late into my research, after having had to figure out the hard way a lot of the things he lays out plainly. *The New Order of Barbarians* is valuable, however, inasmuch as it offers one a condensed version of the real state of affairs of the world, and gives one an overall idea of the specifics of the Big Plan and of the worldview of the implementers of the Big Plan.

The tape consists of the narration of Dunegan; the man frequently lapses into near-quotations of Day's words from twenty years earlier. One can find the tape on YouTube. Here is what Dunegan said:

Preamble: Day explained that there is a timetable, and that a number of the points of the plan were to be implemented later. The plan was gradualist, after the Fabian approach. The idea is that humans are extremely adaptable, and, like the boiling frog, will fail to notice slow incremental change. And change there was to be - constant, radical change. It was hoped that much would be accomplished by the end of the century, because Day's "order" wanted to "enter the 21st Century with a running start." Clearly, 9-11 provided an additional boost to that start. Day said that some of what he talked about would resemble communism, but that it was much bigger than communism; and that there was "much more cooperation between East and West than most people realize." This is true, as we will see when we look at Antony Sutton's work.

Day pointed out that most people, including high ranking members of government, do not know how things work, and how decisions are really made. The names of those who really make the decisions would be known to most people, said Day, though he failed to identify particular persons. Most of the real decision makers were not public servants but private individuals. People do not ask the right questions, explained Day - people are too trusting and dumb. Like Russell and Aldous, Day appeared to exhibit some uneasiness about his role in the great game.

Changes would be implemented under false pretences. Everything would have two purposes - a stated purpose, and a real purpose. We have seen many examples of the veracity of the last statement - feminism is supposed to be for the elevation of women, but in reality it is for the destruction of the family. Global warming is supposed to be the reason for "saving" the planet, but in reality it is a Malthusian scheme. School is supposed to be for education, but it is for indoctrination. The reader can come up with additional examples.

Unsurprisingly, Day expressed concern over the growth of population and over the deterioration of the "human stock." He was a Malthusian Darwinist eugenicist; but then, he had to be let in on the plan. In the long run, families would be limited to two children, with some leeway for the "better" people. Dunegan interpreted "population control" as control over every aspect of life.

Sex: Day explained that since the reproductive urge was so powerful, and the poisoning of water and food supplies with sterilizing drugs was impractical (it has become practicable today), sex would have to be separated from reproduction. This would be done by the promotion of promiscuity in combination with a promotion of contraception. Birth control tools would be sold everywhere - note that in the 1960s, grocery stores did not have condoms in front of the cash register. Sex education would be introduced in school to promote promiscuity and contraception - this has happened.

Abortion would be legalized and subsidized with taxpayer money (Roe vs Wade occurred only in 1973). Teen pregnancies would be used to justify abortion. Homosexuality would be encouraged, for obvious reasons. Note that in 1988, homosexuality was nowhere near as heavily pushed as it is today.

Sex would permeate the fabric of society. Television and cinema would bristle with sex - anyone who has paid attention knows that the situation is much worse now than it was back in 1988. Pornography, in which "anything goes," would flood households via tape recorders. Observe that in 1988 the porno tsunami that we know and enjoy today had not yet gathered full momentum. Sex everywhere! Clothing would become more promiscuous - bras would become thinner, pants would become tighter, skirts would become shorter - and so on. The music would be heavily sexualized and de-romanticised. Love and marriage would make way for gangbangs and idle intercourse. Note that rap music had still not exploded into the mainstream in 1988. And let us not get into useless polemics - I am well aware that some rap constitutes real art (defining "real art" is an interesting exercise but beyond our current scope) - but then, any serious rap aficionado surely knows that rap has been commercialized and perverted to an extreme degree.

Not only would there be sex without reproduction, but there would be reproduction without sex. Straight out of Aldous. We see this today, with semi-frigid couples resorting to artificial insemination. People's frigidity is no accident, as we will see. The Sheep Dolly only came about in 1996.

The family would be broken down. Two person families would become a norm. The extended families would be cut to pieces by people moving around. Women would work outside of home (as was not quite the case in 1969). Children would spend more time at school. Under such conditions, people would have fewer children. To facilitate this, travel would be cheap - for a while. In the long run, travel would become rigidly restricted, with IDs required everywhere. We are entering this second phase now, with the rise of fuel prices, and the over-emphasis on security - in the name of combating "terrorism," of course. Divorces would be made easier to obtain, and the importance of marriage would be de-emphasized. Job insecurity would be used to disrupt successful relationships. For my part, an uncomfortably large percentage of my acquaintances are in the revolting position of living away (sometimes a continent's breadth away) from their loved ones.

Euthanasia and the old: As some of the noble heroes of our play of Human History observed, to lower population growth you either decrease birth rates or increase death rates. This inevitably leads to the idea of legalizing euthanasia. The goal is to convince old people that after a certain time they are no longer fit for this world and should just die. Note that suicide rates are the highest among the old; but perhaps this has always been the case. As far as I know, we have no good statistics on the subject from before the late 19th century. Belgium and Netherlands, which have been set as testing grounds for sensitive cultural issues, legalized euthanasia in 2002. Euthanasia is also legal in Switzerland, the favourite oligarchical haunt. Eastwood's *Million Dollar Baby* (2004) won the Oscar for a reason.

The old would also be killed off by the inflation of the cost of medical care. Life would be made tough for old folks in subtle ways - for example the ink on government forms would be made unreadable, driving would be made more erratic, etc. The young would be made to resent supporting their parents and grandparents.

We will be seeing more of euthanasia as our "post-industrial" societies begin to cope with the issue of the aging of the baby-boomer generation. Perhaps at some point we will see suicide booths on street corners. Martin Amis, whom *The Times* has named one of the 50 most influential British writers since 1945, sparked a controversy in 2010 when he called for, yes, euthanasia booths to help the boomers move on.

Medicine: Medicine would be put under tight control and gradually made more expensive. The deaths of under- or uninsured people would be welcomed as a culling of the herd. Medical care would be made at once 1) unaffordable, and 2) publicly provided. In this way, people become dependable to whatever the states give them, unconsciously submitting to facile manipulation. It was

known that the United States would not accept "socialized" medicine, but that was not a problem, because the oligarchs got the Americans via the insurance corporations. More than one way to cull a population. I note that the Canadian and British public medical care systems are being sabotaged and will eventually be collapsed. Public medical care is also a good way for milking the population. I think that it should not be hard to invent workable medical systems after either the "socialized" or the "free market" models; Cuba is a good example of the former. What most countries have, however, is a system for the fleecing of the population and for the weeding out of the "unfit."

Health care would also be tied to one's job, as is the case in the States. If you do not work, or are self-employed - no health care for you and you die.

New diseases would appear to aid the process of the depopulation. This brings us to AIDS. Richard Day never mentioned AIDS; however, it is obvious that AIDS was a human creation.³⁰ It did not just come out of nowhere. The only question is - was AIDS introduced by accident, or deliberately? I think we can rule out the first option. Imagine some doctor developing viruses for fun in his laboratory; and then he goes to Africa on a safari and accidentally drops a vial; etc. - absurd. On the other hand, imagine a gaggle of eugenicist "geneticist" swine trying to develop a virus to stop the dangerous population explosion in Africa. Throw the *NSM200*, and you have a waterproof indictment.

Day mentioned apropos that the Rockefeller Foundation had already found cures to most types of cancer, but that those cures would not be given to the public, because people have to die of something - and cancer is as good as anything else. On this subject, read Eustace Mullins's *Murder By Injection* (1988), and G. Edward Griffin's *World Without Cancer* (1974). The Rockefellers have been researching cancer for about a century, and they keep researching it with the aid of billions in donations and taxpayer money, and they can keep researching cancer forever for all that they care. A law exists that prohibits anyone from marketing products as cancer cures. The ongoing poisoning of the world population is causing more and more cancers. The whole thing is a fraud. Chemotherapy borders on insanity - "cut, slash and burn"? Irradiate a person to *cure* cancer? But then, the medical establishment's history is one lunacy after another - bleeding and leeches and lobotomies and anti-depressants whose side effects include "sudden death"... But more on that later. Obviously, this is not to say that all medical practices are useless and malicious.

Hospitals would sometimes double for prisons. Psycho-prisons like those in the USSR would be established. Some criminals would serve time in hospitals. See the 2009 Louis Theroux documentary *A Place for Paedophiles*.

For purposes of control, doctors would be forced to corporatize (or socialize) and abandon individual practice.

Day also mentioned that the capability existed for inducing heart attacks in an almost undetectable way. You see, for the good of humanity, some people will evidently have to be assassinated. But it is all for the best.

Because of the constant poisoning, people would have to learn to eat and exercise properly. Note that the current obesity epidemic was in its inception in 1988. GMOs only flooded the market in the 1990s. Some people would die from the poisoning of the food, but that would be all right, because those would be the stupid people, anyway - and who needs them? If the reader takes a stroll down to the ghetto, he will find that the ghetto has few grocery stores and those contain little in the way of real food. But that is also a part of the plan. Day explained that the oligarchs have decided to turn to the neighbourhoods of the underclass into asphalt jungles. You see, the modern world is too civilized and people are not evolving any more. So the oligarchs introduced drug addictions and violence into the ghettos to recreate jungle conditions, so that only the fit would survive. The carnage also served to scare the "middle" and professional classes. Fearful people submit to control. The hypocrisy here is too much to bear. Instead of moving the world forward, these lunatics have brought it backward - and they lie to themselves that it is all for the better! No! The oligarchs have invented fairy tales to justify their own cruelty and existence. They can not see through their own

³⁰There is a literature on the subject. For example, see Dr. Stan Monteith's *Aids. the Unnecessary Epidemic* (2000).

lies, because doing so would destroy their *raison d'être*. And so they go around murdering people with a smile and a feeling of deep satisfaction - because all that they do, they do for the betterment of humanity. What a farce!

Day also said that to accelerate evolution, the oligarchs intended to hasten the onset of puberty. And they have done exactly that, plus more. For example, see the BBC 2005 article *Why puberty now begins at seven*. Also see the Daily Mail 2011 article *'1 in 20 women' hit by early menopause: Doctors baffled at rising numbers of under-40s affected*.³¹ Doctors baffled. But are you?

Religion and tradition: The old religions would have to go - particularly Christianity. This would happen with the help of the churches, the Catholic church being the key one. In fact, the Oligarchs gained control of the Vatican about half a century ago, as we will see later.

Since religion seems to serve some useful purpose, the people would be given a new religion - a mix of the old religion with a dash of environmental fanaticism, and, I suspect, a monster load of "positive thinking." There has to be some positive thinking, no? As we know, this new religion is the New Age baloney. When I say this, note that the oligarchs adapt their plans to changing circumstances. The New Age is demonstrably their chosen religion, and it will likely do the job, but if the New Age does not work, they will invent some other madness, just like they superseded the League of Nations with the United Nations.

Many people would reject religion. Note that fervent atheists usually think themselves rational and irreligious - in fact, they unknowingly believe in various "unscientific" ideologies and dogmas.

The Bible and various classical texts would undergo slow changes. A word here, a word there. At some point, most people would not be allowed to own books. See Ray Bradbury's novel *Fahrenheit 451* (1953), and also the eponymous 1966 Truffaut film. I suspect that the way our oligarch friends would dispose of books is the following: they will close the libraries in an effort to "cut costs" and "pay the debts"; the books will be burned since no one will be able to buy them; new books will not be printed in an effort to protect the forests; and besides, all books will be digitized, anyway; personal computers will become little more than consoles linking one with the "cloud," which will allow for easy copyright control; old hard drives will eventually fall apart. Day points out that to begin with, most literature would fall subject to strict controls. People will only read what they are supposed to read. This is already the case with scientific literature. Most scientific literature has been published by vast publishing corporations. It is surprisingly difficult to obtain scientific literature. Currently, we see the small newspapers go out of business, and the large newspapers shift from paper to subscription-based digital distribution.

Education: In regard to education, most children would spend more time in school, but they would not learn anything. A special few children would enjoy accelerated learning, the idea being that these children would evolve faster. School would become highly competitive and stressful. Those students who crack up would be written off as Darwinian losers. I assume that the poisoning of children with psychoactive drugs is regarded as useful, because those drugs decrease fertility. In regard to the lengthening of the school year, take a look at the work of the Wallace Foundation. WF are one of the foundations in charge of education. There you will find, for example, the document *Hours of Opportunity: Lessons from Five Cities on Building Systems to Improve After-School, Summer School, and Other Out-of-School-Time Programs* (2010). In that document, the authors explain how "statistics" and "science" convincingly "show" that children should go to school all the time.

Day also explained that from high-school on, people would be forced to specialize. Bereft of an overall understanding of the world, such people would fail to make sense of the events around them. Moreover, highly specialized people obviously respond better to control. A specialist can hardly risk to lose his job and enter a blacklist. But we have already discussed this issue in detail.

Indoctrination would become lifelong (you will keep hearing this around you if you listen carefully).

³¹<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/4530743.stm> and <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-2012021/1-20-women-hit-early-menopause-Doctors-baffled-rising-numbers-40s-affected.html>, accessed on October 30, 2011

Those too old to "learn new things" would know that it is time to blow the candle.

Legalities: Antitrust laws would change. There would be more "competition" among fewer supercompanies. This is exactly what has been happening since the conglomeration madness of the 1980s and the 1990s. Gambling would be legalized and promoted - and that is why we have so many online casinos. Nothing would be permanent. People would be scared, depressed and confused in subtle ways - by the manufacture of low-quality products, by television programming, by ugly neighbourhoods, and so on. Good riddance to those who do not cope. Crime would serve as an excuse to control people, as it has always. The various presidential "wars on crime" are most of them total frauds. Crime is good! Crime excuses repression, control, and Darwinian selection! Surely the reader sees this basic fact?

Industry: Because of the push for global interdependence (remember that in 1988 Globaloney still had not arrived in full force), America's heavy industry would have to go. America would remain strong in the fields of communications, agriculture, high-level education, and culture creation. Some heavy industry would remain in the States, in case things go wrong. Plans existed for the manufacturing duties of each area of the world. This because of comparative advantage. Basic 19th century stuff from the pal of Malthus and Bentham, David Ricardo. From what I can see, China has been given the duties of manufacturing, the Middle East supplies the energy, and South America (along with North America) has to feed the planet.

The coastal cities would be the vanguards of change, with the idea that the hinterlands, squeezed by the coasts, would follow suit in the long run. Indeed, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Boston, and New York are the most "liberal" cities in the United States.

Sport: The American sports would undergo some changes. Soccer would be promoted because of its international appeal. Note that the US held the 1994 World Cup. Soccer is indeed gaining popularity in the States. Baseball was deemed too American, and had to go. To destroy baseball, the oligarchs intended to inflate the salaries of the players to the point where baseball would collapse. 1994 also saw a major strike in major baseball.

Women would be encouraged to play more sports. Dolls and tea sets would make way for balls. Dolls are bad, because they promote the idea of maternity. Can't have that! So women would play more sports and become more masculine.

Hunting would be demoted, because guns have to go.

Entertainment: We have been indoctrinated into the illusion that entertainment is a harmless time killer. This is wrong. Entertainment is a powerful method for social conditioning - see Michael Parenti's *Make-Believe Media* (1992). In general, the oligarchs intended to use entertainment to promote drugs and violence. Rap music and MTV are obvious basket cases. Video games are notorious for promoting violence and thuggery - see *Grand Theft Auto* and *Call of Duty*. The general idea was to desensitize people in regard to violence. People's aversion and strong reaction to violence is a well-understood matter - read Grossman's *On Killing*. Music would "get worse." I can say that it has gotten worse. For a vulgar but accurate treatment of this issue, see *Southpark* episode 15.7 - *You're Getting Old* (first aired on June 8, 2011).

Long-term Goals: The long-term goal was, of course, total control. Food rationing, implanted ID chips, weather control - the works. We will look at some of these issues later. Day explicitly said that "We can or soon will be able to control the weather." He stressed that he meant "REAL" control. Politicians would be tricked into writing the policies desired by the oligarchs.

Day frankly admitted that fraudulent science would be used as necessary. The global warming burlesque is a clear example of what Day meant. The UN and economic interdependence would be promoted. Day also said that wars were "obsolete" because of nukes. In the old days, the Oligarchs could control wars, but the nukes made the game unplayable. Instead of total wars, there would be

small-scale conflicts and occupations.

If their plans failed to work, the Oligarchs intended to bring the world system into existence by threatening the world with a nuclear war. The Cuban exercise of 1961 must have been a trial run. Day also praised the two world wars for their contributions to depopulation. As Alan Watt has noted, one wonders why the generals kept sending people over the line in World War I. The French did not even wear khakis in the first days of the war - and that a half century after the American Civil War and the introduction of machine guns into warfare. But that is another topic.

Terrorism would be used if the United States were too slow in joining the system. In light of Oklahoma City and the two WTC attacks, this remark alone provides us with sufficient proof of the genuine nature of Dunegan's story.

Day explained that the Oligarchs would introduce a cashless society, in which those who control the electronic transfers of money control the whole society. This has taken place, particularly in the last decade. Savings would be eliminated and people would live from paycheck to paycheck. Clearly, the long term goal is the introduction of an energy-based monetary system - a new, more insidious "gold" reserve - with all of its implications.

Total surveillance was an explicit goal. We more or less have that already; also look into the so-called "smart meters."

Day mentioned online shopping. Note that online shopping did not exist in 1988 except in a very limited form.

Home ownership would have to go - hence the housing bubble, the mortgage scams, the foreclosures, and so on. At some point, one suspects, private home ownership will become too much for the planet to take, and will be banned explicitly. People would be moved into apartments, where they would not have too many children. Eastern Europe, where the communists stuffed the population into apartments, and where fertility rates are far below replacement, is an example of this phenomenon. The long term goal was a totalitarian world government. Resisters would be humanely killed. Speaking of which, here is another excellent Bertrand Russell quote:

(1931, *The Scientific Outlook*) On those rare occasions when a boy or girl who has passed the age at which it is usual to determine social status shows such marked ability as to seem the intellectual equal of the rulers, a difficult situation will arise, requiring serious consideration. If the youth is content to abandon his previous associates and to throw in his lot whole-heartedly with the rulers, he may, after suitable tests, be promoted, but if he shows any regrettable solidarity with his previous associates, the rulers will reluctantly conclude that there is nothing to be done with him except to send him to the lethal chamber before his ill-disciplined intelligence has had time to spread revolt. This will be a painful duty to the rulers, but I think they will not shrink from performing it.

The quote comes from a chapter on the "Education in a Scientific Society." The latter chapters of the book read like Aldous's *Brave New World*. In fact, Russell asked his publisher if he should accuse Aldous of plagiarism.

Day explained that public deaths are undesirable, because such deaths create martyrs. In the latter stages of the progress to the New World Order, undesirables would "just disappear."

The two tapes end here. Day had spoken for two hours, before saying "there's much much more, but we could be here all night but it's time to stop." Day knew that "You will forget most or much of what I'm going to tell you tonight." This is indeed the case: when people hear information which contradicts their cherished inner beliefs, they simply switch off, and seek to bury the unpleasant memory. If the new ideas catch a chord in the person's mind, he later reflects on the idea in private. I have seen this happen again and again and again when I discuss the matters related in this work with close friends and relatives. This was one reason for writing this book - because reading differs substantially from listening. One can read in private; one can read at one's own pace; and one can read in front of a computer and seek references and verifications. This is why political activists hand out leaflets. Convincing people via conversation is hard, because it is near-impossible to furnish

references while talking at a coffee table or a sofa.

A third tape, recorded in 1991, contains an interview with Dunegan. Some highlights: On homosexuality, Day said something along the lines of: "We recognize that it's bizarre abnormal behavior. But, this is another element in the law of the jungle, because people who are stupid enough to go along with this are not fit to inhabit the planet and they'll go by the wayside." Day said this, not I! Though I do agree that homosexuality is bizarre and abnormal. I also think that it is even more bizarre and abnormal to promote something bizarre and abnormal for the purposes of whatever. The philosophy of the Oligarchs reminds me of the philosophy of the doctor who heals minor flesh wounds via amputation, and then charges the patient for the services provided. Dunegan explains that political correctness is simply disguised censure, as it becomes obvious once one grasps the way things work.

The interviewer and Dunegan talk about the significance of language and the need to reclaim and correctly employ language. We have mentioned this issue here and there. The problem is multifold. Can the reader define the following words: democracy, state, communism, capitalism, free-market, socialism, humanism, science? I can offer multiple definition, some contrasting but all correct in different contexts, of each of those words. Next, even if one can properly define these words, in conversation one must always try to guess the definition that the other person adheres to, consciously or unconsciously. On a different level, one must be aware of the connotations of the words one uses. Take the word "elite." It implies superiority, and I do not feel that the "elites" are superior in anything other than psychopathy. One can call them "parasites," and they are that, but the word is too negative, and hence I stick to "oligarchs." Moreover, there are people out there who have accumulated a million or two after decades of hard work and real service to society. Those people are wealthy, but not parasitic and not oligarchical. The Gateses and the Rockefellers and the Darwins and the rest of them are true Oligarchs and parasites; but not all rich people fall into that category. But let us proceed.

Dunegan points out that Day was "not a four-star general in this outfit," and probably did not know the whole story - which makes Day's statements all the more striking.

Day also said that "This time we're going to do it right." Clearly, the League of Nations was an earlier attempt at establishing the New World Order; but were there other attempts? What of Napoleon and Hitler? Could the plan go back to Rome and Alexander? Remember that Plato established (or merely publicised) many of the ideas which drive our modern Oligarchy. Plato's pupil Aristotle was the tutor of Alexander. Could it be? What of Atlantis, of which Plato spoke? These are interesting questions, but this is not the place to raise them.

Dunegan makes the important point that in the long run the Oligarchs would inevitably jump at each other's throats. This is correct and comprises one of our main trumps.

The interview concludes with the argument that perhaps God will intervene on behalf of humanity. If there are higher powers out there, and the idea is not inconceivable, they may indeed intervene. But in either case we must follow the credo - help yourself and God will help you, too. In the larger sense, one can assume that God gifted humanity with reason, free will, and love - and that in using those great gifts, we draw on the power of Divinity.

Dunegan's tapes are either 1) the fiction of an astute New World Order researcher, or 2) genuine. I will provide a few examples of documents of the first type below. In regard to Dunegan's tapes, I believe that they are genuine. The predictions made in the tape are too minute and have proved too accurate. Then there is the tone of the tape - let the reader listen for himself. It sounds like true retrospection. I see no internal inconsistencies or giveaway anachronisms in the document. My own research cross-references practically all of Dunegan's claims - the man is candid.

Specious "insider" documents have, however, been produced in the past. The obvious example - the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* - is not so obvious. The *Protocols* are supposed to be a forgery (plagiarism) rather than a fabrication. Some have argued that in fact the work that the *Protocols*

are supposed to have reproduced, is an impure copy of an earlier versions of the actual *Protocols*. Nesta Webster, Henry Makow, and Douglas Reed have commented on the subject.

One known fabrication is the document *Quiet Weapons for Silent Wars*. One can find the document online, or in Bill Cooper's *Behold a Pale Horseman* (1991) book. In 2004, *Paranoia Magazine* published a letter by one Hartford Van Dyke, who claimed to have penned *SWFQW*.³² Van Dyke explains that he wrote *Quiet Weapons* to distribute information which he knew was true, but could not share without compromising himself. He was later imprisoned on what were, according to him, trumped up charges. If the reader examines *Quiet Weapons*, he will see that Van Dyke had some reason to be paranoid. Though it appears to be a fabrication, *Quiet Weapons* is well worth reading, just as *Brave New World* is worth reading though it is a "science fiction" novel.

Another famous document, which perhaps was a fabrication, is the 1967 *Report from Iron Mountain*. The *Report* was a bestseller. In 1972, writer Leonard Lewin (who had written the preface to the original anonymous *Report*) claimed authorship and stated that the *Report* was a hoax. In 1976, the eminent historian-economist John Kenneth Galbraith claimed in a book review for the *Washington Post* that he knew that *The Report* was real, because he was invited to participate in its creation. It is conceivable that both Galbraith and Lewin did indeed know of a real Iron Mountain conference, and made their latter statements under duress. Kissinger is known to have participated in a conference of that type during the 1950s. Whatever the case, *The Report From Iron Mountain* merits reading.

Conclusions

So far, we have provided eight insider sources: Quigley, Russo, Perkins, Rosin, Hodson's write-up on the 1938 RIIA meeting, Williams, Blackheath, and Dunegan. Rosin and Blackheath did not divulge very much, but their credibility makes their claims remarkable. Dunegan and Russo were upstanding citizens, and their stories check. Perkins and Williams claim insider status, and, again, everything they say checks. Quigley is in a category of his own. It is important to note that the comments of the eight sources cross-reference and support each other.

In sum: there is indeed a conspiracy. We know because only a conspiracy could explain for the insane events in our world, and we know because some insiders have blown the whistle.

Now that we have acquired a knowledge, however incomplete, of the ideological background of the main creeds of modern society, and of the existence and the nature of the Big Plan, let us take a look at the specifics of the true root of our problems - oligarchy.

³²<http://www.paranoiamagazine.com/vandykeletters.html>, accessed on October 30, 2011

Chapter 4

Oligarchy

Oligarchy¹ is the despotic (i.e. arbitrary) rule of the few over the many. The phenomenon should be examined over a continuum rather than discretely - thus, a society is not either oligarchical or non-oligarchical, but is oligarchical to a degree. As we showed when we discussed Aristotle, and as Spinoza accurately observed, there is no such thing as truly absolute monarchy, and therefore human government in its most general form always falls somewhere on the oligarchical scale. The degree of oligarchisation is not the only parameter of human society and government, but it is among the more important ones.

4.1 In History

For most of its history, civilized human society has suffered under high degrees of oligarchization. Let us pre-empt the implicit question that must be answered sooner or later - is oligarchy natural, and is it good? This brings us to two other issues - what is natural, and what is good?

Defining "natural" is hard and necessarily arbitrary. For example, one can claim that everything that exists must be natural. Though valid, such a definition is useless. Another standard definition of "natural" stems from the Bible - it says that whatever God pushed forward in the Bible is God's will and is therefore natural. Fine, but 1) the Bible was written by a bunch of priests rather than by God; and 2) the Bible is subject to multiple interpretations (e.g. the Catholics vs the lunatic anti-Christian heretic Calvin). The American Constitution is a lucid twenty page document - and nevertheless the American constitutional law is a sprawling body of two centuries' worth of ponderings, deliberations, and interpretations. A similar examination of the Bible would be of a length unreadable within a single lifetime.

We mentioned the Bible and the US Constitution, because the American Declaration of Independence lays its foundations on a "natural," which is in a certain sense equivalent to divine, law. From the preamble of the Declaration, emphasis mine:

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, **the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them**, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

Roughly speaking, there are two types of law - "natural" and "positive." Natural law tends to have an axiomatic basis and to interplay with morality. Positive law tends to ignore morality and to lie on the idea of the authority of the sovereign. Positivist legalism limits itself to interpreting laws and leaves moral judgement to others. Natural law tends to equate what is "natural" with what is "good." Jeremy Bentham, who saw morality as a function of P&P, was one of the main founders of

¹The LaRouche crowd has developed a theory on this topic. I am not familiar with their ideas, though I suspect they mirror mine. The general outlines of oligarchism seem fairly self-evident.

the positivist legal tradition. To Bentham, natural law was "nonsense upon stilts." Law is whatever Bentham says it is! Shut up, pay the interest on your usurious loan, and go back to the Panopticon! The idea that one can remove morality from legality is specious. Law must come from some concept of justice, and justice must come from some idea of good and evil. This brings us back to the first book of Plato's *Republic*. The problem is an old one. Again - justice must lie on some idea of good and evil - therefore one must cut the Gordian Knot and settle on some definition of "good," which will also implicitly define a natural law.

In our most idiotic 21st century, we have been brainwashed into denying the reality of good and evil and the existence of natural law. The reader can verify this fact trivially by asking those around him about good and evil. Many will say that they do not feel qualified to say what is good and what is bad and maybe such things do not exist and so on. Hogwash! The denial of good and evil stems directly from above, and it tries to deny good and evil in their usual senses.

Because the elementary definition of "good" is the standard and commendable "Love thy neighbour as thyself." However, the oligarchical ideologies of the for-profit pseudo-free market and eugenicism propound beating your neighbour to a pulp and taking away his stuff. Or you can enslave your neighbour, that also works. Some may argue on the last point, but it is undeniable that both profiteering and eugenicism are not neighbour-friendly. Both are supposed to maximize aggregate P&P in the long run, but that is a bag of baloney. For all their mumbo-jumbo, the oligarchs adhere to a code of good and evil. Eugenicism argues that killing the weak is good - good for humankind, or good for society - good in some fundamental way. Likewise the profiteering scam. It is supposed to be the economic system most beneficial to mankind. Both ideologies are indeed good - but only for the oligarchs.

I say that there is good and evil, and that the usual definition of "good" is perfectly serviceable. Good people do not screw their neighbours. In this sense, oligarchy, which by definition benefits the few at the expense of their many neighbours, is bad. Here the argument can be made that there can be a benevolent oligarchy, which takes care of its subjects. But even such an oligarchy would necessarily deny the people's right of self-government on an equal basis with the oligarchs - or it is not a true oligarchy.

As to the question of whether or not oligarchy is natural in the sense that human society by some unknown hard law of nature, a type of a social Coulomb's Law, will always tend to oligarchy, I say that the issue of the goodness of oligarchy precedes the issue of the natural existence of oligarchy. In short, smallpox is a fact of a life and a physical disease. Humanity strives to get rid of smallpox. Likewise, oligarchy is a social disease, which humanity must try to mitigate and vanquish. Moreover, I do not think that oligarchism is somehow natural to humanity. Human behaviour follows ideology to a very large degree. In turn, ideology depends on technological progress. The two feed each other. A thousand years ago, Europe was a hodgepodge of tiny feudal domains under the vague dominion of the Church. A hundred years ago, Europe consisted of a few highly-nationalistic massive empires. Today, Europe is almost united, and the idea of a large scale intra-European war is almost unthinkable. A thousand years ago one swore allegiance to the local lord; three hundred years ago to the king; a hundred years ago to the nations-state; today to who knows what - in short, social norms change. Humanity has become somewhat less barbaric. In the age of nuclear weapons and mass communications, the abolition of both war and oligarchism has become possible.

Oligarchism, therefore, is bad and unnatural. One of the main short-term goals of humanity should be the eradication of the disease of oligarchism. Let humanity try to play a different game for a while. Give people a hundred years of no oligarchy. After such a period, our descendent can go back to oligarchy if they want to. Until such an experiment has been conducted, we will condemn oligarchism and its despicable false doctrines.

Having enjoyed a few pleasant platitudes, let us examine the nature of the beast. Unfortunately, the history of human civilization is the history of oligarchy. In the modern era, we have a nasty

financial-industrialist-bureaucratic oligarchy, which governs most nations surreptitiously from behind the scenes. People vote to no avail, because the whole electoral system is rigged. The situation in the United States has become insultingly transparent these days, when television is the key to presidential elections. As we know, a handful of people control the bulk of the media companies of the United States. Thus the, oligarchs need not even steal elections - they only have to make sure that both candidates belong to them, which is not hard, since they can deny access to television to all undesirable candidates. Ralph Nader comes to mind. Of course, there is some in-fighting between the Oligarchs, and fraudulent elections occur, as the farcical Bush 2000 election proved.

The pre-industrial era in Europe featured an aristocratic land-owning oligarchy. A few big land-owners owned the whole joint and lived in luxury at the expense of the labouring peasants and serfs. The feudal age existed under a similar arrangement, with the great difference that in that age the oligarchy was more prone to internal warfare. Thus, while in the 18th century the nobles of Austria fought against the nobles of Prussia, in the 13th century everybody fought against everybody.

Imperial Rome had a pronounced slave-owning latifundista oligarchy. Republican Rome also had its oligarchy. It should be understood that the land-holding patterns of the Roman population varied during the existence of Classical Rome. There were democratic periods characterized by citizen-armies and small-landholders, and heavily oligarchical periods characterized by mercenary / professional armies and the concentration of land ownership. Similar patterns existed in Greece. In general, one accurate measure of the degree of oligarchism in an agricultural society is the concentration of land ownership. The corresponding measure in an industrial society is the distribution of the means of production, including sovereignty over one's labour. The more concentrated those are, the more oligarchical the society.

India had the disgusting caste system, the Chinese had their Mandarins, Japan had the Samurai, and so on.

Unsurprisingly, the "golden ages" of history are the ages of low-intensity oligarchism. The Athenian democracy of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. coincided with material prosperity and philosophical and technological advancements. Some other key features of the period were: widespread citizen participation in political activity; the general absence of the concentration of land in a few hands; forgiveness of unpayable usurious debts; and citizen armies - the famous phalanxes.

The Golden Age of Imperial Rome was the 96-180 A.D. era of the Five Good Emperors - Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius. Nerva (30-98, Emperor 96-98) instituted land redistribution reforms and cut oppressive taxes. But Nerva only ruled for a couple of years. The real reformer was Trajan (53-117, Emperor 98-117). The man extended the Roman empire to its limits by conquering Dacia (modern-day Romania). He used the loot to help finance massive infrastructure and poverty relief programs. Rome prospered. Trajan also instituted elementary education programs. Let me stress here that such programs are commendable, particularly in an archaic setting such as Imperial Rome. When I inveigh against indoctrination, I protest against the insane twelve year multiple-choice compulsory debacle of our time. Basic literacy programs are perfectly fine and in fact necessary. In the age of the Internet and public libraries, such programs are obsolescent; but in an impoverished society, literacy programs help immensely.

Trajan's era also saw the pinnacle of Roman art. The emperors of the 2nd century A.D. solved the succession problem of monarchical governance by siring no sons and by personally selecting their successors. The third Good Emperor, Hadrian (76-138, Emperor 117-138), continued Trajan's public works programmes and built libraries, aqueducts, baths, theatres, and fortifications. Possessed of good sense, Hadrian surrendered the indefensible province of Mesopotamia, and worked for the internal benefit of Rome. The logistical limitations of the age had rendered the further expansion of the empire impossible. Hadrian travelled widely to oversee the Roman provinces, in accord with Machiavelli's principle that the Prince should rule in person. A learned man, Hadrian patronized the arts. His successor, Antonius Pius (86-161, Emperor 138-161), ruled after Hadrian's example, though without leaving Italy. Antonius also reformed Roman Law. He facilitated the enfranchisement of slaves, and introduced the idea of "innocent until proven guilty." The last Good Emperor, Marcus

Aurelius (121-180, Emperor 161-180), dealt with a succession of crises and has been recorded in the annals of history as a true Philosopher King.

The Italian Renaissance centred not around the decadent mercantile "republics" of Venice and Genoa, but around the industrial proto-states of Milan and Florence. Under the Viscontis, the Sforzas, and the Medicis, the two city-states developed basic bureaucracies and became powerful industrial loci. Both Francesco Sforza (1401-1466) and Cosimo de Medici (1389-1464) invested their own considerable fortunes into the modernization of their provinces. The two were, perhaps, early examples of the archetype of the paternalistic industrialist.

France enjoyed a Golden Age of Enlightenment (and a Golden Age there was, though perhaps not that much of true "enlightenment") in the 18th century. At that time, the French Kingdom was the most opulent, prosperous, and populous kingdom in Europe. The idea of the "absolute" kings of France is generally poorly understood. The kings of France had created a semi-modern state, but they were far from all-powerful. Therein lay the problem: the French kings ruled according to law rather than by dictate. 18th century France was spectacularly rich because of its fertile soils, colonial incomes, and military strength (which provided reasonable security to the king's subject). France was rich, but nevertheless the king could not secure sufficient incomes to fulfil his duties, in particular those in the military domain. The disastrous Seven Year War, in which England beat France to establish its empire, and the French *revanche* in supporting the American War of Independence, effectively bankrupted the French government, leading to its collapse. France needed a revamping, but no single power group in the state - and in particular not the king - possessed the power to do the job. So the state collapsed. Another important point about the French Revolution is that it was not a spontaneous popular revolution, but a meticulously planned oligarchical revolution. The Revolution did not substitute a cruel despotic government with a popular democratic one; rather, it brought in a new oligarchy in the place of the old one; and it catapulted France into a ruinous quarter of a century of warfare and tyranny.

For an overview of 18th century French society, try the University of Rennes's Henri Sée's *Economic and Social Conditions in France During the Eighteenth Century* (2004).

Two traits of 18th (to early 19th) century French society are notable in the current context: First, the French peasants enjoyed relatively extensive land ownership, and the city craftsmen held their own shops; and second, the all-conquering Napoleonic armies were mass citizen armies, as opposed to elite professional armies or mercenary armies. In contrast, the lands in Prussia and England belonged to a few landed aristocrats. Not that ancien regime France was some sort of paradise, but it did possess "progressive" qualities.

The prosperity of 18th century France stemmed to a large degree from the economic policies of Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619-1683) and Philibert Orry (1689-1747), the economic ministers of Louis XIV (1638-1715, King 1643-1715) and Louis XV (1710-1774, King 1715-1774) respectively. Both men favoured protectionism, infrastructure projects, and manufacturing, i.e. industry. Colbert also promoted more equitable taxation. At the same time, Colbert helped establish what we would today call corporatism. The point remains that dirigistic, paternalistic industrialism, though not necessarily always socially just (and one can only do so much in an oligarchical environment), enriches society. It must be understood that a certain level of prosperity is necessary for the existence of democracy. Roughly speaking, prosperity gives the general population greater opportunities for political activity and for learning. Moreover, no matter what they tell you, most people do not really care about their form of government as long as they enjoy stability and prosperity. Obviously, this is not to say that non-elective government is preferable to elective government.

Two important points deserve mention here: first, it is easy to confuse the production of necessities with the production of idiotic pseudo-luxuries. Until very recently, most of humanity everywhere lacked in bare necessities - proper shelter, proper nutrition, and pleasant surroundings. Today, some

of humanity has those basics. The problem is that the for-profit system fosters two abominable policies: convincing people to buy garbage, and producing sub-par goods, which break down to ensure future consumption. The problem is that if people stop buying the garbage under present conditions, the whole system will collapse. But then, it is collapsing anyway. Obviously, a sensible system should aim to: 1) provide the basics and certain well-built amenities, like private cars; 2) distribute those across the population; 3) give people their time to spend in leisure rather than rest. As Aristotle explained, leisure means philosophy and art; while rest means getting drunk and getting laid so that you can survive through next week's mind-numbing work.

So: until all people within a certain state enjoy the necessities of life, industry is necessary and good. From some point on, the problem becomes not the lack of industry, but the maldistribution of wealth within society. In the long run we encounter the problem of the pernicious and degrading Benthamite mentality of consumerism.

The other point in regard to dirigisme and corporatism is that a conscientious oligarchy is a tolerable oligarchy. Let would-be revolutionaries beware perpetual revolutionary activity. If a government is doing its job, let it operate without unnecessary internal threat to its stability. The revolution can wait - it is not going anywhere, and it will have a better chance of success in prosperous times, when, moreover, it might be achieved peacefully. Freedom is nice, unless it is the freedom to starve. One can also raise the issue of the freedom versus liberty dichotomy; but let us move on.

In the half century of peace between the unification of Germany of 1871 and World War I, Europe industrialized massively under a system of heavy protectionism and government interventionism. This went along with vicious class warfare, and the attainment of various privileges ("rights") by the working class - the eight-hour workday, mass suffrage, minimum wages, and so on. The Depression and the World Wars collapsed the whole structure, spawned fascism, and essentially ruined Europe for a generation. The postbellum Marshall-plan recovery coincided with the emergence of the welfare state and the general de-barbarization of the Old Continent. France went back to dirigisme under de Gaulle and experienced 30 years of prosperity.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the Americans enjoyed a Golden Age before the Civil War, and another Golden Age in the 1950s. The first era tended to be democratic and agrarian. The people lived on small farms and in small cities and by and large managed their own affairs. The second Golden Age followed the spectacular American industrial boom of World War II, in which all developed world nations but America (and the few other lucky states like Sweden, Switzerland, Canada, and Australia) smashed each other to pieces. America, untouchable on its continent, build itself up into a monolithic powerhouse. Between the phenomenal increase in America's productive capacity, and the need for employment caused by the war, the American working class managed to attain significant victories. The system which brought the prosperity was not merely interventionist - it was a full-blown minutely integrated war economy system in which government, big business, and the unions cooperated closely, sometimes to the annoyance of the workers. What is protectionism anyway? It is when the government protects and helps develop (by proper legislation) the national industry. Liberalism is when the already developed England demands that Somewhereia lowers its trade barriers so that England can dump its textiles and ruin the country's industry. A free market would be nice, but it necessitates an equal playing ground. This is why there are arbiters in professional sport - and why industry needs at least some regulation. Over-regulation can certainly be a problem - for example, certain powerful corporate interests can ask the government to regulate their competition out of existence. Not good! However, a realistic free-market must operate under certain rules. Government can play a large positive role in the industrial development of the nation. In fact, that is one of the main purposes of government.

America has not had a remotely fair playing field for at least a century. The disintegration of American small business is happening and is bad. "Big government" is a poorly defined concept. "Big" how? Clearly, no one wants the government to interfere with the humdrum details of life. At the same time, the state has a role to play in human society. Instead of bitching about "big government," people should quit watching television, and should obtain control of the government. Then they can

do whatever they want. But of course, things are much more complicated than that.

In regard to Asia, both Japan and South Korea accomplished their "miracle" under heavy protection and via the coordinated action of the industrial cartels of the Keiretsu/Zaibatsu and the Jaebol. Both countries have gone from fascism to something resembling democracy. China has finally emerged from its time of troubles to follow the same path.

The post-war period in the developed world also tended to coincide with the peak of the power of the unions, and the attainment of reasonably "fair" wages and a generally equitable distribution of the wealth across the spectrum of society. Moreover, between the Napoleonic era and about 1975, mass armies dominated the battlefields, and democracy (meaning self-determination) tended to develop.

Everywhere we see the same trends: 1) movements toward the equitable distribution of wealth tended to stimulate economic development of the public's well-being; 2) conscious government activity aimed at the promotion of the public's well-being, as opposed to governmental non-intervention, contributed toward the betterment of the conditions of life of the general population; 3) the periods of the mass armies tended to be more "democratic" than the periods of the professional armies.

In summary: 1) oligarchy has dominated human history; 2) prosperity, peace, the more equitable distribution of property, and responsible government, tend to go together and to produce an anti-oligarchic effect.

We must stress that the favourite "capitalist" party-line to the effect that for-profit liberal capitalism leads to prosperity and to democracy is utterly false. Prosperity comes from the sub-ordination of profits to national interest; from protectionism, dirigisme, and interventionism rather than economic liberalism; and from the more equitable distribution of property among the population. Thus, pre-Civil War America enjoyed its internal free-trade because of the protection of the larger Union, and because of the relatively egalitarian distribution of national wealth that existed at the time.

Moreover, prosperity is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the emergence of real democracy. If they want true democracy, people should stop playing with their gadgets and watching their ball games, and should get their act together and join the cultural and political life of the nation. Here we run again into the problem of mass brainwashing.

4.2 Outlook

The characteristics of the oligarchical outlook are: 1) rapacity; 2) obsessive secrecy; 3) snobbery; 4) a dog-eat-dog law-of-the-jungle interpretation of the universe; 5) paranoia; 6) love for lying; 7) hatred of technology and development; 8) atavism; 9) truculence and the glorification of war; 10) inbreeding and an obsession with genealogy; 11) internationalism; 12) class-conscious ultra-tribalism.

Oligarchs are greedy. They always want more for themselves. The oligarch can never have enough. One reason for this is that people tend to gauge their wealth comparatively. Imagine a society in which 90% of the population lives in mansions, 9% lives in palaces, and 1% lives in private kingdoms. By any serious measure, such a society would be exotically affluent. However, the oligarchically minded members of the 9% will think themselves poor, because their meagre palaces are not entire kingdoms. Similarly, the millionaire Wall Street speculator thinks himself poor in comparison to his billionaire peers. The yacht, the Riviera villa, and the private jet are not enough. The good speculator needs a rocket ship and a private island to feel comfortable. As Machiavelli observed, one can never satisfy the oligarchs. They always want more. As George Carlin put it, (emphasis mine)

Forget the politicians. They are irrelevant. The politicians are put there to give you the idea that you have freedom of choice. You don't. You have no choice! You have owners! They own you. They own everything. They own all the important land. They own and control the corporations. They've long since bought and paid for the Senate, the Congress, the state houses, the city halls, they got the judges in their back pockets and they own all the big media companies, so they control just about all of the news and

information you get to hear. They got you by the balls.

They spend billions of dollars every year lobbying, lobbying, to get what they want.

Well, we know what they want. They want more for themselves and less for everybody else, but I'll tell you what they don't want:

They don't want a population of citizens capable of critical thinking. They don't want well informed, well educated people capable of critical thinking. They're not interested in that. That doesn't help them. That's against their interests.

That's right. They don't want people who are smart enough to sit around a kitchen table and think about how badly they're getting [played] by a system that threw them overboard 30 [damn] years ago. They don't want that!

You know what they want? They want obedient workers. Obedient workers, people who are just smart enough to run the machines and do the paperwork. And just dumb enough to passively accept all these increasingly [lousy] jobs with the lower pay, the longer hours, the reduced benefits, the end of overtime and vanishing pension that disappears the minute you go to collect it, and now they're coming for your Social Security money. They want your retirement money. They want it back so they can give it to their criminal friends on Wall Street, and you know something? They'll get it. They'll get it all from you sooner or later cause they own this [stinking] place! Its a big club, and you ain't in it! You, and I, are not in the big club.

And that is correct.

The oligarchical greed goes hand-in-hand with the idea of the zero-sum game. For the oligarchs, there is only so much stuff out there and it must all belong to them. That is the motivation behind the writings of Malthus and the Club of Rome.

Another typical oligarchical trait is the love for secrecy. Again: just listen to what the great philosophers of the ages said. Take Adam Smith, in whose opinion those who think that the "masters" do not cavort in secret have a poor grasp of reality. When your sole mission in life is to squeeze the blood out of the veins of the labouring masses, you conduct your business in secret. This is why the oligarchical classes have so many private clubs - Masonic lodges, golf courts, country clubs, expensive restaurants, 51st floor boardrooms, country mansion smoking rooms, Jekyll Island, Deer Island, the Bohemian Grove, bought-out ritzy hotels - you name it. How do you think corporations and governments work? As Jordan Maxwell (among others) has pointed out, they do not just live in the moment. The CEO does not wake up, snort a line of coke, and scream "How about we open a new factory in Guangdong, wherever the hell that is!" That is not how it works. The big corporations, foundations, and governments have long-range plans, which they follow. This is how serious people do things. They plan, and then they proceed according to plan, improvising as necessary. Just remember the legendary military timetables at the eve of World War I - the Schlieffen Plan, the mobilization orders, the railway schedules, and so on. Serious people plan, and for the important things they plan sedulously and circumspectly.

And the oligarchs plan in secret, because if they told you what they have in store for you, the guillotine business would boom in a matter of hours. Scaffold-building companies and guillotine manufacturers would appear on every corner. That is why we have the extreme state secrecy laws in the Western world. The West has a mountain of nukes, and an elite army equipped with a gadgetry that comes straight out of the science fiction of a half a century ago. The nations of the West have Nato. Nothing on Earth can threaten the oligarch-owed Western governments - except the populations of the Western countries. Hence secrecy, and hence the concerted effort at the destruction of Western culture.

Snobbery is intrinsic to oligarchism. The proper oligarch regards himself as naturally superior to the vulgar plebeians/ paysans/ proles/ serfs/ chumps/ slaves. In one of his talks, Michael Parenti related the following story: Parenti was down in South America to deliver a lecture. He was taking

his breakfast at the hotel, and he could not help overhearing the chatter of a few ladies of breeding who sat nearby. The good ladies discussed the deplorable indolence of their servants. How could the devils be so lazy! What did the ladies pay them for!

And that is how it goes. The great thinkers Malthus and Bentham repeatedly endorsed the working ethic - for the peasants and for the workers. Both men were, of course, gentlemen of leisure. Aristotle's writings also come to mind.

Oligarchs also see themselves as smarter than the bulk of the population. Theirs is the commoner's view. It is not the oligarch's fault that there are so many chumps out there! The oligarch is rich not because he is a lying thieving creep, but because he is smart. The inner doctrines of Masonry provide an illustration of the oligarchical glorification of ill-understood intelligence, as we will see later.

A class, which profits of the exploitation of others, will naturally view the world as a vicious free-for-all, a jungle in which the strong survive and the weak fall by the sidelines. The worldview of the gangster class is essentially identical, in accordance with the "as above, so below" principle.

In contrast, if the reader talks with those around him, he will find that most "normal" people tend to see the world as a generally decent place, in which people prosper by helping each other out.

The doctrines of economic liberalism (for-profit free-markets) and Darwinism obviously stem from exactly this oligarchical ideological propensity. Since the world is a jungle, reason the oligarchs, no one can blame them for taking care of #1. Remember Charles Galton Darwin's observations - the ruling class is justified in taming the serfs, but must keep itself wild. This is why throughout history there have existed two sets of laws - a Hobbesian system for the commoners, and a laissez-faire system for the oligarchs. In the old days, there simply existed separate laws for the nobles and the serfs. Today we have the form but not the substance of "equality before the law."² What happens is, 1) the judges tend to belong to the oligarchical class and watch out for their buddies and club brethren, 2) the wealthy hire crafty shysters, who scan the law for loopholes and get their clients out of trouble, and 3) the rich simply buy their way out of troubles via "settlements."

Said Anatole France of the small cranium,

The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread.

From a moral perspective, oligarchs have to see themselves as naturally superior to the underclass, in order to justify their existence.

The writings of P. G. Wodehouse are also of interest in regard to the present point. Wodehouse's most famous characters are Bertie Wooster, his butler Jeeves, and Lord Emsworth of Blandings Castle. Bertie Wooster, member of the "Drones" Club, is a parasitic good-for-nothing who lives under the wings of his guardian angel manservant Jeeves, whose main business, apart from satisfying Bertie's natural needs, is getting Bertie out of jams. Emsworth is an imbecilic gentleman who emerges out of his farcical troubles by the good graces of the Lady Luck. Therein lay Wodehouse's genius - he appealed to the upper classes by presenting the world as they wanted it to be, and he appealed to the lower classes by showing them the banal reality of the lives of the oligarchs. True to his characters, Wodehouse proved lethargic enough to run into the hands of the Germans during World War II. The pro-British Nazis held Wodehouse for a while. Figuring him for a dolt, the eventually let him go home. Back in England, Wodehouse encountered a cool welcome. He blasted some of his critics, moved to New York, and went on with his leisurely life.

Evelyn Waugh wrote in a somewhat similar vein, though Waugh's writings are harsh and cynical compared to Wodehouse's innocent contrivances.

Paranoia is another attribute of oligarchism. The oligarchs fear that there always is someone who wants to take away their stuff - because they always want to steal other people's stuff. That is

²For an annotated list of examples, see Parenti's *Democracy for the Few*, 7th or later edition, Chapter 9.

why oligarchs obsess over their own security, and relentlessly develop new ways of controlling the population. Though the oligarchs engage in perpetual class warfare against the world, they emit pathetic shrill cries of "class warfare!" whenever the underclass dares organize in a union or a political movement. Likewise, any leader who dares threaten the integrity of the oligarchical domain is branded a "tyrant." So any South American president who tries to kick out Standard Fruit and redistribute the nation's land to the nation's people becomes a tyrant or a communist or a demagogue. People like Pinochet and his likes are noble national leaders until they outlive their usefulness.

Oligarchs are hypocrites and liars. They believe in lying for the common, meaning theirs, good. We have discussed this at length already. It suffices to say that the oligarchs will always try to portray themselves as benevolent upstanding members of society.

One important aspect of oligarchy is its intrinsic hatred of technology. The problem with technology is that it threatens the status quo. In general, technology leads to prosperity, which tends to have an anti-oligarchical effect. Even if it does not lead to prosperity, technology will tend to provoke changes in the arrangement of things. This is why Malthus and the Club of Rome inveighed against techno-optimism, and advised for the orderly return to the good old times of feudalism. At the same time, oligarchs enjoy inventing new means of repression. Thus our society happily works on biometrics rather than on solving global poverty.

The ideal oligarchical world would be a stable caste society, in which the workers do their work and the oligarchs do their oligarching in perpetuity. Something like H.G. Wells's *Time Machine*, but without the cannibalism. That is what oligarchs want, and that is what they are working toward. The oligarchical hatred of technology and love of secrecy unite in the concept of hidden knowledge. Knowledge is power, and therefore the oligarchs feel compelled to keep as much knowledge as possible secret. Bacon explicitly made this point. Sometimes, oligarchs simply destroy knowledge. Historically, only the wealthy had access to books, which made the guardianship of knowledge an easy matter. The Guttenberg Press and industrialization solved this problem. So the oligarchs turned to private institutes and top-secret government labs.

The last point goes along with atavistic idealism. The oligarchs always long for the good old days, when the butlers respected their masters, and the serfs paid their rents, and the sun shone brightly, and the birds sang beautiful songs. Rome was a subject of oligarchical revelry until well into the 20th century. These days the oligarchs long for the good old 19th century, in which no labour unions and minimum wage laws existed. Ah... Those were the days!

In line with their bestial worldview, oligarchs love war. The medieval knights gloried in war and considered it a good unto itself. War is wonderful in many ways - it directs the population's hatred toward external enemies, it provides a Malthusian outlet, it furnishes juicy government contracts, it showers victorious oligarchical butcher generals with glory, it provides loot, it expands the empire - war is great! This is why nations keep engaging in utterly absurd ruinous wars. Why on Earth did America invade Vietnam? Because of oligarchy.

This is also why the old aristocracy pursued the hunt with such vigour. For them, hunting served as an exercise at war. Now, the West Virginia redneck shoots a deer so that he can put food on the table.³ The oligarch of the school of Philip the Germ and Richard Cheney shoots endangered animals, quail, and 78 year old attorneys, for somewhat different reasons.

Wealth consolidation is a major problem for the oligarchs. To keep their wealth in few hands, oligarchs intermarry between themselves, often within their own families. The feudal class of Europe was thoroughly incestuous and interbred, as a simple look at the genealogies of the various rulers will show. The Habsburgs, and the World War I Northern European litter of kinglings, are a classic

³See the late Joe Bageant's excellent *Deer Hunting With Jesus* and *Rainbow Pie*.

example of massive inbreeding. In 1914, the kings of England, Germany, and Russia (and a few other nations) were cousins. The Romanov Tsarevitch famously suffered from haemophilia, while Kaiser Wilhelm II sported a rotten arm. The current heir to the throne of England is a notoriously inbred specimen who likes to talk to flowers and believes flowers talk back to him.

This incestuous monomania coalesces with the delusion of the natural superiority of the oligarchy to spawn the idea of hereditary excellence. Thus oligarchs ponder their genealogies in an effort to figure out just how excellent they are. We always had Darwinism coming. The Age of "Reason" had arrived, and the oligarchs needed a "scientific" justification for their inbreeding. That is why they loved Darwinism so much, and why they took to eugenics like vultures to carrion.

In point of fact, inbreeding leads to degeneracy, as humanity has known for millennia.

Oligarchs tend to be internationalist-minded. They do not really recognize borders and boundaries. They form a global class of predators. Two striking examples can be found in the international money-lenders and in the 14th century European nobility. Both groups lived across wide areas, knew their peers intimately, and ruled with an iron fist. The communists also come to mind.

This is what people must understand in regard to the current crop of politicians in charge of the Western nations. These politicians and their controllers *do not really care about their nations*. They are working toward the internationalist "New World Order." This is extremely hard for people to understand on account of people's frequent refusal to try to imagine how others think. People genuinely believe that Bush was trying to "defend" America. What an absurdity! Bush is completely removed from what people imagine "America" is. He lives in an oligarchical internationalist world of his own, of which people know almost nothing.

Another important aspect of the oligarchical psychology, which ties with the point made above, is the extreme tribal mentality oligarchs tend to manifest. In general, though they often fight between themselves, oligarchs are well aware of their class belongings, and are always ready to ally with their peers to squash peasant rebellions. In its extreme form, this mentality leads to brutal pathology. The consummate oligarchs literally do not regard the ordinary people as full human beings. Hence, they do not care if a few (thousand or million) members of the "herd" die. They do not care! This is why the oligarch can be a loving father, a kind friend, and a vicious mass-murderer at the same time.

The careful reader will have noticed that oligarchy displays the symptoms of psychopathy. This is not a coincidence.

4.3 Psychopathy

When cursing the evils of the world, one invariably encounters the retort: "It's just human nature - nothing we can do about it." Though most people live by the dictum of neighbourliness and cooperation, they like to parrot the doctrinaire Hobbesian / Benthamite view that humans are essentially dumb animals whose main mission in life is to satisfy their base desires. This opinion stems from the lifelong free-market / Darwinism / consumerism brainwashing that we have all received.

So let us look at human nature.

4.3.1 Human Nature

Dave Grossman in his *On Killing* (1995) examines the manner in which military organization train young soldiers to kill. In the aftermath of WWII, the Pentagon decided to see how many of the American soldiers actually fired at the enemy in combat. Amazingly, only 15-20% of front-line troops shot at their adversaries. This astounding fact bears repeating: even in war, 80+% of people will not shoot at the enemy. Further studies across various theatres of war and various cultures produced similar conclusions. Most people will avoid killing even in mortal combat.

Those who did not fire were no cowards. They did not run and hide. Often they showed heroism under duress. They simply refused to willingly kill their fellow humans.

To drive the point home, Grossman notes that of the 27-rough thousand muskets recovered after the Battle of Gettysburg, nearly 90% were loaded. Loading a musket takes a while. Shooting takes a pull on the trigger. So not only did people fire to miss; a lot of them did not fire at all!

This paramount fact alone should suffice to bury the idea that humans are intrinsically evil savages who would slaughter their neighbours if only given the opportunity. Of course, the reality is much more complicated. But the point remains - if most 20th century Americans refused to shoot to kill even under fire, then, under ordinary circumstances, the vast majority of the population would have been strongly averse to violence. One important point here is that internalized controls strongly affect human behaviour. In other words, secure, Christian Americans will generally abhor violence; but people who have grown up in a war-torn era and area may exhibit much higher propensities toward killing. Thus, peace breeds peace, and war breeds war.

Therefore, we can say that, in general, security, prosperity, and civilization tend to lead to a widespread aversion to killing. Here, one would naturally ask, "but what about the Germans and the World Wars?" Prior to WWI, the Germans felt insecure, because they felt encircled, which they were, due to the machinations of the British. Prior to WWII, the Germans experienced a horrendous twenty years of severe economic depression. Moreover, they were once again encircled.

The next question should be, then what about the Americans? Why do they keep going to war? Here we pick up Grossman's analysis.

Military establishments exist to wage war, and, on principle though not always in practice, they wage war to win. Killing definitely helps one win a war. Thus motivated, the Pentagon psychologists set out to figure out how to make young Americans kill. They came up with the practice of behavioral conditioning. The human mind is not a blank slate, but humans are highly suggestible and adaptive. This great boon of humanity has been perverted into a curse by the behaviorist mad doctors. In effect, it is possible to instil lasting habits into the human mind via the methods devised by Pavlov, Watson, and Skinner.

So the Pentagon revised its training methods. At the shooting range, they replaced the old circular targets with cardboard man-shaped figures. They pumped gratuitous violence on the TV. In our era, the Pentagon went as far as to release a free first-person-shooter game - *America's Army* (2002-). Such a game can only have one purpose - conditioning. Similar commercial titles, like *Call of Duty*, sell in the millions.

After shooting human-shaped targets for a while, one becomes accustomed to the idea of shooting human-shaped objects. Moreover, the overload of violent images that modern children see on the television as they grow up leads to a widespread desensitization to violence. Blood and gore cease to impress and disgust people. Killing becomes easier. Kubrick focused on this issue in his *Clockwork Orange* (1971).

One other approach to raising firing rates is the dehumanization of the target. In general, WWII artillery and bombing crews exhibited high firing rates, because they never saw their victims. Today, soldiers have heat-goggles, which display the enemies as yellow blobs. We saw this in the infamous Iraq war journalist-murder videos. Shooting yellow blobs is easier than shooting humans.

The tricks worked. After their brainwashing in boot camp, the American soldiers slaughtered the Vietnamese "gooks" en masse.

Killing carries consequences. The Vietnam cohorts became notorious in American history for their mental problems and general in-adaptability to peaceful life. Landmark films like *Rambo* (1982), *The Deer Hunter* (1978), *Apocalypse Now* (1979), *Catch 22* (novel - 1961, movie with Orson - 1970), *Mash* (1970), and *Full Metal Jacket* (1987) high-lighted this issue. The Gulf War participants, better killers yet, have suffered horrendous casualty rates *after* the war. Undoubtedly, the use of depleted uranium in that war, and other external poisons, have contributed to the plight of the Gulf War veterans. Nevertheless, the psychological damage of the war must have left its mark. Those Ameri-

cans who fight the War on Terror suffer terribly. Recently, more American troops have died due to suicide than due to enemy activity. And for every suicide there must be four to ten people on the edge - narcoleptic depressives, compulsive alcoholics, heroin addicts - broken, ruined people.

In a certain sense, American soldiers are difficult to sympathize with, because, frankly, they are imperial soldiers on what obviously is an imperial war. At the same time, these men are human beings, and many of them are merely naive patriots. They deserve at least pity, and preferably compassion. Of the dead Iraqis, Pakistanis, and Afghanis, what more can we say than that there should be a new Nuremberg?

The extreme mental anguish of the post-Vietnam American veterans implies that though conditioning can overcome natural (or deeply ingrained socio-cultural) human instincts, the victims of indoctrination pay in blood - at least metaphorically speaking - in the long run. This means that either 1) most humans are naturally decent, or 2) humans who grow up in secure prosperous societies grow up to be decent. Both alternatives imply that "human nature" is not intrinsically bestial and aggressive. Note that this is the old nature versus nurture conundrum, and that, like oligarchy and popular rule, nature and nurture span a continuum.

We draw two conclusions: 1) most humans, at least of the modern variety, revile killing under ordinary circumstances; and 2) conditioning techniques can turn humans into killing machines at the expense of the victims of the conditioning.

In simple terms, humans tend to be gentle and suggestible. Remember Aldous Huxley's observation to the effect that 20% of humans are highly suggestible, 60% are somewhat suggestible, and 20% are not suggestible, but perhaps still are conditionable. We see the same thing here: after simple training, 80% of the participants in WWII refused to shoot at the enemy. But after the scientific conditioning of the Vietnam-era boot camps, the figures flipped.

Movies, games, and pulp literature tend to mask the realities of war. Erich Maria Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* (book - 1929, film - 1930), Celine's *Voyage au bout de la nuit* (1932), and Heller's *Catch 22* (1961) give one a more realistic impression of what war really is about. In short, war is pure horror. There is little heroism in war. War is a stew of tedium with a dash of agony. War is involuntary defecation under the roar of the guns. War is the nasty little infections and diseases and the trench amputations. War is the deafening rumble of artillery and the nauseating stench of destruction. War is the uncontrollable panic at the approaching enemy tanks. War is the profound apathy that follows intense combat. War is the morphine which offers a brief respite from it all. War is the going over the top in the face of machine gun fire at the orders of an incompetent general hundreds of miles away. War is seeing your friend get blown up. War is the repugnance of having to kill a fellow who has never done you harm.

Moreover, *War is a Racket* (c.1930-1935), as the most decorated American soldier of his time, General Smedley Butler, two-time recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, explained.

WAR is a racket. It always has been.

It is possibly the oldest, easily the most profitable, surely the most vicious. It is the only one international in scope. It is the only one in which the profits are reckoned in dollars and the losses in lives.

A racket is best described, I believe, as something that is not what it seems to the majority of the people. Only a small "inside" group knows what it is about. It is conducted for the benefit of the very few, at the expense of the very many. Out of war a few people make huge fortunes.

In the World War [I] a mere handful garnered the profits of the conflict. At least 21,000 new millionaires and billionaires were made in the United States during the World War. That many admitted their huge blood gains in their income tax returns. How many other war millionaires falsified their tax returns no one knows.

How many of these war millionaires shouldered a rifle? How many of them dug a trench?

How many of them knew what it meant to go hungry in a rat-infested dug-out? How many of them spent sleepless, frightened nights, ducking shells and shrapnel and machine gun bullets? How many of them parried a bayonet thrust of an enemy? How many of them were wounded or killed in battle?

Out of war nations acquire additional territory, if they are victorious. They just take it. This newly acquired territory promptly is exploited by the few – the selfsame few who wrung dollars out of blood in the war. The general public shoulders the bill.

And what is this bill?

This bill renders a horrible accounting. Newly placed gravestones. Mangled bodies. Shattered minds. Broken hearts and homes. Economic instability. Depression and all its attendant miseries. Back-breaking taxation for generations and generations.

...

Those who have not read Butler's brief piece should absolutely do so. The man knew what he was talking about. Huey Long intended to make Butler his Secretary of Defence.

Next, let us examine three landmark psychological experiments - Stanley Milgram's 1961 obedience to authority experiment, Philip Zimbardo's 1971 Stanford prison experiment, and Solomon Asch's 1950s conformity experiment.

Milgram had his subjects administer electric shocks of increasing intensity to a helpless prisoner on the orders of a doctor. The shocks looked real but were fake. About two-thirds of the subjects went through the whole procedure, which culminated with a "lethal" 450 volt shock. All participants expressed doubts and only continued after they had gotten the impression that the presiding doctor had assumed full responsibility for the outcome of the affair. All forty subjects in the original experiment obeyed orders until the 300 volt threshold, to which the "victim" actor responded with some animation. Repeated experiments produced similar results. Some participants experienced severe emotional breakdowns during or after the experiment. Very few people categorically refused to participate. They tended to have correctly associated the prospective experiment with the Nazi crimes of World War II.

Zimbardo took a sample of 24 students and divided them into two groups - prisoners and guards. Then the brave researchers started role-playing. The game got out of hand. The guards ended up torturing the prisoners, who began to rat on each other and to fight with each other to avoid punishment. After six days the experiment disintegrated. Zimbardo himself, in his role of prison superintendent, lost track of reality.

Asch inserted each of his subjects into a group of five to seven people who were in on the game. The subjects were given a simple question to answer. The other members in the group would give the correct answer on the first two trials, and the wrong answer on twelve of the next sixteen trials. Only 25% of the 123 participants never gave a wrong answer. 5% conformed with the group every time. The average conformity rate over all trials was 37%. The experiment was replicated later, with similar outcomes.

What can we conclude?

The naive interpretation of Milgram's results, which was, indeed, the interpretation of Milgram himself, is that most people instinctively obey authority. This conclusion necessarily follows from the ideological assumptions of the cretinous behaviorist school of psychology. In reality, the experiment merely shows that Milgram's subjects, who were a particular set of people from a particular culture from a particular era, tended to obey authority. Why was that? We know why from our examination of the school system. Most modern people have been conditioned from an early age to OBEY authority figures. Doctors are particularly respectable archetypes. One of the purposes of TV shows like *ER* and *House* is to reinforce the positive image of doctors and scientists. People have been instructed to trust technicians. You have to have that to have a technocracy.

Similarly, people have been given a positive image of science. Thus, the subjects of the experiment did what they did in the belief that they were helping further science - an action they regarded as positive. The subjects thought that they were doing an evil to a single individual for the benefit of the greater collective. We should also note that the transfer of the act of violence into the simple act of pressing a button bypassed the subjects' inner abhorrence to violence. Milgram's guinea pigs could focus their attention on the button - press the button and science will advance to the benefit of humanity. Had Milgram conducted the experiment with baseball bats, the results would have been vastly different.

One other important implication of Milgram's experiment is the existence of the phenomenon of cognitive dissonance. To put it in proper Orwellian terms, cognitive dissonance is double-speak for double-think. Cognitive dissonance is one's accommodation of opposing ideas. Thus, though the subjects would have never dreamed of harming a person except in self-defence (and perhaps not even then), they did "harm" a person under Milgram's orders. This is classic double-think. The exposure of one's double-think, particularly in regard to highly sensitive issues, can, for obvious reasons, lead to a mental breakdown - which is what Milgram saw in a few of his test subjects. Cognitive dissonance is well understood at the top. Dunegan mentioned the concept in his talk.

Also note that Milgram's experiment highlights the pernicious influence of "legal positivism," i.e. the disassociation between law and morality. The subjects did what they did on the assumption that they bore no responsibility. Does a person following orders bear responsibility for his actions? In the current context, the test subjects were clearly morally guilty of wrongdoing, since they did what they did under no threat of harm to themselves. This shows the degeneration of morality in Western society, directly traceable to Bentham's (and Hobbes's) legal positivism. The way out of such a hideous situation is simple: one need only adhere to natural law and elementary personal responsibility. Doc tells you to zap the wretch behind the window? Tell Doc to go to hell.

What Milgram's experiment really shows is that brainwashing works, and works well.

Asch's experiment showcases well-understood mob psychology principles, and the idea of group-think. In general, people lose themselves in mobs and follow the mobs' examples. Scientific indoctrination, such as that done in the schools, can strengthen this propensity. One ends up with a controllable population. All the oligarchy has to do is to appoint leaders to the herds, and the herds will follow their leaders into the chasm.

To defend oneself from this phenomenon, one should beware of mobs. One should avoid mobs when possible, and should try to stick to one's reasoning powers when inside a mob. Retaining one's mind inside a mob is not as easy as it appears to be. Merging with the mob-mind can be an exhilarating and intoxicating experience. That is what many people mistake for the feeling of God when they go to church. God has little to do with it. You deal with God on your own. The church serves to strengthen community bonds, and, unfortunately, to brainwash.

Zimbardo's experiment shows that unnatural, vile situations conduct to unnatural and vile behavior. This is another problem that tends to fly over the heads of the behaviorists. The favourite pastime of behaviorists is the insertion into a box and subsequent torture of helpless animals. Boy, do behaviorists have a riot doing that. For example, as Aldous told us, behaviorists once put a mouse into a sterile box, hooked a wire to the pleasure centres of the mouse, and gave the mouse a button to press. So the mouse pressed the button, and kept pressing. The conclusion? Mice, and therefore humans, will gleefully entertain themselves to death if given the opportunity. David Foster Wallace wrote a whole thousand-page novel around this concept. In reality, all the behaviorists found was that if you torture a mouse and give it heroin, it will take the heroin. Aldous understood that.

Likewise the Zimbardo experiment. It did not show that humans are naturally violent and mean. It merely showed that if you put humans into a rigged Skinner Box, you can get the worst out of them. Now, a sensible person would say - great, we have figured that out, so let's avoid such situations. But the oligarchs says - oh, boy! - let's use this to control people. And that is why we have depressing, constricting school buildings and office spaces. So that we behave like jerks to each other, and ignore

the enemy behind the curtain.

We should mention here that a human subconsciously regards the area near his body as his private space. Unwelcome intrusions into this private space lead to annoyance and anxiety. Thus, one easy way to generate conflict among people is to herd them together into a constricted space.

The main conclusion that we draw from the above experiments is that humans tend to be trusting, adaptable, and brainwashable. The trusting nature of humans suggests that most people not only do not seek to harm others, but expect the same in return. The suggestibility of people forces us to examine every human fiasco from the perspective of indoctrination.

Unfortunately, brainwashing alone does not explain the existence of what we can safely call *evil* in our world. Which brings us to the topic of psychopathy.

4.3.2 Psychopathy

Humanity has studied psychopathy throughout its history. Psychopathy, though usually not expressly identified, is one of the favourite subjects of literary writers. In its academic setting, the study of psychopathy traces back to Hervey Cleckley's 1941 work *The Mask of Sanity*. The pre-eminent expert on psychopathy today is Robert Hare, author of the excellent *Without Conscience* (1993), and the useful *Snakes in Suits* (2006). Other works on the subject include George K. Simon Jr.'s compact *In Sheep's Clothing* (1996), Martha Stout's *The Sociopath Next Door* (2005), Sandra L. Brown's *Women Who Love Psychopaths* (2008), and Dr. Robin Stern's *The Gaslight Effect* (2007). One of the best work on psychopathy is Andrzej M. Lobaczewski's *Political Ponerology (Ponerologia Polityczna)*. Lobaczewski (1921-2007) was a Polish psychologist. Born in 1921, the man personally experienced the horrors of both Nazi fascism and Soviet communism. Doctor Andrzej and a few of his colleagues formed a loose organization dedicated to the study and understanding of the evil that had descended upon Poland and Europe. The fruit of that research was *Political Ponerology* - an oeuvre twice lost and thrice written. The first version of *Ponerology* went into the fire a few minutes ahead of a search by the Secret Police. Lobaczewski later sent a laboriously rewritten second copy to the Vatican via a courier; the document vanished and was never heard of again. Banished from Poland in 1977, Lobaczewski wrote a third version of the book in New York in 1984. What happened next was that Big Zbig read the book, praised it, and then proceeded to sabotage its publication. What better recommendation than that? *Ponerology* found its way to the English-language paperback mass-market in 2006.

The content of the book is as remarkable as the story of its writing. *Ponerology* builds on the motto *Ignota nulla curatio morbid* - cure not what thou understandeth not. The term "ponerology" itself refers to the theological discipline of the study of evil. The psychological term closest, but not synonymous, to "ponerology" is perhaps "pathology."

We should note here that it is hard to separate the study of psychopathy from the metaphysical concept of Evil. Nature (genetics) and nurture (social norms) play certain causal roles in the emergence of psychopathy, but they do not tell the whole story. Hare provides an illuminating examples of this problem in Chapter 1 of his *Without Conscience*: the twins. One of a pair of twins, who shared roughly identical backgrounds in nature and nurture, was a psychopath, while her sister was normal. It follows that psychopathy goes beyond nature and nurture, and perhaps into the realm of free-will. The interpretation of psychopathy as the malignant and somewhat arbitrary touch of the devil is an accurate one. For the purposes of scientific inquiry, let us adopt the above interpretation in its metaphorical sense. The point is - psychopathy, for whatever reason, exists, and constitutes a paramount problem for humanity.

"Genetics" do seem to play some role in the propagation of psychopathy. In particular, inbreeding with its degenerative effects probably contributes to the manifestation of psychopathy. Similarly, pathological situations stimulate the emergence of psychopathic impulses.

Who is the psychopath and what does he do? Let us adopt Hare's succinct overview of the psychopathic personality: the psychopath manifests the following characteristics (Chapter 3 of *Without Conscience*):

Emotional/Interpersonal

- glib and superficial
- egocentric and grandiose
- lack of remorse or guilt
- lack of empathy
- deceitful and manipulative
- shallow emotions

Social Deviance

- impulsive
- poor behavior controls
- need for excitement
- lack of responsibility
- early behavior problems
- adult antisocial behavior

The short description of the psychopath is "a person without conscience." Some writers go as far as to say that the psychopaths are the soulless. Let us stick to the first definition to avoid unnecessary metaphysical arguments.

The psychopath, then, is the person without conscience. Some classic literary and cinematic archetypes can help illustrate the point. The remorseless conman is a classic psychopath. Pictures such as *The Sting* (1973), *The Lady Eve* (1941), *Paper Moon* (1973), *Catch Me If You Can* (2002), and *House of Games* (1987) try to infuse some humanity into the conman archetype. That is done for dramatic purposes - in reality, serious conmen experience no guilt. Uniformly, they say that the victim had it coming, and enjoyed the con anyway. The psychopathic lover boys who prey on middle-aged widows always excuse their behaviour with the argument that they had merely provided a service to a woman in need of some attention. The female version of the psychopath is the legendary *femme fatale* of the film noir cycle, portrayed in films such as *Double Indemnity* (1944), *The Maltese Falcon* (1941), *Out of the Past* (1947), *All About Eve* (1950), and *The Lady from Shanghai* (1947). The literary roots of the noir cycle go back to the works of the pulp writers of the 1920s and the 1930s, the most of famous of whom were the masters of style James M. Cain, Dashiell Hammett, and Raymond Chandler. The *femme fatale* is the ruthless ice-cold dame who will seduce, scam, and assassinate her way to the top. Another classic psychopathic archetype is the ambitious gangster. In the 1930s, Jimmy Cagney made a career by playing the thug: see his *The Public Enemy* (1931), *The Roaring Twenties* (1939), and *White Heat* (1949). Paul Newman toed the line between the outright psychopath and the tortured neurotic in his classic roles in *Cool Hand Luke* (1967), *The Hustler* (1961), *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1958), *The Verdict* (1982), and *Hud* (1963). The Newman in *Cool Hand Luke* edges toward the neurotic, while the Newman in *Hud* is a bonafide psychopath. The distinction between neurotics and psychopaths is critical. The former are genuinely tortured people who constantly agonize over their real and perceived errors and sins, while the latter are unfeeling individuals who pantomime

inner suffering for the purposes of manipulation.

Oliver Stone nailed the psychotic Wall Street executive in his *Wall Street* (1987). Robert Altman gave us the dope on the remorseless Hollywood producer in *The Player* (1992). The usually sympathetic Burt Lancaster portrayed a repulsive hack-journalist psychopath in *Sweet Smell of Success* (1957). Jimmy Stewart, who grew above Capracorn after his participation in World War II and *A Wonderful Life* (1946), portrayed what may have been a psychopathic shyster in *Anatomy of a Murder* (1959). Also see the 2002 Academy Award winner *Chicago*. De Niro's *The Good Shepherd* (2006) and Ridley Scott's *Body of Lies* (2008) showcase the psychopathic spook.

It is no coincidence that the theme of psychopathy is so prominent in all the major works of two of the best directors of the 20th century: Stanley Kubrick and Roman Polanski.

The reader can come up with additional examples. Psychopathy fascinates people. We also note that in the last two decades Hollywood has begun to heavily promote psychopathy, for one reason or another. Television is doing its best to glorify psychopathy and degradation as well, via shows such as *Big Brother*. That such a show exists and attracts viewers speaks volumes of the extreme degeneracy of our culture. This is not idle moralizing: we are in serious trouble.

The psychopath is the abusive seducer who takes his prey for all that he or she is worth, and vanishes after the victim has collapsed emotionally or financially. The psychopath can be found in varying degrees in the thuggish racketeer, the abusive parent, the manipulative child, the brutal dictator, the shyster who keeps the bad guys out of jail, the mad doctor lobotimizer, the psychiatrist who uses his patients as sexual playthings, the City of London speculator, the lying politician, the condottiere, the exacting latifundista, the Ponzi-loving swindler, and the boot-licking hack reporter.

Like so many other things, psychopathy lies on a multidimensional continuum, i.e. a person can exhibit various psychopathic traits in various degrees. The full-blown psychopath adheres to most, or all, of the characteristics in Hare's list. We can label those who approach the psychopathic threshold without crossing it "sociopaths."

As far as numbers go, studies suggest that about 1% of a general population exhibits psychopathy, and a segment of about 6% manifests sociopathic tendencies.

To put it in another way, some people are talkative, some people are strong, some people are artistic, some people are generous, some people like their whisky, and some people are psychopathic. It is extremely hard to tell if psychopaths become what they are by choice. I would say, let us accept Goethe's *Faust*, and uphold the doctrine of free-will. To an extent, one can choose what one is to be.

Ultimately, criminality must be cured at the root. The members of a functioning society must internalize that society's values, and function with internal checks on specific malicious actions. And when a society shamelessly invades other nations and steals their oil, and finds nothing wrong with the idea of making money by selling music which glorifies violence and thuggery, then that society is on the way out, and no amount of jails will save it from itself.

It should be understood that psychopathy does not appear to be curable. Psychopaths misuse those who treat them well, and whine to or conspire against those who treat them poorly.

Now, those psychopaths born in the poorer strata of society generally find their way into jail - again and again. The more careful ones stay out of jail and carve a trail of agony and annihilation along the axes of their lives. They are the deadbeat wife-thrashing husbands and the ungrateful gold-digging wives. Let the reader beware of generously applying the label of psychopath to those around him. Domestic trouble and interpersonal sabotage can occur outside of the influence of psychopathy. After all, we live in a world that is worse than it could or ought to be.

Prisons cause further problems in regard to psychopathy. As the Stanford experiment showed, the prison, as a Skinnerian environment, conducts to psychopathy. The initially incompetent psychopath usually learns the ropes of organized crime during his first stint in prison, where he also establishes underground connections. Unfortunates who have succumbed to unfavourable circumstances, and

who are principally decent, may capitulate to nihilism and fatalism due to their experience in a penitentiary institution.

At the same time, the notion that all people are intrinsically good, and that all crime stems from poverty and childhood abuse, and that basic human decency should suffice to set a criminal straight, disintegrates in the face of psychopathy. Undoubtedly, the evils of poverty and cross-generational abuse contribute to the pathology of a society. At the same time, psychopathy appears to exist independently of those factors, and responds contemptuously to good treatment.

Furthermore, the view that criminality stems from circumstances beyond one's control is insulting and presumptuous, because it denies personal responsibility. Let people make mistakes and pay for their mistakes. At the same time, the cure of the social pathology of thievery in the face of unwarranted poverty should be economic rather than sociological - we must treat causes rather than effects.

So what do we do with the psychopaths? Do we throw them into some kind of a zoo as various authors, such as Robert Heinlein (*Coventry*), John Carpenter (*Escape From* movies), and George Carlin, have proposed? Set up an island somewhere and dump all the psychopaths on the beach with a week's rations for each? The British did a similar thing with Australia, but unfortunately they forgot to ship their ruling class down under. Can we do that? Is such a proposal not too close to the eugenical ideas of H.G. Wells & Company? The question is a complicated one. Let us identify the psychopaths and remove them from power to begin with, and then we will see.

As we go higher up the social ladder, psychopathy becomes exponentially more insidious. There exists an obvious synergistic positive feedback between oligarchy and psychopathy. The two diseases feed on each other. Many lower class psychopaths eventually run afoul of the law and take a trip downtown. Even the ones on the outside, at worst, harm only isolated sections of society, down to single individuals. But what of the upper class psychopath?

Oligarchy provides multiple protective layers to the oligarchical psychopath. When an oligarch commits an obvious crime, his whole class rushes to his defence. First, the psychopath receives protection from his family, which wants to preserve its prestige. Second, the psychopath receives protection from his entire class, which wants to portray itself as virtuous and benevolent. Third, the psychopath obtains help from his professional colleagues, who want to protect the archetypical image of their profession. Thus, the shyster lawyer and the butcher doctor have their tracks covered by their colleagues and superiors.

In other words, instead of ending up in jail, the oligarchical psychopath ends up right back in the corporate boardroom, court of law, or surgery room.

Worse yet, many oligarchical structures and ideologies reward psychopathy, because the oligarchical outlook in itself is inherently psychopathic. Take the for-profit corporate institution. A new CEO arrives. He announces that his business is not the production of stuff, but the attainment of profits. The CEO proceeds to close two factories and lay off two thousand highly qualified workers. That is called downsizing. Next, he opens a couple of factories in China, where there is ample slave labour. Stock prices soar. The difference in wages translates into profits. The financial press writes-up the CEO as a great hero of humanity, the Don Juan of the liberal nocturnal lady of the free-markets. Meanwhile, he spends his evenings with call girls and vast amounts of cocaine. He treats his servants and staff like scum, because, after all, he is the CEO, and they are the peasants.

Having climbed Mount Everest, the CEO abandons his company to enter politics. The stock prices of the company slump soon after his departure, undoubtedly due to the great man's absence, rather than because of his incompetent long-term policies. Now our hero runs for a political position - governor, or perhaps senator. He knows the score and will do whatever his fellow psychopathic puppet masters tell him to do, as long as the coke and the supple teenage maidens keep coming. What the hell, after a few years in the Senate, the man may even become President.

We can easily provide numerous names that fit the above description in part or in toto - but let the reader do his own research. Some of the references, which we have given so far, contain specific illustrations of the archetype described above. For example, see Mark Ames's *Going Postal* (2005).

Was Georgie Bush a psychopath? Why, yes, of course he was! He and and plenty of others besides him.

Politics offers a perfect venue to the oligarchical psychopath. One of the most distinguishing features of the psychopaths is their uncanny ability to lie. Psychopaths are extremely convincing deceivers and manipulators. So let us put a psychopath in front of a camera, and show him to the entire naturally trusting and suggestible brainwashed population. And afterwards we can have elections.

To protect themselves from this type of depredation, people must learn to judge one's action rather than one's words. In regard to politicians, people must understand economics and psychology. Otherwise, the puppet psychopathic politician can tank a nation's economy to the benefit of his cronies, and blame the snafu on the invisible hand of the market. He can do that, and the people will not be able to see through his mask, because of their ignorance. This is exactly why psychology and economics are expressly not taught at the schools. People hear watered-down introductions to mathematics and active literacy, but not a word of economics or psychology. The universities go out of their way to mis-teach both subjects. The economists propound neo-liberal baloney, and the psychologists teach the reductionist anti-human behaviorist creed.

Watch the hands, not the lips.

The problem of psychopathy is endemic to any hierarchical organization or society. What happens when the psychopaths climb their way to the top? They give orders and the people, trained to 1) obey their "betters," 2) trust those above them on the assumption that all people are like them, i.e. trusting and generally good, and 3) respect technicians and technocrats; the psychopaths give orders and the people follow the orders.

Once in charge, the psychopaths merrily use the immense powers at their disposal to promote psychopathic oligarchical creeds like communism, fascism, Social Darwinism, and neo-liberalism. In this way, psychopathy can infest an entire society. Left unchecked, the psychopath destroys everything in his way. On the higher plane, psychopathy rots at the heart and body of society, until things fall apart. Highly hierarchical societies, like Imperial/Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan, are particularly prone to succumbing to psychopathic orgies. Lobaczewski terms the extreme form of psychopathic government "pathocracy." That is exactly what we are dealing with today - though the orgy has not yet reached the stage of *delirium tremens*.

Interaction between psychopaths works along the following lines: in general, some psychopaths are stabler, craftier, more truculent, or more photogenic than others. The craftier, stabler psychopaths tend to hide behind the scenes, and to control their more photogenic and convincing fellows. Truman Capote famously examined such a relationship in his *In Cold Blood* (book - 1965, film - 1967). The movies *Pretty Poison* (1968), *Badlands* (1973), and *Gun Crazy* (1950) (among others) also analyse the subject.

Unstable, highly sadistic psychopaths usually gravitate to organizations such as the Gestapo and the Cheka/NKVD. Speak of which, FBI's J. Edgar Hoover was a notorious basket case; but that is neither here nor there.

Psychopaths tend to recognize each other in crowds. They help each other climb hierarchical structures on the "scratch my back" principle - because that is the only principle that a psychopath recognizes. Victor Suvorov (the pen name of former spook Vladimir Rezun) gave an example of this type of behaviour in his *Aquarium* (1985). The Aquarium was the codename for the headquarters of the GRU, which was the Russian equivalent of the CIA. Piranhas were the only fish that swam there. Victor Ostrovsky, in his two biographical books on the Mossad, paints a similar picture of the Israeli intelligence service. And no surprise - spook organizations are extremely oligarchical and psychopathic in nature. This alone should be sufficient reason to ban intelligence services altogether - what do nuclear powers need intelligence services for? And if you do not ban them, at least regulate them to pieces.

Low-grade, stupid psychopaths serve as patsies. They get the dirty jobs and provide a limitless pool

of scapegoats. Thus an oligarchy will gladly sacrifice a few of its low-ranking members to pacify popular fury and to make a pretence at justice. This is a standard technique of manipulation. On the individual level, the psychopath employs a similar trick in distributing petty gifts as a show of his benevolence. People tend to place exaggerated value on symbolic gestures of good will.

This explains how terrorism works (as Tarpley has also elaborated). The top level spook-connected oligarchs trick unsuspecting dirt-poor fanatics and idiots into committing acts of stupendous ugliness and imbecility. The dupes usually do not even realize that they are being manipulated. Note that the dupes and patsies are generally too stupid to be trusted with large-scale operations - so the oligarchs orchestrate the operations in person, and make sure that the patsies end up in the wrong place at the wrong time to take the fall. When a patsy shows undue perception, as Lee Harvey Oswald did, assassinations and "suicides" (with two shots to the head) occur. Note that Oswald was not even necessarily a psychopath.

True believers and the highly compassionate are a favourite prey to the psychopaths. Male psychopaths frequently play on the maternal instinct of women. The neurotic pitiful wretch tends to incite disgust and sexual repulsion in women; the manipulative psychopath, on the other hand, can seduce even experienced and intelligent women in minutes. The key lies in one's sense of self-respect, which shows very clearly in one's body language. People read body language intuitively, and experienced people can learn to consciously interpret body language. Experts on body language can appear to be clairvoyant.⁴ Neurotics almost by definition hate themselves. Psychopaths, on the other hand, are egocentric and thus incapable of hating themselves. Thus, the whining psychopath, unlike his unfortunate neurotic fellow, attracts women, because, contrary to what most women say, women possess a dual psychological drive toward security and maternal behaviour, with an accent on security, and will almost universally opt for men who exhibit strength, drive, and ambition, combined, perhaps, with a certain secondary need for care, mothering, or perhaps just plain cooking & cleaning. The psychopathic man can run circles around women, because he is reckless rather than strong, greedy rather than ambitious, and manipulative and selfish rather than needy - all of that, but also a convincing actor.

Psychopathic women of good looks can do whatever they want, because men, simple creatures that they are, will go far for a lavishing pair of eyes and the snooty snub nose between them. Less well-endowed women can still build themselves into seductresses of some prowess by the use of a number of tricks - flattery, the peddling of sexual favours, the judicious administration of liquor to the prospective prey, and so on. In old age, psychopathic women become Miss Havishams, burdens-in-law, and other such unflattering stereotypes.

I apologize for the cynicism; but we are discussing a cynical matter. Cleckley used a droll tone in his book, Hare tried to sound scholarly, Lobaczewski opted for clinical iciness, and as far as I am concerned, let us say it like it is, and move on.

Back to the true believers - they provide valuable assets to the manipulative psychopaths, who mould the regiments of true believers into sincere, dedicated front groups, which work for the promotion of various nefarious agendas. The oligarchs always dump those true believers who figure out the scam. A case in point is Bella Dodd (1904-1969), who, in an effort to help the proletariat, worked for the CPUSA between 1932 and 1948. Emotionally and physically burned out, Dodd quit the Party at the age of 45, and wrote the autobiographical anti-communist piece *The School of Darkness* (1963). Disgruntled environmentalists, politicians, bureaucrats, educators, journalists, and biologists have written similar pieces.

Sometimes, true believers are called "useful idiots." Therein lies the way out - let us not be idiots.

In summary, psychopathy is a social disease, which combines with the disease of oligarchy to in-

⁴See, for example, Desmond Morris's *People Watching* (2002), Joe Navarro's *What Every Body is Saying* (2008), and Judi James's *The Body Language Rules* (2009).

flict evil on the world and on the population of the world. Psychopathy and oligarchy go hand in hand. Through the use of pernicious ideologies and mass brainwashing, the sickness of psychopathy can infect an entire society, and typically leads to a suicidal orgy of destruction and insanity.

Ignota nulla curatio morbid - but, perhaps, now we know.

4.4 Methods of Oligarchy

Now that we have an idea of the nature of oligarchy, we must examine the monster's modus operandi.

Oligarchy attains power either through raw force, or via the infiltration of ordinarily useful social systems.

To win power through force, an oligarchy requires a stable base, or a powerful outside ally. Thus the British spread from their untouchable island base of the Albion, the Americans from their continent, the Venetians from their lagoon, the Romans from their Rome, the Byzantines from the fortified Constantinople, and so on. Likewise, the petty oligarchies of the various small states of the world operate under the patronage of the Anglo-American mother oligarchy. If the population of any small state steps out of line, the USMC lands on the shores of the country within a week or two - to fight communists or drug smugglers or terrorists or whatever.

Therefore, to destroy an oligarchy, one must aim for the neck of the beast. When Heracles fought the Hydra, he cauterized the stump of every head he cut, to prevent two new heads from sprouting. Finally, with a mighty blow, Heracles chopped off the Hydra's main head. The Soviet Union collapsed under a similar treatment - but then a new Hydra arrived. In principle, the greatest responsibility for the salvation of the world lies with the Americans and the English - and particularly the former, though much of the Oligarchy remains in the latter. The main head is the crucial one. Not that the people of the rest of the world should idly watch by - help the Americans! - decapitate the Hydra near you!

But the main duty lies with the Americans. Because whenever a small nation chops off one of the Hydra's heads, and cauterizes the wound, the US Army drops by, demolishes the nation, and glues a new zombie head on top of the old stump. Britain no longer possesses the power to conduct such surgical operations on its own.

The other aspect of the oligarchical use of raw force deals with the distribution and the technological level of the weaponry of the era - see Quigley's *Weapons Systems and Political Stability* (1983). In general, when the weapons of choice in a society are expensive, and their use requires extensive training, the following phenomena occur: 1) the few who can afford the weapons oligarchize; 2) private and mercenary armies proliferate; 3) popular rule succumbs to oligarchy. The classic example is the early medieval era, in which the mounted knights lorded from their castles over the hapless unarmed serfs. Horses were expensive, armour was very expensive, and castles were prohibitively expensive. Conversely, when the weapons in a society are cheap and easy to use, 1) the masses acquire personal arms; 2) citizen armies emerge; 3) popular rule gradually supplants oligarchism. The classic examples are the Hellenian hoplites and the American pioneers.

There also is the distinction between shock weapons and missile weapons. Shock weapons are melee weapons and they exist to control people. Missiles kill. Thus, a policeman will smack you with a baton to guide you along your way, and will shoot you if he decides that it is time for you to go. Indiscriminate killing is a poor way of controlling a population, since it ensures the resistance of the survivors. Our oligarch-owned society has developed remarkable new missile weapons.

Let us stop here for a quick quote from our friend Big Zbig:⁵

And these new and old major powers face still yet another novel reality, in some respects unprecedented. And it is that while the lethality - the lethality! - of their power is

⁵<http://www.chathamhouse.org/events/view/155245>, accessed on November 6, 2011.

greater than ever, their capacity to impose control over the politically awakened masses of the world is at a historical low. I once put it rather pungently, and I was flattered that the British foreign secretary repeated this, as follows: Namely, in earlier times it was easier to control a million people - literally. It was easier to control a million people than physically to kill a million people. Today, it is infinitely easier to kill a million people, than to control a million people. It is easier to kill than to control. And, of course, that bears directly on the use of force - particularly by societies that are culturally alien - over other societies. And this is why in many respects in the post colonial era it is futile to be conducting colonial wars. This is something that, perhaps, some recent American policy makers did not fully assimilate. It should follow, therefore, from that, not as a matter of surprise, that the crisis of leadership - of American leadership - in the world, the ongoing crisis, could become the crisis of global stability.

Zbig uttered those words - where else? - at Chatham House, on November 17, 2008.

Weapons can be classified into two additional categories: defensive and offensive. A castle is a defensive weapon, while artillery is an offensive weapon. When offensive weaponry dominates defensive weaponry, centralization occurs. Thus, the cannons of the French king helped lift France out of the mire of feudalism. Conversely, when the castle ruled the battlefield, extreme political decentralization occurred.

Military doctrine plays a role of its own. For example, the highly organized Roman Legions disabled fortifications relatively easily. The Legions collapsed along with the Roman Empire. As the whole system fell apart, it became near impossible to recreate the Legions. Indeed, military organization failed to rise back to its levels of the Classical period, until perhaps the 16th century.

Clearly, a pluralistic society should try to have citizen armies armed with cheap but efficient weapons, and high levels of military organization. Those are not always attainable. For example, tanks, airplanes, and air carriers have dominated conventional warfare since the 1930s. Thus, the Anglo-Americans have controlled various third world governments by controlling their armed forces. The Anglo-Americans sell a few tanks and airplanes to the third world army, and then help an appropriately psychopathic general conduct an orderly coup. At this stage, the general is in the pocket of the Anglo-Americans, because they can always organize another coup against him, and because, besides, he owes them. So the Oligarchs keep selling the general arms, while he bleeds his compatriots to pay for the arms. Simple and effective. For examples of how this works, read Bill Blum's *Killing Hope* (there is a 2003 edition). In such situations, military coups from patriotic officers sometimes help. In the long run, the Oligarchs come back with a vengeance, as the Qaddafi exercise proved. Thus, unfortunately, certain arbitrary factors can lead to oligarchization.

Oligarchs attain domestic power in one of two ways - by a sudden coup, or by the gradualistic methods of creeping infiltration. The first technique works well in autocratic, totalitarian societies. In the autocratic setting, the oligarchs need only install their own puppet King, and rule by proxy from behind the scenes. The (Oh So) Glorious Revolution of William of Orange provides an example, as does the Bolshevik takeover of Russia.

In the pluralistic setting, oligarchs resort to gradualism. They infiltrate crucial branches of government, and weaken and demoralize the society, until the time arrives when they can come out into the open and tighten the screws. The takeover occurs via the medium of secret societies, and the use of oblique methods of control. Examples of oblique control are the passing of subversive legislature via controlled agents, and the use of economic warfare. The oligarchs, if they have the means, which they usually do, because bankers are intrinsically oligarchic, can create an economic depression, and then quietly blackmail the government into ceding power to the oligarchical cabal. We look at secret societies and the use of NGOs for the passing of legislation in the next chapters.

Once in charge, the oligarchs retain their power via the careful admixture of carrot and stick. They bribe some segments of the population and tyrannize other segments. In general, the existence of a visible underclass helps, because people imagine themselves free when not at the very bottom. But the main instrument of oligarchical control is the combination of indoctrination and insidious ideologies. It has been said that the true slave is the one whose very mind has been enslaved, because he thinks himself free; and that one can not enslave a truly free man, but can only kill him.

Oligarchs prefer hierarchical, centralized, integrated systems of government, and obsessive secrecy at all levels of power. In such a setting, a tiny group of individuals can exert enormous influence over society by the monopolization of the key channels of power. This is why we have corporations, intelligence agencies, and so on. Obviously, most of those who work for the corporations, and even for the intelligence agencies, are basically decent and unsuspecting - but they often do evil, sometimes unconsciously, at the behest of their superiors and the superiors of their superiors.

As to the oligarchical ideologies, we have seen plenty of those. The oligarchs dictate it is a dog-eat-dog world out there, that people should obey the letter of the law rather their conscience, that life is meaningless, that the goal of life is the satisfaction of one's elementary physiological needs and desires, that the world is full of enemies and evils whom only the oligarchs know how to stop, that war is good and noble, that one can never really know anything, that conspiracies do not occur, that black is white, that two and two is five, that war is peace, that freedom is slavery, that ignorance is strength.⁶

Conclusions

In sum: oligarchy is a social disease characterized by predation, deceit, paranoia, brutality, and avarice. It synergizes with the social disease of psychopathy to, in effect, unleash the four horsemen unto human society. Oligarchism is against science and technology, against prosperity, and, in general, against humanity. The disease infects hierarchical societies by sudden coups, and pluralistic societies by a slow but persistent surreptitious assault. Oligarchy is about as natural as smallpox, poverty, and ignorance, and should be combated along with the former.

Next, we examine one of the most powerful tools in the arsenal of the Oligarchy - the secret societies.

⁶Also see 1984's book-within-a-book, *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism*.

Chapter 5

Secret Societies

A group of ambitious oligarchical-minded individuals attains or retains power through the use of secret societies. Most people deny the existence or the influence of the secret societies, because they have not heard about the secret societies, because the secret societies are secret. Some groups, like the CFR, are secretive rather than secret - meaning that their existence is acknowledged, but kept quiet.

To appreciate the importance of secret societies, observe that during its period of rapid decline between 1980 and 2008, America was in the hands of three secret society agents: Bush I (1980-1992), Clinton (1993-2000), and Bush II (2001-2008). Bush I and Bush II are both Skull & Bones, and father and son to boot. Clinton is a Rhodes Scholar, and, in the opinion of Bush II's mother, George W.'s "fourth brother."¹ Moreover, Clinton's homestate of Arkansas was a Rockefeller playground - indeed, Winthrop Rockefeller (1912-1973) was Governor of Arkansas between 1967 and 1971, a few years before Clinton's first governorship (1979-1981). Whether the doting assassination-attempt-victim B-grade actor Reagan could dominate the Skull & Bones former CIA director Bush, I leave to the reader to decide.

Now, a low-level secret society is little more than a playground for infantile adults. However, when the powerful elements of a community form a secret society, they mean business. On the local level, the country clubs and golf courses do the job. Everybody knows that the big wigs of town meet at those place and talk business. As John O'Hara pointed out in *Appointment in Samarra* (1934), the country clubs also harbour the banality of the typical human preoccupations with drink and coitus; but beyond that, serious, influential people, talk shop. That is how they stay in power.

As we go higher up the ladder, and as the networks of control begin to encompass larger areas, more complicated structures emerge. We look at those in the next section.

Before we proceed, we note that a high-level secret society, whose membership includes powerful members of the larger community, is necessarily a potent political tool - and in the game of thrones, you use whatever weapons you have. It follows that a high-level secret society must work either *for* or *against* the established government (of whatever form) in the context of its influence - thus, the Bolsheviks fought against the Russian government in 1917, but for the Soviet government after the Civil War, inasmuch as the Soviet government was their own government. We will consider more examples as we go along.

Follow a few general references; we will provide specific references in their proper contexts: Nesta Webster's *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* (1924), Edith Starr Miller's (Lady Queenborough) *Occult Theocracy* (1933), Brad & Sherry Steiger's *Secret Societies The Complete Dossier* (2006), Bill Cooper's *Mystery Babylon Series* (available online in samizdat transcript, talks con-

¹See the pair's January 2010 interview with Bob Schieffer. Available here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wEgSd1ZL-tI>, accessed Jan 17, 2012.

ducted over the 1990s), Jim Marrs's *The Rise of the Fourth Reich* (2008), John Lawrence Reynolds's *Secret Societies Their Mysteries Revealed* (2007), Arkon Daraul's (likely a pseudonym for one Idries Shah) *A History Of Secret Societies* (1984), Thomas Frost's *The Secret Societies of the European Revolution* (1876), Charles William Heckethorn's *Secret Societies Of All Ages And Countries* (1897), Jan van Helsing's *Secret Societies and Their Power in the 20th Century* (1995), Dr. Stan Monteith's excellent and concise *Brotherhood of Darkness* (2000), and so on.

We are tempted to abbreviate "secret societies" to "SS"; but perhaps we should not.

5.1 Structure

Secret societies have been around since the dawn of civilizations. The ancient priesthoods were precisely secret societies. The history of the ancient priesthoods is interesting, but I have not had the opportunity to do proper research on the subject, and so we leave it for another time.

In general, secret societies exhibit: 1) a hierarchical organization of circles-within-circles; 2) compartmentalization via the semi-autonomous cell mechanism; 3) some bait, usually in the form of prestige and/or purported secret knowledge; 4) an insistence on secrecy and discretion; 5) an outward pretence of benevolence and philanthropy; 6) some type of ritualistic initiation paired with an esoteric ideology.

Secret societies are, in essence, command structures, and therefore they almost always are hierarchical. Generally, one can roughly divide the membership of a secret society into three circles. The outer circle consists of the low-level members, most of them dupes and naifs, who serve the following purposes: 1) they provide a recruitment pool, 2) they serve as cannon fodder for whatever goals the inner circles decide to pursue, and 3) they provide the secret society with influence at the grass-roots level. In the Masonic setting, the outer circle is the Blue Lodge.

The second, inner, circle consists of those members who wield sufficient influence to merit elevation above the outer level, and those members who have little personal power, but seem both clever enough to get things done, and willing enough to follow orders. Members of the second circle are given some idea of the true purposes of the organization, but do not know the whole score. In the Masonic setting, the inner circle is the hierarchy between the 4th and the 29th (perhaps even 32nd) degrees of the Scottish Order.

The third, innermost, circle consists of the men who own and control the secret society. Only they know the true methods and goals of the organization. In the Masonic setting, the innermost circle (33rd level) is hard to identify. Someone controls Masonry - but who? The City of London bankers and the old ("Black") European nobility are the most likely culprits.

Being command structures, the secret societies usually exhibit compartmentalization. For example, Masonry has lodges across the Anglo-American world; then there are higher level selective lodges; and finally, there must be an unofficial top lodge somewhere, perhaps one bereft of the Masonic mumbo-jumbo, where the top brass gathers once in a while. The Illuminati and their successors the communists also used cell structures.

In effect, the organization inducts its new members into cells, which consist of a few members of the same level as the newcomer, plus a higher-level controller or two. The people inside the cell know only as much as they need to know. They are taught some secret handshake or password in order to be able to take orders from above. In the event of discovery, the larger mechanism sheds the corrupted cell without incurring great damage, since the members of the cell can only betray each other and the orders that they have followed. Competent, trustworthy members climb the ladder. Bumbling fools and independent thinkers linger in the perdition of the lower levels of the hierarchy for ever.

To get people to join its ranks, an organization must offer some bait. The types of bait tend to

fall into three categories: 1) the promise of secret knowledge and/or power; 2) the promise of prestige; 3) the utopian dream.

Note that cults, which resemble secret societies in many ways, almost always focus on the promise of secret knowledge - because that bait is the cheapest, being free, and because a general population seems to always overflow with willing dupes and sheep. The secret knowledge scam goes like this: the prospective member enters a queer looking "temple," where he is told that: "We are an ancient organization and we know many secrets. We think that you are a great fellow, very bright and singularly handsome, and we want to tell you the secrets - but first you must prove yourself. To prove yourself, you must memorize all of our esoteric mumbo-jumbo, and also you have to follow our orders to the letter. To the letter! And don't ask any questions. If you are worthy, you will understand everything in time. And if you are not worthy, then you will not be able to understand the big idea anyway. And now, get going! Chop chop!"

The esoteric "knowledge" of the organization usually amounts to a few symbolic fairy tales, which one can interpret in a myriad of ways. Those in the outer circle receive one fraudulent interpretation, those in the second circle another fraudulent interpretation, and so on. Those choice obedient psychopaths, who make their way to the top, are told that the whole story is hogwash and a joke and a method for fooling the naive.

Along with the secret knowledge lies the promise of power. Prospective revolutionaries believe that the revolution will bring them glory, license, and wealth. Often, the contrary happens. Does the man who has recently carried out a successful revolution want a gang of professional revolutionaries mucking up his business? No. And that is why purges succeed so many revolutions. For example, Hitler went after his old buddy Ernst Röhm and the Sturmabteilung (SA) in the wee hours of the morning of the 30th June 1934, the Night of the Long Knives. Stalin decimated almost the entire inner Nomenklatura, as well as the upper echelons of the Red Army. The French ran in circles until Napoleon consolidated his power.

Trotsky died an exile, with an icepick in his eye. Though he did manage to slaughter a few million people before Uncle Joe got him. Ah, Leo and Joe! What wonderful fellows! Not to mention the syphilitic thug Lenin, whose mummy still stains the Red Square. But we are getting ahead of ourselves.

Often, the promise of power remains unstated. Those who know anything, know that joining the Masons is good business, and that joining the CFR is very good business. In other words, the Masons can afford not to offer their inductees the promise of any crass material perks, because those are implicit. Thus, the Masons can gallivant around hailing their own beneficence, altruism, and enlightenment.

The promise of prestige preys on the human clannish instinct. Humans like to belong to groups, and the more prestigious the groups, the better. Thus, a powerful secret society can attract new members simply by advertising its luminaries. For example, the Masons feature a wide selection of Founding Fathers and subsequent Presidents. Naturally, people figure that if the Masons were good enough for George Washington and FDR, the Masons are good enough for anybody. The CFR is an even more extreme example, as a glance at its membership shows. The CFR is the in-crowd, and people love belonging to the in-crowd.

Utopian idealism is the third way in which secrets societies attract new members. Communism is an obvious example of how this approach functions. Over the last two centuries, millions of dupes have thrown their lot with the communist cabal, in the hope of helping the proletariat. For obvious reasons, any organization must profess benevolent goals. We go back to the fundamental rule of: watch the hands, not the lips.

The Masons also never stop babbling about how they want to help humanity and how they are very generous and so on. It is worth nothing that the logos of Freemasonry and Communism almost coincide. Is the coincidence coincidental? No - it could not possible be.

We must learn to recognize bait when we see it. Sometimes, a fish is too hungry to ignore the bait; and sometimes, a fish manages to pick a hook clean of the bait. But most often, the fisherman leaves the bank of the river as night descends, deposits his earnings in the bank in the middle of town, and

goes home to enjoy a tasty dinner.

One crucial point that must be made here, is that blackmail is part and parcel of the modus operandi of secret societies. In short: if the secret society manages to trick a prospective member into committing a reprehensible act during, or before, or after initiation, then they have him for good. The Thugs of India, for example, only admitted proven murderers. This is also why the more powerful secret societies can protect their secrecy to a great extent. Do you expect the members of a City of London Masonic lodge to go on television and explain to the world how they have profited from insider trading, and then go to jail? And this is but a mild example.

Being secret, secret societies insist on discretion. For example, new Masons swear to guard the Brotherhood's secrets, or face a penalty of death. Masons claim that the threat of murder is just for fun. In 1826, however, a few pious Masons abducted and massacred one Captain Morgan, who had revealed certain Masonic secrets. The discovery of the murder provoked a massive scandal, which gave birth to the third major American party - the Anti-Masonic Party, which later became the Whig Party. Of course, modern Masons claim that the murder of Captain Morgan was an isolated incident. The point remains that Masonry insists on secrecy.

Chatham House has a rule, the Chatham House Rule:

When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed.

The more interesting Chatham House meetings are invitation-only. The CFR operates under a similar rule.

Historically, the Communist Party was notoriously secretive.

Secretive societies always pretend to be benevolent and philanthropic. Thus,

The mission of Chatham House is to be a world-leading source of independent analysis, informed debate and influential ideas on how to build a prosperous and secure world for all.

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) is an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher dedicated to being a resource for its members, government officials, business executives, journalists, educators and students, civic and religious leaders, and other interested citizens in order to help them better understand the world and the foreign policy choices facing the United States and other countries.

(1911 Britannica) According to an old "Charge" delivered to initiates, Freemasonry is declared to be an "ancient and honourable institution: ancient no doubt it is, as having subsisted from time immemorial; and honourable it must be acknowledged to be, as by a natural tendency it conduces to make those so who are obedient to its precepts . . . to so high an eminence has its credit been advanced that in every age Monarchs themselves have been promoters of the art, have not thought it derogatory from their dignity to exchange the sceptre for the trowel, have patronised our mysteries and joined in our Assemblies."

And the Communists want to help the proletariat, and the Mormons are good Christians, and Mazzini wanted to liberate the people's of Europe, and so on and on and on.

Malthus also wanted to help the underclass - by killing them to raise their wages, and by keeping their wages low so as not to corrupt their working ethic. Marx wanted to get rid of the reactionaries - for their own good, of course, because everything Marx did was for the good of the proletariat, and once the reactionaries and bourgeoisie had become proletarians, they would have benefited from

their own destruction.

Secret societies also enjoy rituals. The purpose of rituals is brainwashing. Generally, people respond more openly to suggestion, when they are tired, scared, awed, or confused. Hitler understood this concept very well, and made sure to hold his monumental rallies in the evening.

According to this principle, secret societies conduct outlandish initiation ceremonies. The Masons, for example, play dress-up. One becomes a Mason with a blindfold over his eyes and a noose around his neck. This getup confuses, impresses, and terrifies the inductee.

The Bonesmen, on the other hand, play dress-down. New Bonesmen strip, lie naked in a coffin, and relate their most embarrassing sexual escapades to their fellows, who relieve the gravity of the ceremony with a liberal shower of urine.²

It is more or less an open secret that the Bohemian Grove annual party involves group sex and other perversions.

One finds elaborate and bizarre rituals across the religions of the various cultures. Vigils, characterized by hunger and sleeplessness, are a frequent feature of initiation procedures.

Another standard trick is the recitation requirement. Under this requirement, the prospective inductee must recite some gibberish, sometimes under stress. The willingness to memorize gibberish translates into a tendency toward blind obedience. Moreover, the subject usually internalizes some of the gobbledegook, which helps with his indoctrination.

The inner circles of secret societies attract new members in two general ways. First, they watch out for sharp yet obedient cadres among the outer rims of the organization, and gradually build them up into competent high-level operatives. Maurice Strong, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Henry Kissingers are examples of the products of this procedure.

Second, the top members of the secret societies sometimes invite ideologically amenable fellow oligarchs, or unsuspecting influential members of the community, directly into the inner or innermost circles of the organization. For example, Rockefeller invited Aaron Russo straight into the top levels of the CFR, as we learned from Russo's interview with Alex Jones.

It is impossible to carry out a proper revolution without the formation of a secret society. The problem here is that to derail a secret society, a rival organization must merely infiltrate the innermost circle of the society. All hierarchical structures suffer from this Achilles's Heel.

Now, political movements, secret or not, need some organization for the purposes of decision making and media representation, and that inevitably leads to a certain degree of centralization and vertical integration. Therefore, all political movements must be extremely wary of infiltration at the highest levels. One way around this conundrum is the delegation of power into the hands of a lone individual of proven probity. This approach leads to another problem. Masterful leadership can work wonders, but when a great leader perishes, his organization tends to collapse. Thus, oligarchs decapitate some organizations by executing (or rather, assassinating) their leaders.

The Tea Party is a recent example of an organization corrupted from above. Mark Ames and his The Exiled crew, as well as their former brethren Taibbi, have written on the subject.

In regard to strong leaders, Yugoslavia collapsed after Tito died. Alexander of Macedon and Charlemagne's empires died along with the two great conquerors. The various movements of the 1960s lost steam after the murders of Bobby Kennedy, Malcolm X, and MLK. We have already cited the Huey Long and Gracchi brothers examples elsewhere.

In sum, secret societies exist to either facilitate the acquisition of power by tiny cabals, or to surreptitiously maintain and expand the control of an existing ruling camarilla. Secret societies employ standard methods of brainwashing and hierarchical control, and always profess good will and noble intentions. Let us now look at the important secret societies of the modern era.

²Watch De Niro's *The Good Shepherd*.

5.2 RIIA

We draw from Carroll Quigley's posthumously released work *The Anglo-American Establishment* (1981).

Our story begins with the 19th century British utopianist John Ruskin. Ruskin (1819-1900) was one of the major British thinkers, writers, and art critics of the second half of the 19th century. He was one of the progenitors of the pre-Raphaelite art movement.

In his 1860 essay *Unto This Last*, Ruskin lambasted the utilitarian/liberalist "free-trade" greed-is-good economic ideology of his era (and of our era also). Ruskin contested that merchants and manufacturers have a moral duty before the state to take care of production, rather than to hunger after profits. To Ruskin, "Political economy (the economy of a State, or of citizens) consists simply in the production, preservation, and distribution, at fittest time and place, of useful or pleasurable things." - which is the same definition that we used.

We further agree with Ruskin that

But mercantile economy, the economy of "merces" or of "pay," signifies the accumulation, in the hands of individuals, of legal or moral claim upon, or power over, the labour of others; every such claim implying precisely as much poverty or debt on one side, as it implies riches or right on the other.

It does not, therefore, necessarily involve an addition to the actual property, or well-being, of the State in which it exists. But since this commercial wealth, or power over labour, is nearly always convertible at once into real property, while real property is not always convertible at once into power over labour, the idea of riches among active men in civilized nations, generally refers to commercial wealth;

...

...an accumulation of real property is of little use to its owner, unless, together with it, he has commercial power over labour. Thus, suppose any person to be put in possession of a large estate of fruitful land, with rich beds of gold in its gravel, countless herds of cattle in its pastures; houses, and gardens, and storehouses full of useful stores; but suppose, after all, that he could get no servants? In order that he may be able to have servants, some one in his neighbourhood must be poor, and in want of his gold - or his corn.

...

What is really desired, under the name of riches, is essentially, power over men; in its simplest sense, the power of obtaining for our own advantage the labour of servant, tradesman, and artist; in wider sense, authority of directing large masses of the nation to various ends (good, trivial or hurtful, according to the mind of the rich person).

Ruskin opts for "divine, not human law" when it comes to defining justice, thus repudiating Bentham's legal positivism.

Unfortunately, having written so much sense in the first half of his essay, Ruskin embarks on a Platonic-Aristotelian discursion:

...if there be any one point insisted on throughout my works more frequently than another, that one point is the impossibility of Equality. My continual aim has been to show the eternal superiority of some men to others, sometimes even of one man to all others; and to show also the advisability of appointing such persons or person to guide, to lead, or on occasion even to compel and subdue, their inferiors, according to their own better knowledge and wiser will.

He adds that "and whereas it has long been known and declared that the poor have no right to the property of the rich, I wish it also to be known and declared that the rich have no right to the property of the poor." And that is the paternal capitalistic/aristocratic view, which is reasonable enough, except that for every paternalist we seem to have ten hyenas.

Ruskin also complains that "I know no previous instance in history of a nation's establishing a systematic disobedience to the first principles of its professed religion." Correct, John, and that is why they had to also invent Darwinism.

The man also points out that true profit stems only from tangible production or truly useful services, and never from exchange. Exchange can never produce true profit, meaning an increase of wealth for the society, but only acquisition, meaning the transfer of wealth - generally even mere claims to wealth - from one place to another. Ruskin then explains that acquisition by exchange only occurs when one party carries an advantage in knowledge or power over the other - and, therefore, the science of becoming rich by exchange is a science founded on nescience (anti-science) - "This science, alone of sciences, must, by all available means, promulgate and prolong its opposite nescience [mass ignorance]; otherwise the science itself is impossible."

Ruskin summarizes his view on political economy with the dictum "There is no wealth but life." Because of his love of nature, Ruskin tended to despise industrialism (see his *The Storm-Cloud of the Nineteenth Century* (1884)), which, admittedly, can be rather ugly. Thus, some cite Ruskin as the first modern proto-environmentalist. What Ruskin wanted was a nice agricultural feudal system, in which everybody happily stuck to his station, and the philosopher shepherd kings took good care of their obedient smiling flocks.

And such was Ruskin - an erudite aristocrat of the Socratic tradition, and in particular an admirer of Plato and *The Republic*.

On February 8, 1870, Ruskin delivered his inaugural lecture as the Slade Professor of Oxford University. A young man by the name of Cecil Rhodes listened attentively, recorded the lecture in longhand, and never parted with the manuscript. In 1874, Ruskin set up a gravel digging exercise for a number of Oxford undergraduates, in order to teach them the nobility of manual labour. Alfred Milner and Arnold Toynbee (the legendary historian was this one's nephew) were among the digging crew. The experience affected them profoundly.

In 1858, Ruskin encountered the fair Irish maid Rose La Touche, aged ten. Ruskin fell in love. When Rose turned 18, Ruskin requested her hand in marriage; three years later she refused; in 1875, Rose died.

The touch of greatness often comes with a price. Throughout the 1870s, Ruskin went through periods of emotional and mental turbulence. His darling's death threw the man over the edge. In desperation, he attempted to talk to the spirit of the wilted Rose, and, if we are to believe Ruskin, she replied.

Ruskin's former marriage to an Effie Gray had been annulled for non-consummation. Ruskin had found Gray's body repugnant. A wonderful academic debate has sprung in regard to the cause of Ruskin's repugnance. Some blame Effie's pubic hair, others her menstrual blood, and still others sniff body odour.

Unsurprisingly in the light of his rejection of economic liberalism, Ruskin in his old age attacked the theory of Darwinism.

Although he was one of the premier writers of the 19th century, perhaps because of his heretical ideas, Ruskin has fallen out of fashion in our time. Ruskin died in 1900. The 19th century survived him for another decade before imploding.

Our story continues with Ruskin's two famous pupils, Cecil Rhodes (1853-1902) and Alfred Milner (1854-1925). And what did the young Rhodes hear during the momentous Sheldonian Lecture of February 9, 1870? Follow Ruskin's words:³

... The art of any country is the exponent of its social and political virtues.

³From *Selections from the Works of John Ruskin*, edited by Chauncey B. Tinker, Ph.D..

...

There is a destiny now possible to us - the highest ever set before a nation to be accepted or refused. We are still undegenerate in race; a race mingled of the best northern blood. We are not yet dissolute in temper, but still have the firmness to govern, and the grace to obey. We have been taught a religion of pure mercy, which we must either now betray, or learn to defend by fulfilling. And we are rich in an inheritance of honour, bequeathed to us through a thousand years of noble history, which it should be our daily thirst to increase with splendid avarice, so that Englishmen, if it be a sin to covet honour, should be the most offending souls alive. Within the last few years we have had the laws of natural science opened to us with a rapidity which has been blinding by its brightness; and means of transit and communication given to us, which have made but one kingdom of the habitable globe. One kingdom; - but who is to be its king? Is there to be no king in it, think you, and every man to do that which is right in his own eyes? Or only kings of terror, and the obscene empires of Mammon and Belial? Or will you, youths of England, make your country again a royal throne of kings; a sceptred isle, for all the world a source of light, a centre of peace; mistress of Learning and of the Arts;- faithful guardian of great memories in the midst of irreverent and ephemeral visions;- faithful servant of time-tried principles, under temptation from fond experiments and licentious desires; and amidst the cruel and clamorous jealousies of the nations, worshipped in her strange valour of goodwill toward men?

"Vexilla regis prodeunt." Yes, but of which king? There are the two oriflammes; which shall we plant on the farthest islands - the one that floats in heavenly fire, or that hangs heavy with foul tissue of terrestrial gold? There is indeed a course of beneficent glory open to us, such as never was yet offered to any poor group of mortal souls. But it must be - it is with us, now. "Reign or Die." And if it shall be said of this country, "Fece per viltate, il gran rifiuto," that refusal of the crown will be, of all yet recorded in history, the shamefullest and most untimely.

And this is what she must either do, or perish: she must found colonies as fast and as far as she is able, formed of her most energetic and worthiest men; - seizing every piece of fruitful waste ground she can set her foot on, and there teaching these her colonists that their chief virtue is to be fidelity to their country, and that their first aim is to be to advance the power of England by land and sea: and that, though they live on a distant plot of ground, they are no more to consider themselves therefore disfranchised from their native land, than the sailors of her fleets do, because they float on distant waves. So that literally, these colonies must be fastened fleets; and every man of them must be under authority of captains and officers, whose better command is to be over fields and streets instead of ships of the line; and England, in these her motionless navies (or, in the true and mightiest sense, motionless churches, ruled by pilots on the Galilean lake of all the world), is to "expect every man to do his duty"; recognizing that duty is indeed possible no less in peace than war; and that if we can get men, for little pay, to cast themselves against cannon-mouths for love of England, we may find men also who will plough and sow for her, who will behave kindly and righteously for her, who will bring up their children to love her, and who will gladden themselves in the brightness of her glory, more than in all the light of tropic skies.

But that they may be able to do this, she must make her own majesty stainless; she must give them thoughts of their home of which they can be proud. The England who is to be mistress of half the earth, cannot remain herself a heap of cinders, trampled by contending and miserable crowds; she must yet again become the England she was once, and in all beautiful ways, - more: so happy, so secluded, and so pure, that in her sky - polluted by no unholy clouds - she may be able to spell rightly of every star that heaven doth show; and in her fields, ordered and wide and fair, of every herb that sips the dew; and under the green avenues of her enchanted garden, a sacred Circe, true Daughter of

the Sun, she must guide the human arts, and gather the divine knowledge, of distant nations, transformed from savageness to manhood, and redeemed from despairing into Peace.

You think that an impossible ideal. Be it so; refuse to accept it if you will; but see that you form your own in its stead. All that I ask of you is to have a fixed purpose of some kind for your country and yourselves; no matter how restricted, so that it be fixed and unselfish. I know what stout hearts are in you, to answer acknowledged need; but it is the fatallest form of error in English youth to hide their hardihood till it fades for lack of sunshine, and to act in disdain of purpose, till all purpose is vain. It is not by deliberate, but by careless selfishness; not by compromise with evil, but by dull following of good, that the weight of national evil increases upon us daily. Break through at least this pretence of existence; determine what you will be, and what you would win. You will not decide wrongly if you resolve to decide at all. Were even the choice between lawless pleasure and loyal suffering, you would not, I believe, choose basely. But your trial is not so sharp. It is between drifting in confused wreck among the castaways of Fortune, who condemns to assured ruin those who know not either how to resist her, or obey; between this, I say, and the taking of your appointed part in the heroism of Rest; the resolving to share in the victory which is to the weak rather than the strong; and the binding yourselves by that law, which, thought on through lingering night and labouring day, makes a man's life to be as a tree planted by the water-side, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season;

"ET FOLIUM EJUS NON DEFLUET,
ET OMNIA, QUCUNQUE FACIET, PROSPERABUNTUR."

The word **spell**, in the English language, bears the dual meaning, that of composing words, and that of weaving magic. Magic! - indeed - for the flowing words of the master orator mesmerize the minds of men, and it is in those minds that first are cities and nations built and destroyed, in peace and in carnage, in passion and in pestilence.

Who weaves the path of history; or how does she weave herself? We have, on the one hand, the ideas and actions of those few whose names and statues have survived the clamour of the ages; and we have, on the other hand, the popular will and understanding, and the collective energy and dedication, of the nameless, yet hard-working and much-suffering, masses of humanity.

Lone men command neither history nor humanity, but merely guide them, oft over the precipice. Napoleon ransacked all of Europe; but what would Napoleon have been without the French army, the product of centuries of prosperity and toil; and the French state, the product of an Enlightened age and a bloody Revolution? Tesla invented the alternating electric current. Suppose Tesla never existed - what then? Perhaps someone else would have produced the same invention - but when? For Tesla was a man of utmost genius, the likes of whom are born perhaps but once in a century. Even after the invention, it took decades of hard work until all citizens of prosperous nations enjoyed cheap electricity - an achievement founded on the stability of the nation-state, the product of a historical process of a length of five centuries; and also of the hard work of millions of people, young and old, strong and weak, male and female.

The question of whether it is great men that shape history, or that history produces great men to satisfy her needs, is one of extreme difficulty - particularly due to our ignorance of the shadowy chronicles of the puppet masters of the ages, who have always existed, perhaps in unbroken succession, or maybe in isolated outbursts of machination. Take Hitler - a single stray bullet, or shell, or waif of gas, in the Great War, and Hitler would have died in 1918. What would have happened then? Would the mindset of the German population have necessitated another demagogue in the stead of Hitler? But then, was not Hitler but a puppet on a long string? (And there is good indication for one to suspect that he was.)

My feeling is that those fortunate men, who possess both an intellect and the means to employ

it to great effect, do exert a force on history; and history, in turn, propagates those whose time has come to the forefront of the era. The puppet masters control some agents from behind the scenes, but even they, by virtue of the limitations of their techniques, can not control everything. They might have given Napoleon and Hitler free reigns in efforts to ravage Europe; but from one point on, both Napoleon and Hitler possessed such power unto themselves, that all control over them could only have been oblique at best. And yet - what if a man of Ruskin's eloquence sits beside a ruler and whispers in his ear?

What can we make of Ruskin and Rhodes? The former's lecture, delivered, with characteristic eloquence, at the nexus of the most powerful empire the world had so far seen in its six millennia of recorded history, in the charged atmosphere of the Sheldonian theatre, to an excited crowd, took Rhodes's mind by storm - and from that day on, Rhodes dedicated all his energies, and the momentous resources at his disposal, to the pursuit of the Big Idea - the creation of a worldwide Commonwealth of Nations under the aegis and the supposedly aristocratic - but really plutocratic - domination of the Masters of the Albion.

We will see that the idea had existed at least since the late 18th century; probably since the time of Bacon; and perhaps since an age that was younger still. How can we tell? For we must assume that the true powers of the world converse in secret, and rarely leave any damning evidence behind.

Without a doubt, in 1870, the telegraph, the railroad, and the ironclad had made the emergence of the Big Idea an inevitability. A Ruskin and a Rhodes were bound to appear. Behind them were greater powers still - the bankers of the world and the Black nobility of Europe - but of those we know not enough.

So let us look at Cecil Rhodes and the Rhodesian legacy.

Rhodes was born a vicar's son in Hertfordshire in 1853. Removed from school for reasons of weak constitution, Cecil studied at home, under his father's gaze. Shortly after the Sheldonian lecture, Rhodes travelled to South Africa, where, already by 1871, he began to build his empire with the backing of the Rothschilds (who were the bankers of the British high-ups). In exploiting the South African diamond and gold mines, Rhodes amassed a great fortune - which he used, or tried to use, in efforts at fulfilling Ruskin's grand dream.

From the introduction of Quigley's *Anglo-American Establishment*: (emphasis mine)

The Rhodes Scholarships, established by the terms of Cecil Rhodes's 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 was created by Rhodes and his principal trustee, Lord Milner, and **continues to exist to this day** [1960s-1970s].

...

This society has been known at various times as Milner's Kindergarten, as the Round Table Group, as the Rhodes crowd, as The Times crowd, as the All Souls group, and as the Cliveden set. All of these terms are unsatisfactory, for one reason or another, and I have chosen to call it the Milner Group.

...

It is not easy for an outsider to write the history of a secret group of this kind, but, since no insider is going to do it, an outsider must attempt it. It should be done, **for this Group is, as I shall show, one of the most important historical facts of the twentieth century**. Indeed, the Group is of such significance that evidence of its existence is not hard to find, if one knows where to look.

For those readers who still doubt the existence of a conspiracy - let this lay your qualms to rest. You have, above, a testament to the certainty of the existence of a conspiracy, written by, if not the best,

then at least one of the best, American historians of the 20th century; and you have what for all useful purposes is a Manifesto of the secret society behind the conspiracy. Evidence of the existence of the society is indeed not hard to found, and we provided some in the form of the short piece on Hodson's record of the second RIIA meeting in Chapter 3.

The natural question as to why so few have heard of the Milner Cabal is of a rhetorical nature.

A word on Quigley: Carroll Quigley (1910-1977) was born in Boston. Though possessed of a significant mathematical talent, he opted for the study of history - and accordingly earned a PhD from Harvard. He taught there and at Princeton before settling at the elite School of Foreign Service of Georgetown University. The School's undergraduate program has been touted as one of the top five programs in the nation; and while Quigley was there, his course was almost universally deemed the most important in their lives by his students.

Somehow or other, Quigley figured out the existence of the Milner Group, and managed to get in touch with Alfred Zimmern (this is documented in Dr Stan Monteith's *Brotherhood of Darkness*). Zimmern spilled the beans on the condition that Quigley did not reveal the source of the information. As far as I gather, Quigley also managed to get into the archives of the CFR, on the condition that he kept quiet about the Rockefellers.

From here on, I will be paraphrasing Quigley, and interjecting my own thoughts and research. The two large quotations above were necessary to set the tone. Let the reader verify my subsequent claims by following the references.

It should be understood that the Milner band is but one branch of various interconnected and competing cabals and conspiracies. By the caprices of faith, the Milner Group has been partially exposed. What are the other groups? For the last two centuries, the major power holders in the world have been: 1) those in command of the Anglo-American axis; 2) those in command of Europe and Japan (ancient nobility and *nouveau riche* industrialists); 3) the international money-lenders. The three groups overlap, and therefore, necessarily, all important cabals must be found in them or in close proximity to them. That is indeed the case, as we shall see.

The society was founded in 1891 by Rhodes, William T. Stead (1849-1912), and Reginald Brett - Esher (1852-1930). It consisted of an inner "Society of the Elect," and an outer "Association of Helpers." A triumvirate was to govern the inner circle of the organization.

Cecil Rhodes essentially owned South Africa along with its monumental wealth in gold, diamonds, and other natural resources. He died in 1902. William T. Stead was the pre-eminent journalist of the era. After eventually falling out of the Rhodes group, he sank with the Titanic. Esher was a confidant of Victoria, Edward VII, and George V, as well as a shadowy influence over the British foreign and domestic policy of the age. He died in 1930.

Alfred Milner (1854-1925) took Stead's place in the Triumvirate by 1900, and inherited Rhodes's principal role after the latter's death in 1902. Thus, Milner was in charge of operations until his death in 1925. Born of German heritage, Milner furthered British imperialistic goals across the globe - he learned the ropes in British Egypt, where he served as under-secretary to the Treasury; and then proceeded to aid Rhodes in the building of the British dominion of South Africa. Milner founded the Round Table journal in 1910, and was the true power behind the Lloyd George cabinet of the second half of World War I.

Lothian (1882-1940), whom we have already met, dominated the secret society between 1925 and his death in 1940. His successor, guessed Quigley, was Robert Henry Brand (1878-1963). Brand was on the boards of a myriad of the major City banks - thus giving us a tie between the Round Tablers and the bankers - and the husband of Phyllis, the sister of the famous Nancy Astor of the Cliveden Set and the Astor fortune. Nancy's husband, Waldorf, a pal of Lloyd George's, was a newspaper magnate. Nancy, Waldorf, and Lothian, who was close to Nancy, all joined the Church of Christian Science. As we can see, the world of the oligarchs is a small world indeed - they all know each other

- how could they not?

Brand's successor was Adam D. Marris, the son of William S. Marris (1873-1945) of the original Round Tablers. Marris got Brand's post at the Lazard Bank. He died around 1981.

Here are some of the accomplishments of the Rhodes society: they created the Boer war; they largely dominated the key aspects of British foreign domestic policy since about 1915 to at least after the Second World War; they controlled the British newspaper of record, the *London Times*; they set up the *Round Table* magazine and RIIA/ Chatham House; they conducted, in part, the appeasement policy in regard to Hitler; they authored the Paris Peace and created the League of Nations in association with a few other groups; they had a lot to do with the management of the League of Nations; they created the British Commonwealth; they wrote the Balfour Declaration (which Quigley says should properly be termed the Milner declaration; Rothschild also had a hand in it); they controlled the important All Souls College of Oxford, and from thence exerted influence on the entire university; and they controlled to a very large degree the sources and writing of the history of the period.

As the plotters quickly understood, a small group can wield great power only by: 1) monopolizing the real channels of hierarchical power, rather than the trappings and appearance of power; and 2) monopolizing the most important institutions for the propagation of ideas - the top newspapers and magazines, the top schools, the educational bureaucracy, the most prestigious annals of history, and so on. The strategy is an obvious one - and these fellows had the means to pursue it with gusto. And that they did, for they had a world to win.

The details of those exploits can be found in Quigley's work. I will focus on a few issues that strike me as particularly interesting. We should also examine the biographies of a few more of the key members and important associates of the cabal.

Milner's connection with the British socialist circles can be established through the man's close friendship with the older Arnold Toynbee (1852-1883), whose proto-socialistic ideas contributed to the emergence of the British welfare-state. As we saw earlier, Milner took part in the Coefficients Club, along with the Webbs, H.G. Wells, and Bertrand Russell. The second Toynbee, Arnold J., was the top British Historian of the era, and a key member of the RIIA organization.

In the pre-World War I era, Milner was close to the powerful Cecil / Salisbury Block, which dominated the central political nodes of the British Empire in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. After Robert Cecil's (1830-1903) death, Balfour (1848-1930) took over, and the Block's influence trickled into the hands of Milner. In a sense, the Rhodes/Milner group was merely the next, improved iteration of the model established by Salisbury.

Cecil's group administered patronage on comradely and nepotistic bases, rather than in appreciation of merit. Needless to say, the families of the cabal were thoroughly intermarried and interbred. Milner, as a man of origins humbler than Salisbury's, shifted the accent in recruitment to ideological commitment.

All Souls College is a bizarre institution, whose members, all of them graduates, automatically become Fellows (members of the College's governing body). The College's entrance exams are supposed to be the hardest in the world. Of course, the difficulty arises from the fact that the exams are, in effect, a screening process for the entrance into a secret society. Those who do not, consciously or unconsciously, comply with the ideology of the society, stand no chance of gaining entry into All Souls. The College also serves as a high-level think tank in the politico-historical sciences. In general, absolutely any Fellow of the All Souls College should be regarded as a potential member of the great conspiracy. Note that the Fellows need not know the express goals of the organization, or even of its existence, to serve as useful pawns. For lack of space I omit an analysis of the famous (or, rather, the historically important) members of All Souls - and those are many. Let the reader inquire into the matter in person.

The same holds, to an even greater degree, for the Rhodes Scholarship. Absolutely any Rhodes Scholar either 1) is a member of the conspiracy, 2) is a pawn of the conspiracy, or 3) has slipped

through the cracks. We note in passing that Bill Clinton was both a Rhodes Scholar and a student of Quigley's. For that matter, Clinton had been in the Order of DeMolay (i.e. Mason-Jugend) as a child.

RIIA - the Royal Institute of International Affairs - headquartered at Chatham House in London - is a foreign policy "think-tank" front for the Rhodes Society. Founded in 1920, around the Second World War, RIIA effectively merged with the Foreign Office. The other Commonwealth nations have Institutes of International Affairs of their own, which serve purposes similar to RIIA's, and maintain close contact with the London mother branch. Membership in RIIA is extremely prestigious. The organization is one of the focal points of the British Establishment. The American version of RIIA is the CFR, which we examine next.

Founded in 1910, a decade before RIIA, the *Round Table* journal was and remains to be the mouth-piece of the Rhodes Society. The journal is one of the most prestigious in the world, along with the CFR's *Foreign Affairs*.

In his later years, Rhodes was amongst the wealthiest men on Earth. But to get there, he needed some financial backing. The help came from the House of Rothschild, which translates into another connection between the money-masters and the Rhodes trust. Rothschild also accepted, along with a few others, the duty of administering Rhodes's will.

The "ultimate recovery of America" was one of Rhodes's goals. While this has not happened explicitly, the fates of America and England are today woven together in the so-called "Special Relationship" that the two powers share. A special relationship - but who is in charge? Does the London tail wag the Washington dog? We stress again that the East Coast American Establishment has historically been heavily Anglophile. Two of the most powerful figures in 1900 America were Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919) and J.P. Morgan (1837-1913). Carnegie was of Scottish birth, and always promoted Anglo-American camaraderie. J.P. Morgan, born in Connecticut, learned the banking trade in London, where he established connections with the Rothschild dynasty. It is said of Morgan that he ran his New York bank as if it was in London.

One of the more amusing and insidious achievements of the Rhodes-Rothschild combine was the creation of the diamond cartel De Beers. For an overview of the scam, read Edward Jay Epstein classic article from *The Atlantic* for February 1982, *Have You Ever Tried to Sell a Diamond?* In their efforts to collect the whole wealth of the world, our ambitious heroes set up major diamond-digging operations in South Africa. They did well, even too well. Diamonds, like gold, are not particularly useful in themselves. Their "value" comes from their shininess, and their historical scarcity. In effect, diamonds serve for nothing more than vulgar displays of personal wealth. The glut of South African diamonds crashed the diamond market to the dismay of our protagonists.

Rhodes & company quickly cartelized the world diamond business, and cut the supply to raise prices. The flowering of the advertisement industry in the 1920s and 1930s gave the then owners of De Beers (the Oppenheims) a golden (diamond?) opportunity. A massive PR campaign convinced the American public that no sensible girl should marry the sod who fails to produce a diamond ring. The rest is history - and profits.

Quigley points out that the members of the Milner gang "were all fantastically ignorant of economics." Undoubtedly, they held much responsibility for the sequence of calamities which was the Great Depression. The bankers, with their deflationary fanaticism, were another major culprit. But then, the two groups overlapped.

It is worth pointing out that the Milner group, Lionel Curtis in particular, played a large role in the creation of independent India.

The Group were always for the British Empire, and in 1910 they saw Germany as a problem. In

all likelihood, they considered a war with Germany, for the purpose of the destruction of Germany, inevitable. They had fabricated the Boer War; but the honour of creating World War I likely fell to the Salisbury people, Edward VII, and Grey the Foreign Secretary. All it took was the arrangement of the Entente - a feat of diplomacy well within the means of the masters of Britain. Moreover, it should be understood that throughout its history, Britain always allied itself with the second strongest power in Europe against the foremost force on the continent; and never shirked from letting the two powers destroy each other in bloody wars.

In contrast, the Group, via its subgroup the Cliveden Set, was notoriously "pro-German" and pro-appeasement in the 1930s. Quigley points out that they were never pro-German: they merely thought that a *laissez-faire* policy in regard to Hitler was the most propitious strategy for their Empire.

Milner's gang's ideology, established largely by Ruskin and the older Toynbee, tended to be collectivistic in nature. They were motivated not by crass greed, but by missionary zealotry. Wealth they regarded as a means toward a greater end, for which reason they, perhaps, collected riches all the more vigorously. They were professedly anti-democratic. They wanted to help humanity by moulding the world after their own dreams. True believers, the disciples of Milner and Rhodes were. Though they hungered, at least on paper, after a "rule of law," their ideology was quite close to what became known as fascism; nor was it much different from communism. The road to hell is paved with good intentions.

The Group played an important role in the precipitation of World War II. In general, they adhered to their doctrine of supporting the second power against the first power - and so they willy-nilly threw their lot with the Germans as a means of curbing French and Soviet supremacy. If either Germany or Russia ever became a threat, the two powers would be allowed to fight it out in what would inevitably be, and was, a bloodbath.

That was exactly the policy of certain elements of the British upper echelon of the 1930s, including members of the Group. Hence Munich. At the eve of the war, the Milner Group, perhaps informed of the Molotov-Ribbentrop unholy alliance, made an about-face and turned against Germany. Public opinion necessitated the British declaration of war on Germany in September 1939, anyway. The unexpectedly rapid fall of France, which put an end to the aptly named "phony war," must have finally demolished the idea of appeasement once and for all. In general, after the outbreak of hostilities, the Milner people were for smashing Germany, and the Chamberlain crowd were for more appeasement. The latter even pretended to advocate an attack on Russia in the days before Fall Gelb. It is certain that they had some scheme or other in mind.

It must be understood that the Second World War, in the shape that it took, could have been easily averted. The Germans could have been stopped on the Rhine in 1936, and again in Czechoslovakia in 1938. Even in September 1939, a French assault on the German western front could have brought a quick peace. One problem was that Stalin, in all likelihood, always meant to strike westward. Paranoid as that maniac was, however, he would never have struck against a Europe that could potentially have united against him. The war could have been averted - but then whence the profits? And the UN? The Anglo-American merger? And the depopulation?

The British, along with the international bankers, fabricated both World Wars, just like the Milner-Rhodes gang fabricated the Boer War. Milner's people were instrumental in the British appeasement of Hitler, which was the decisive immediate cause of the war. The policy was not unanimously accepted among the members of the Group, and led to some dissent and fragmentation.

Milner's people were ambiguous toward the League of Nations, and did not see it as the nucleus of a world government; at least not for a while. Likely, they had their own Commonwealth in mind for that role. One suspects that other factions had different ideas for the League. At the same time, the Round Table saw some usefulness in the League of Nations, and promoted public support for it.

It is worth noting that in recent times, Rhodes Scholars have dominated Goldman Sachs, which

has been the main player in the recent economic crisis. From Dr. Stan Monteith's *Brotherhood of Darkness*:

(p. 36) Dr. Dennis Cuddy discussed Goldman Sachs:

The huge investment banking firm of Goldman Sachs has included dozens of [Rhodes] scholars over the past half century, but never as many as in the 1990s, when at any given moment at least a half dozen have been partners..."

Monteith proceeds to make the important point that while there are notable Jewish elements at the pinnacle of the global cabal, the entire operation is decidedly not a, shall we say, Jewish thing.

Also, from Wormser's *Foundations: Their Power and Influence* (1958):

(Ch. 7) At least one foreign foundation has had a strong influence on our foreign policy. The Rhodes Scholarship Fund of Great Britain, created to improve England's international public relations but not registered here as a foreign agent, has gained great influence in the United States for British ideas. It has accomplished this by annually selecting a choice group of promising young men for study in England. The usually Anglophile alumni of this system are to be found in eminent positions in legislation, administration, and education in the ranks of American foundation officials. They form a patronage network of considerable importance. Dr Frank Aydelotte in a book, *The Rhodes Trust 1903-1953* published in 1956, reported: "The influence of this group on American educational practice and particularly on the rapidly increasing maturity and breadth of methods of instruction in American institutions of higher learning, has been immense." He continued: "The number of those going into government is constantly increasing." Of a total of 1,372 American Rhodes scholars up to 1953, 431 held or hold positions in teaching and educational administration (among them, 31 college presidents); 113 held government positions; 70 held positions in press and radio; and 14 were executives in other foundations. Dr Aydelotte remarks: "One indication of the success of operations of the Rhodes Scholarship in America is the remarkable way in which they have inspired other foundations." He reports that the Guggenheim fellowships and the program of the Commonwealth Fund set up by Mr. Harkness and several similar programs were developed with the aid of officials of the Rhodes fund.

Dean Rusk, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, and several of the staff members of that foundation are Rhodes scholars. Mr. Henry Allen Moe, the director of the Guggenheim foundation, and O.C. Carmichael, former president of the Carnegie foundation, are Rhodes Scholars. Senator J.W. Fullbright, Congressmen C.R. Glason, R. Hale, and C.B. Albert, and 14 American State legislators are also Rhodes alumni. Among the many Rhodes scholars connected with out Department of State are these: Ambassador to the Netherlands S.K. Hornbeck (formerly Chief of Far Eastern Affairs in the Department); B.M. Hulle (former Chief of North European Affairs in the Department); W. Walter Butterworth (former Assistant Secretary of State for Eastern Affairs, U.S. Ambassador to Sweden, Deputy Chief U.S. Mission to London); Walter Gordon (U.S. Embassy in London, in charge of Economic Affairs with the rank of minister); and G.C. McGhee (Ambassador to Turkey). Before becoming president of the Rockefeller Foundation, Dean Rusk served as a deputy Under-secretary of State. Dr Aydelotte reports that, in addition, 12 Rhodes scholars were attached to various intergovernmental agencies (ILO, UN, etc.). It may not be merely coincidental to this subject that Cecil Rhodes, who created the Scholarships, and Andrew Carnegie were friends.

Americans should take note of the fact that their educational establishment has been dominated by Rhodes Trust and allied elements, when America waged a war of independence precisely against Britain, and when Rhodes's stated goal was to return America to the loving fold of the Mother

Empire.

For at least one example of a direct connection between the Rockefellers and the Round Tablers, take Jerome Davis Greene (1874-1959). Born into an influential old family, Greene went into banking and foundations governance. He became involved with the Rockefellers upon leaving Harvard, and served in their various foundations throughout his life. Concurrently, he worked for the British investment banking firm Lee, Higginson & Co in the period 1917-1932. While in London, he established strong ties with the Milner Group. Upon his return to the States, Greene became a foundations operative.

To conclude this section, let me note that many revile Quigley for his self-professed "support" of the Milner cabal. In Quigley's own words,

In general, I agree with the goals and aims of the Milner Group. I feel that the British way of life and the British Commonwealth of Nations are among the great achievements of all history. I feel that the destruction of either of them would be a terrible disaster to mankind. ... I suppose, in the long view, my attitude would not be far different from that of the members of the Milner Group.

If that "long view" is a one-world federate government of partner states co-operating under the rule of just law, then, I suspect, many would agree with the "goals." The problem lay in the means:

But, agreeing with the Group on goals, I cannot agree with them on methods. To be sure, I realize that some of their methods were based on nothing but good intentions and high ideals - higher ideals than mine, perhaps. But their lack of perspective in critical moments, their failure to use intelligence and common sense, their tendency to fall back on standardized social reactions and verbal cliches in a crisis, their tendency to place power and influence into hands chosen by friendship rather than merit, their oblivion to the consequences of their actions, their ignorance of the point of view of persons in other countries or of persons in other classes in their own country - these things, it seems to me, have brought many of the things which they and I hold dear close to disaster.

Though in the title of the book he refers to an *Anglo-American* establishment, Quigley never touches the US. That is a sign to us, that we must do our homework. To drive the point home, the cover of the book features an upturned American flag - a symbol of distress. In penning *Tragedy & Hope* and *The Establishment*, Quigley has done more to expose the cabal than almost anybody else. The man heartily despised, on the intellectual as well as on a moral level, the decline in the quality of American education, the incompetence and short-sightedness of the international money-powers, the vile doctrine of the behaviorists, and a host of other nasty matters, big and small. Quigley was for popular democracy, Christian decency, and self-determination, but was also a realist, who saw the encroaching power of the technocracy. He saw them coming, and he thought they were doomed to failure. Though, in some sense, an adherent to the concept of *tout comprendre c'est tout pardonner*, Quigley did not let the *pardonneur* prevent him from acting. For which, we may thank him.

5.3 CFR

The Council on Foreign Relations, sometimes known by its address of Pratt House, New York, was founded in 1921 to serve as a front for the American Anglophile Establishment. As a quick glance at the membership list of the group shows, the CFR is *the* who's-who of the American oligarchy. The group maintains tight connections with its British counterpart, the RIIA. Some authors insist that RIIA is in charge, but I fail to see that. It seems to me, that the interests of the British and American oligarchical cabals are so interwoven, that they can afford to act by consensus, rather than under a hierarchical system. It is true, however, that, in a certain sense, the British have managed to "recover" America following their woeful loss of half the continent in 1789.

Woodrow Wilson (1856-1924) created in 1917 the so-called "Inquiry," later renamed to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, which was directed by the controller of Wilson, Colonel House (1858-1938), and supervised by the "philosopher" Sidney Mezes (1863-1931), of Harvard, the University of Chicago, the University of Texas (of which he was president for a while), and of the College of the City of New York (also president). Mezes's wife was the sister in law of Col. House. Other luminaries of the Inquiry were Walter Lippmann (1889-1974) of PR fame, Charles Seymour (1885-1963) who was in charge of Yale in the 1940s, Clive Day (1871-1951) the Bonesman of Yale, and a few other men of prominence. This group comprised a part of the American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference. Following Versailles, the group founded the CFR. J.P. Morgan interests dominated the CFR in the early years of its existence. After Morgan's bank declined in relative prominence in the 1930s and 1940s, the Rockefellers took over the CFR, and it remains a playground of theirs until today. The 96 year-old dinosaur David Rockefeller (1915-) has been a director of the CFR since 1949. After graduating from Harvard with a thesis on Fabian Socialism, Rockefeller appropriately spent a year in the Fabian-founded London School of Economics (where, incidentally, he met JFK). David completed a PhD in economics at the Rockefeller-founded University of Chicago. Unsurprisingly, he took the banker's view that the Great Depression had been a natural adjustment of the all-wise free-markets, and that the silence of the factories of the Depression had not been a waste. And that must have been the case - for the Rockefellers, who, with their appreciated money, had bought stuff left and right. In World War II, Rockefeller worked with the spooks, and after the war he chaired Chase Manhattan. In short, David's understanding of political economy was the bankrupt Austrian School - Chicago Boys - Globaloney pseudo-scientific oligarchical version of economics. In 1973, following Rockefeller's trip to Moscow, Chase opened a branch in front of the Kremlin. That year, David also travelled to China, where he established ties between his bank and Red China's National Bank.

For a deeper yet still succinct look at the biography of David Rockefeller, try Will Banyan's article *The Proud Internationalist*. For now, let us only add what David had to say for himself in Chapter 27 of his *Memoirs* (2002):

For more than a century ideological extremists at either end of the political spectrum have seized upon well-publicized incidents such as my encounter with Castro to attack the Rockefeller family for the inordinate influence they claim we wield over American political and economic institutions. Some even believe we are part of a secret cabal working against the best interests of the United States, characterizing my family and me as "internationalists" and of conspiring with others around the world to build a more integrated global political and economic structure - one world, if you will. If that's the charge, I stand guilty, and am proud of it.

Today, the CFR has about 5000 members. One joins the CFR only by invitation. A policy of discretion similar to the Chatham House Rule applies to CFR meetings. Clearly, the CFR must consist roughly of three rings - an innermost one composed of people who know the score; an inner one for those who associate with the CFR on a frequent basis but are not full insiders; and an outer one for those who are CFR members in title only. As Russo explained, most of the members of the CFR do not know the true purposes of Rockefeller & Co, and have joined the club for prestige or from internationalist idealism.

Some notable historical members: Joe Biden (VP to Obama), Dick Cheney (who was also Secretary of Defence under Bush Sr.), President Bill Clinton, President George H.W. Bush (also two-time VP to Reagan), President Jimmy Carter, President Gerald Ford (whose VP was Nelson Rockefeller), President Richard Nixon, President Herbert Hoover, and Gorbachev. Kissinger and Brzezinski are high-level CFR members. Kissinger ran the Nixon and Ford administrations, and Brzezinski "helped" Carter. Ike Eisenhower was a CFR cadre through-and-through. The Ford and Carter administrations were totally dominated by the Rockefeller faction. All other administrations since World War II sported hordes of CFR members in powerful positions.

A few other key historical CFR members include: Averell Harriman, who was one of the most important American figures of the 20th century; the Bundy Brothers and the Dulles brothers, who were instrumental in the creation of the CIA, and were highly influential in the Eisenhower and Kennedy-Johnson administrations; the bizarre character of Armand Hammer; Irving Kristol the father of Neoconservatism; George Kennan of the Telegram; Alexander Haig, Reagan's Secretary of State; Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defence under JGK and LBJ, and later the 5th President of the World Bank; Dean Rusk the Secretary of State under JFK and LBJ; Caspar Weinberger, the Secretary of Defence of Reagan; Paul Warburg the legendary banker; and too many others. It should be understood that the CFR overlaps with some other organizations, notably the Skull & Bones secret society (for obvious reasons, we can regard the CFR itself as "secretive" rather than "secret"). The CFR is not quite the power behind the scenes, but merely one of the tools of the power behind the scenes.

A useful and well-researched, though somewhat ideologically doctrinaire, source on the CFR is James Perloff's *The Shadows of Power* (1988).

From Ch.1, p.7 of that book:

Through early 1988 [and since 1921, over 23 four-year presidential terms], fourteen secretaries of state, fourteen treasury secretaries, eleven defence secretaries, and scores of other federal department heads have been CFR members.

Impressive numbers, by any count.

The outlook of the inner circle of the CFR, easily determined through the contents of *Foreign Affairs*, and the biographical idiosyncrasies of the CFR's prominent members, is: secretive, in the sense that its more powerful members prefer to wield real power in private capacity from behind the curtains; internationalist, in the sense that the ultimate goal of the CFR is a one-world government; elitist; banker-friendly; co-operative, meaning that the CFR top honchos do not shy from working with other groups, such as the Communists; manipulative; Anglophile; and ruthless - "the end justifies the means."

In 1973, Rockefeller and Brzezinski set up the Trilateral Commission. The three sides of the Commission are Europe, North America, and Southeast Asia (particularly Japan). Clearly, the purpose of the Trilateral Commission is the coordination and guidance of the three key economic blocks of the world into regional coagulation and international inter-dependence, with the ultimate goal of world government. The members of the Trilateral Commission are a set of high-level government officials and top industrialists.

The major historical trends and events of the post-war era occurred either with the express knowledge, or through the direct machinations, of the innermost circle of the CFR. Examples include - the 1970s oil crisis, which, as Engdahl explains in *A Century of Oil*, was arranged by Kissinger; the Vietnam War; the Soviet-Afghan conflict, in which Brzezinski played an important role, and which destroyed the Soviet Union; and the craze for Globaloney.

5.4 Skull and Bones

There are only a few references on Skull and Bones. I draw from Antony Sutton's *America's Secret Establishment* (1983, 1986, 2002). The latest and most thorough overview of the Order, as far as I know, can be found in Kris Millegan's *Fleshing Out Skull & Bones: Investigations into America's Most Powerful Secret Society* (2003). Sutton (1925-2002) was an academic historian. Millegan is the son of an OSS/CIA operative. Interestingly, Sutton obtained the membership list of the Order through Charlotte Iserby, whose father and grandfather had been Bonesmen.

Two useful movies to watch in regard to Skull and Bones are *The Brotherhood of the Bell* (1970)

with Glenn Ford, and De Niro's *The Good Shepherd* (2006), starring Matt Damon and Angelina Jolie.⁴

The Skull and Bones (a.k.a. The Order a.k.a. Bones a.k.a. Skull & Bones a.k.a. The Brotherhood of Death) secret society is the most prestigious of Yale's three secret societies, the other two being Scroll and Key, and Wolf's Head. The order was founded in 1832-1833 by William H. Russell (1809-1885) and Alphonso Taft (1810-1891) as Branch 322 of a German secret society.

Prussia was the major military and scientific power in 19th century Europe, and, as such, exerted an enormous cultural influence on the young American Republic. The scions of the American oligarchs scurried in swarms to the Prussian universities to learn the methods of the all-conquering Prussians, and to obtain the vaunted PhD degrees.

What German secret society had Russell and Taft extended into New England? Likely the society of the Illuminati, of which we will see more shortly.

The Skull & Bones symbol was used by the old Knight Templars, of whom the Masons claim to descend.

Russell and Taft were both members of the Boston Brahmin oligarchy of old American blue blood and money. Alphonso Taft was the father of President William Howard Taft (1857-1930, President 1909-1913). In 1870, Alphonso played a role in the Board of Education of Cincinnati vs. Minor case, which banned the reading of the Bible in public schools. This is important in the light of the Illuminati obsession with smashing Christianity.

William Russell's cousin, Samuel Russell (1789-1862), was the man in the charge of the notorious Russell & Company syndicate, which handled a good portion of the American opium trade with China. The profits of the drug trade were stupendous. One of Samuel Russell's associates was a Warren Delano (1809-1898), who was the maternal grandfather of FDR. The Order continued to exhibit connections with the profitable drug business throughout the 20th century, partly through the CIA, which was, at least in its early years, largely a Skull & Bones operation.

Every year the Order selects 15 new members from the junior (3rd) year class of Yale University. Those "tapped" spend their senior year with the Order. New members undergo an occult initiation ceremony replete with coffins, urine, nudity, and secret names. To enter the order is to be "born again," which gives a new meaning to Georgie Bush's antics.

The Order desires the following qualities in new members: blood relations with other members of the order; political savvy or business acumen; and a team-spirit, i.e. a willingness to take one for the Order, to help out fellow Bonesmen, and to follow dictates.

As with any such society, inevitably some members drift away from the central core of the organization. They can be counted on to provide the occasional favour, but they do not belong to the nucleus of the society. These members comprise the outer circle of the Order.

The members of the Order, like the members of All Souls, can expect to always receive the juiciest business contracts, political posts, and academic positions that there are. To fail in life as a member of the Skull & Bones, one must possess the unique *je-ne-sais-quoi* with which Georgie W. was so richly endowed. But then, the example of Georgie only shows that even the most pathetic psychopathic dry drunk can become President with the help of the Order.

Full Bonesmen go by the title of "Patriarch." These Patriarchs hold annual meetings at their own Deer Island on the Saint Lawrence River, near Alexandria Bay, New York.

And now for the roster. The public domain contained almost nothing on the Order until the 1980s, when a kind soul mailed Antony Sutton a package, which contained the historical membership lists of the Skull & Bones. Sutton published the documents along with a brief analysis.

⁴Movies are useless as hard evidence, but can be useful in transmitting the general shape of an idea. For example, films like *JFK* and *Wall Street*, though factually inaccurate, are thematically precise. Both films indirectly tell the viewer exactly what is going on. I find myself forced to resort to such references, because most people never read - but do watch cinema. The academically minded reader can focus on the scholarly references provided throughout this text.

Historically, the members of the Skull and Bones secret society have been: East Coast, though they have allowed a few West Coast members since the 1950s; WASP (white Anglo-Saxon Protestant), though recently they have allowed for some heterogeneity; male; and old money, though, by necessity, they gradually allow new money into the cabal.

A number of powerful American dynasties have participated into the Order for generations. Those dynasties include the following names (brief comment on the origins of the family; the Robber Barons came during and after the Civil War): Whitney (arrived to New England in 1635), Stimson (1635), Perkins (1631), Taft (1679), Wadsworth (1632), Gilman (1638), Phelps (1630), Bundy (1635), Lord (1635), Rockefeller (oil/banking robber barons), Harriman (railroads robber barons), Weyerhaeuser (lumber), Sloane (retail), Pillsbury (flour milling), Davison (pals of J.P.Morgan's), Payne (Rockefeller cronies). Also of interest are the Vanderbilts (railroads), and the Bush family.

Between them, these families have held countless influential public offices, academic chairs, and corporate board memberships and directorships. These people are Power.

Follow a few illustrative mini-biographies of Bones members:

Presidents of the United States: William Howard Taft (1857-1930, President 1909-1913), George H.W. Bush (1924-, President 1989-1993), and George W. Bush (1946-, President 2001-2009); John Kerry (1943-) of the Skull and Bones was George W.'s contender in 2004. Note that serious organizations prefer to rule from behind the scenes. The Bonesmen could have had many more presidencies. William Maxwell Evarts (1818-1901) was a Secretary of State, Attorney General, and a senator. Morrison Remick Waite (1816-1888) was the seventh Chief Justice of the United States from 1874 to 1888.

William Barrett Washburn (1820-1887) was a Senator and a Governor of Massachusetts.

Daniel Coit Gilman (1831-1908) was a president of the University of California, John Hopkins University (top medical school in the U.S.), and the Carnegie Institution (highly influential in U.S. educational policy).

Andrew Dickson White (1832-1918) co-founded Cornell University.

Arthur Twining Hadley (1856-1930) was an economist and the President of Yale between 1899 and 1921.

Irving Fisher (1867-1947) was a neo-classical economist, a prohibitionist, and a dedicated eugenicist.

Henry Lewis Stimson (1867-1950) was the Secretary of War under Taft (1911-1913) and under FDR (1940-1945). He served as Governor General to the Philippines under Coolidge (1927-1929) and Secretary of State under Hoover (1929-1933).

Pierre Jay (1870-1949) was the first chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Thomas Cochran (1871-1936) was a partner to J.P. Morgan.

Francis Burton Harrison (1873-1957) was a Congressman and the Governor-General of the Philippines under Wilson (1913-1921). After the Philippines became "independent," Harrison "advised" the first four Filipino Presidents.

Percy Avery Rockefeller (1878-1934) was a board director of (among others) Atlantic Fruit Company, Anaconda Copper Mining Company, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bowman Biltmore Hotels Company, Chile Copper Company, Consolidated Gas Company, W. A. Harriman & Co. & Brown Brothers Harriman & Company, National City Bank of New York, National Surety Company, Provident Loan Society, Remington Arms Company, United Electric Light & Power Company, and Western Union & Telegraph Company.

Charles Edward Adams (1881-1957) was a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Charles Seymour (1885-1963) was one of the founders of the CFR and the President of Yale between 1937 and 1951.

Harold Stanley (1885-1963) was the Stanley of "Morgan Stanley."

William Averell Harriman (1891-1986) was one of the key figures of the 20th century. His education was the standard Groton-Yale. He was the US Ambassador to the USSR during the war (1943-1946), Secretary of Commerce under Truman (1946-1948), and a Governor of New York (1955-1958). In his private capacity, Averell was on the boards of a plethora of important industrial and financial

concerns. His bank, Brown Brothers Harriman, was and remains the most important US "private" (i.e. secret) "investment" bank. Brown Brothers Harriman has strong ties with the Bushies. During WWII, Brown Brothers had some goings-on with the Nazis. The scandal was extinguished. In the summer of 1942, before becoming ambassador, Harriman accompanied Churchill to a meeting with Uncle Joe. Kennan's telegram received heavy support from Averell. Harriman was one of the men behind the Marshall Plan. Under Kennedy, Harriman served as "Ambassador at Large" and as "Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs." Anatoliy Golitsyn, the Soviet 1961 defector, accused Harriman of being a Soviet spy. This ties in with an earlier incident - the Soviets had given a bugged present to Averell, who proceeded to hoist the ornament into the US Ambassador to Moscow's residential office. Golitsyn was right, but he did not see the whole picture. Harriman did co-operate with the communists, not to help them out of sympathy, but to pursue his own, and his Order's, murky goals. Averell was the chief US negotiator at the 1975 Paris peace talks at the end of the Vietnam war. After WWII, Harriman was an "elder statesman" (*éminence grise*) of the Democratic Party. In 1971, Averell married his second wife, Pamela Hayward, who happened to be the widow of Winston's son Randolph Churchill. In 1983, Harriman flew to Moscow as a private citizen to have a chat with Yuri Andropov (1914-1984, General Secretary 1982-1984). No American had talked to Andropov since Brezhnev's (1906-1982, General Secretary 1964-1982) death. Prescott Sheldon Bush (1895-1972) was George H.W.'s father, a partner in Harriman's bank, and a senator.

Robert Abercrombie Lovett (1895-1986) was the Secretary of Defence during the Korean War, and the Under Secretary of State under Truman. He had been "assistant secretary for air" during WWII. Briton Hadden (1898-1929) co-founded *Time-Life* in 1923 with his fellow Bonesman Henry Luce (1898-1967).

Eugene Gladstone O'Neill, Jr. (1910-1950) was the son of the Noble laureate playwright.

William Putnam "Bill" Bundy (1917-2000) was CIA, and a high-ranking foreign affairs advisor to JFK and LBJ. He was one of the main creators of the Vietnam War. Having created the war, Bill went to the academia to write history. He edited *Foreign Affairs* between 1972 and 1984. Bill's wife was Dean Acheson's daughter.

McGeorge "Mac" Bundy (1919-1996) was Bill's brother. Mac learned the ropes from Henry Stimson between 1945 and 1947. Despite having only a bachelor's degree, Mac was a major long-serving professor at Harvard. In fact, in 1953 he became the youngest Dean in the history of the University. In 1961, Mac became JFK's National Security Advisor (the same post that Brzezinski held under Carter). Bundy was a major player in the Bay of Pigs fiasco, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and, of course, Vietnam. Between 1966 and 1979, Mac was in charge of the Ford Foundation (influential in many fields, particularly education). Like his brother, Mac retired from public life to write (his own sanitized version of) history.

Dean Parker Acheson (1893-1971) was Scroll & Key rather than Bones. He was Truman's Secretary of State, one of the authors of the Marshall Plan, and one of the founders of Nato. During the war, Acheson was the Assistant Secretary of State. He implemented and administered the famous Lend-Lease program. Acheson was the State department's head delegate at Bretton Woods in 1944. Eisenhower gave Acheson a vacation, and so the latter moved behind the scenes. Both Kennedy and Johnson treated him as an important unofficial advisor. Dean's son, David, was Skull & Bones.

Charles Merville Spofford (1902-1991) was a lawyer at the powerful Davis Polk & Wardwell; a brigadier general during WWII; a Nato official in the early 1950s; and an intimate of John D. Rockefeller III's.

William Frank Buckley, Jr. (1925-2008) was a CIA cadre, the founder of the magazine *National Review*, and a long-time TV talk-show host. Buckley's political views were fanatically "conservative" - jingoism, free-market fundamentalism, and so on.

Evan (Van) Griffith Galbraith (1928-2008) was Buckley's friend, an Ambassador to France under Reagan, the Pentagon's attache to Europe under Bush Jr., and a major investment banker.

Thomas Henry Guinzburg (1926-2010) was the president of the Viking Press.

Raymond K. "Ray" Price, Jr (1930-) was a "speechwriter" to Nixon, Ford, and Bush.

David Gaub McCullough (1933-) is a prominent historian and a two-time winner of the Pulitzer. Winston Lord (1937-) was the president of the CFR between 1977 and 1985, US Ambassador to China between 1985 and 1989, and Assistant Secretary of State under Clinton. As the reader can see, Bonesmen thrive equally well under both Democrats and Republicans.

David Lyle Boren (1941-) was the Governor of Oklahoma between 1975 to 1979. As a senator, he is (Wikipedia) "the longest serving Chairman of the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. Currently, he serves as Co-Chair of the nonpartisan U.S. President's Intelligence Advisory Board." He has been the President of the University of Oklahoma since 1994.

Robert Kagan (1958-) is a co-founder of the Bush administration's manifesto, *PNAC*, which we discussed in Chapter 2.

Austan Dean Goolsbee (1969-) is a Chicago Boy, and served as Obama's Economic "Czar" for a year and a half, before Christina Romer replaced him.

The Order maintains contact with its British counter-part via various banks, private relations, and interlocking clubs and societies. In all likelihood, the two organizations act in concert most of the time.

Obviously, the Order is only one powerful branch of the overall system of interlocking secret societies and private banks and corporations, which form the planetary power matrix of the global Oligarchy. The overall goals of the Order remain somewhat unclear. Their most immediate concern can only be oligarchical supremacy in America, and American hegemony in the world; beyond that, they likely desire a pleasant patrician New World Order. As G.H.W. Bush, known in Bonesman circles as Mr. "Magog," put it:

From: 1991 State of the Union Address: (emphasis mine)

... What is at stake [in the genocidal Gulf War] is more than one small country, it is a **big idea - a new world order**, where diverse nations are drawn together in common cause to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind: peace and security, freedom, and the rule of law. Such is a world worthy of our struggle, and worthy of our children's future.

... We have within our reach the promise of renewed America. We can find meaning and reward by serving some purpose higher than ourselves - a shining purpose, **the illumination of a thousand points of light**. It is expressed by all who know the irresistible force of a child's hand, of a friend who stands by you and stays there - a volunteer's generous gesture, **an idea that is simply right**.

... We will succeed in the Gulf [where the Bush's own CIA had installed Saddam]. And when we do, the world community will have sent an enduring warning to any dictator or despot, present or future, who contemplates outlaw aggression.

The world can therefore seize this opportunity to **fulfill the long-held promise of a new world order** - where brutality will go unrewarded, and aggression will meet collective resistance.

The speech gives one a clear idea of the Order's goal.

In regard to its methods, it must be pointed out that, as Charlotte Iserbyt has documented, the Order brought the Wundtian behaviorism (i.e. animal training methods), which we discuss later, into the American educational system. Skull&Bones, along with its allied foundations, particularly the Rockefeller one, has been incredibly influential in the development of 20th American compulsory schooling.

As one can glean from the above roster, and as has been documented, the Order has been thoroughly immersed in banking (they have also dominated the powerful Guaranty Trust private investment firm), spying, drug trafficking, war, high-level opinion-shaping (via, for example, *Time-Life*), and high-level service in important governmental positions. As Matt Damon explained in De Niro's movie, the Order owns America.

5.5 Bilderberg Group

The best reference on the Bilderberg Group is Daniel Estulin's meticulously researched *The True Story of the Bilderberg Group* (2009). Jim Tucker is another major Bilderberg researcher.

Founded in 1954 by Bernhard the Nazi of the Netherlands and Józef Retinger (1888-1960), and named after the location of the first meeting, the Bilderberg gang convenes annually at a posh hotel in a quiet town to co-ordinate the actions of the Euro-American oligarchy. The Bilderberg conferences host 100-150 high-profile figures, who gallivant and chat in total secrecy under the protection of a small army of private security contractors and local policemen. The group was almost totally unknown for the first 40 years of its existence. Today, however, the online alternative media has managed to partially lift the veil of darkness surrounding the Bilderbergers.

Bernhard we have already met. Who was Retinger? The man was the protege of a Polish Austro-Hungarian noble. After graduating as the youngest ever PhD from the Sorbonne in 1908, Retinger moved to England, where his best friend was the nihilistic Polish-born writer Joseph Conrad (1857-1924), the author of the apocalyptic *Heart of Darkness* (1899) and *Nostramo* (1904). After a lengthy spell in Mexico, where he dabbled in politics, Retinger returned to Europe to participate in WWII on the behalf of the Polish London government-in-exile. After the war, Retinger headed the United Europe movement. The man died in 1960.

Retinger was, then, a British agent, and one of the promulgators of the European Union. Indeed, as we have seen on and off, the European Union has long been a goal of the Anglo-American oligarchy. Along with sister organizations like the Club of Rome, the Bilderberg gang was one of the major influences in the creation of the EU. Let me reiterate here that I do not view the idea of a united Europe negatively. My problem lies with the Sovietic/ Patrician nature of the existing EU. The EU that we have aims to drain the sovereignty of countries for the purposes of the creation of a neo-liberal neo-feudal world system. Those opposed to this idea should aim not to annihilate the EU, but to conquer its bureaucracy, and refashion the organization into more sensible and democratic patterns. The American founding member of the Bilderberg cabal was one Joseph E. Johnson (1895-1990). This Johnson was a US State Department official and an envoy to the UN. Between 1950 and 1971, Johnson was the President of the prestigious internationalist front the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Between 1965 and 1981, Johnson was the VP of one of the other high-level foundations/ thing-tanks, the (City of) London International Institute for Strategic Studies. The man's internationalist credentials are impeccable.

David Rockefeller was a member of the Bilderberg "steering committee" from the start. In the 1970s, he brought his agents Kissinger and Brzezinski into the fray. The "steering committee" of the original 1954 meeting is almost entirely Anglo-American (note that Canada and to an extent the Netherlands tend to fall in the Anglo-American sphere of influence).

The Steering Committee forms the innermost circle of the Bilderberg society. The inner circle consists of the frequent attendees, not all of whom necessarily belong to the innermost circle. The outer circle of the Bilderberg gang consists of those who have attended only a few times, or perhaps just once. Note that, as usual, only the innermost circle knows the score. Those in the outer circle likely attend for reasons of prestige, and may believe that the Bilderberg organization really is a gathering where rich people and top politicians can discuss at leisure their noble plans for helping humanity.

A few more Bilderberg names (from the Appendix of Estulin's book):

From the 1973 meeting (which discussed the upcoming oil crisis):

Ernst van der Beugel - professor of international relations at Leiden University acted as Honorary Secretary General for Europe; Frits Karsten of AMRO Bank acted as Honorary Treasurer; Josef Houthuyns - chairman of Belgian Christian Union; Denis Healey - British MP; Reginald Maudling -

British MP; David Owen - British MP; Eric Roll - Warburg banker; John Simon of British Leyland; James Akins of the US White House; George Ball of the Lehman Brothers; Zbig; Bill Bundy; Emilio Collado of Exxon; Arthur Dean of Sullivan & Cromwell (top corporate lawyer, pal of John Foster Dulles, negotiate the ceasefire at the end of the Korean War); Hank Kissinger; Lewis Lapham of *Harper's*; Walter Levy - an "oil consultant"; James Perkins - Chairman of the International Council for Educational Development; Shepard Stone - President of the International Association for Cultural Freedom; John Tower - senator; Carroll Wilson of MIT's Sloan School.

Guivanni Agnelli of Fiat; Edmond de Rothschild of the French wing of the dynasty; Helmut Schmidt who governed Germany from 1974 to 1982; Shepard Stone - of the *NYT*, military intelligence, and the Ford Foundation; Roberto Ducci of Italy who won a medal in Ethiopia and served in Croatia during the war - postbellum, Ducci, who had been a royalist rather than a fascist, was one of Italy's top diplomats; René Granier de Lilliac of the French petroleum company Total; Arthur Greenhill of Britain, who was, at various times, Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Governor of the BBC, board member of S.G. Warburg and Leyland International, and who was involved with the notorious removal of the Chagos Islanders; Max Kohnstamm the Dutch diplomat and historian with strong ties to Royal Dutch Shell and other major concerns - the private secretary of the Queen Wilhelmina - a founder of the Club of Rome; Joseph Luns the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs between 1952 and 1971; Peter Lougheed the Premier (i.e. Governor) of Alberta, Canada from 1971 to 1985; Donald Macdonald the long-serving Canadian cabinet member; Olof Palme the important Swedish politician; Roger Seydoux Fournier de Clausonne the top French diplomat; Theo Sommer the German pundit; Otto Wolff von Amerongen the industrialist who traded for the Third Reich in Portugal during the war, and attained a directorship for Exxon by 1971.

As we can see, the Bilderbergs consist of about equal proportions of high-level 1) politicians, 2) industrialists, bankers, and old nobility, and 3) academics, foundation agents, and journalists. Note that some representatives act as agents to major figures who, for whatever reasons, fail to attend.

From the 2006 meeting in Ottawa:

Ettienne Davignon was the Vice Chairman - the man is a Eurocrat and was in charge of the bank Société Générale between 1989 and 2001; Jos Pedro Aguilar-Branco the Portuguese Minister of Defence; Fouad Ajami of the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins; George Alogoskoufis the Minister of Economy of Greece; Egemen Bagis of Turkey; Francisco Pinto Balsemao the former PM of Portugal; Martin Bartenstein the Minister of Economic of Austria; Franco Bernabé the Rothschild agent; Oscar Bronner of *Der Standard*; Edmund Clark of the Canadian TD banking consortium; Philip Crawley of the top Canadian newspaper the *Globe and Mail*; George David of Coca-Cola; Richard Descoing the Director of the Institut d'Études Politiques; Mathias Döpfner of *Springer*; John Elkann of Fiat (and now Chrysler), Agnelli's grandson, born only in 1976; Tiny Tim Geithner of the Fed; Paul Gigot the Editor of the Editorial page of the *WSJ*; Eival Gilady the advisor to the PM of Israel; Jean-Pierre Hansen the Belgian banker; Eero Hienaluoma the Minister of Finance of Finland; Richard Holbrooke of the US; Allan Hubbard the economic advisor to Bush; Josef Joffe the Publisher-Editor of *Die Zeit*; Vernon Jordan of Lazard Frères of Wall Street; Anatole Kaletsky of the *London Times*; Yves de Kerdrel of *Le Figaro*; John Kerr of Kinlochard of Royal Dutch Shell; James Kimsey the founding CEO of America Online; Hank Kissinger; Gerard Kleisterlee of Philips; Mustafa Koc the Turkish industrialist; Kemal Korpulu the Turkish politician; Henry Kravis and his wife, the man a banker, the woman a foundation operative; Neelie Kroes of the EU; Ed Kronenburg of NATO; Mahmood Sariolghalam, an academic from Iran; Paolo Scaroni the CEO of Eni SpA (oil and gas); Rudolf Scholten the Austrian banker; Jurgen Schrempp of DaimlerChrysler; Ekkehard Schulz of ThyssenKrupp; Augusto Santos Silva the Portuguese politician; James Steinberg, a Dean at the University of Texas; Peter Sutherland of Goldman Sachs; Richard Waugh of the Canadian Bank of Nova Scotia; Martin Wolf the Associate Editor and Economics Commentator of the *Financial Times*; James Wolfensohn of the US, concerned with the Gaza problem; Philip Zelikow of the US State Department; Yi Zhang of the "China Society for Strategy and Management Research"; Robert Zoellick the US Deputy Secretary of State; and Vendeline von Bredow and Adrian

Wooldridge of the *London Economist*.

That none of the newspapers and magazines represented at Bilderberg published anything on the meeting is sufficient proof of the total oligarchical control over the Western so-called "free press."

Estulin lists the following ideas as the goals of the Bilderberg Group:

- **One International Identity:** this amounts to the destruction of national cultures from within via, one suspects, immigration in the West, and Hollywoodization in the rest of the world.
- **Centralized Control of People:** self-explanatory. The means will be increasing amount of heavy-duty brainwashing, the cashless society, and, in the long run, it is hoped, the mass chipping of the population. The chips will likely start as mere GPS trackers/ credit cards. The end goal is the brain-chip.
- **A Zero-Growth Society:** this means the end of industrialization and development and a reversion to some sort of a pre-industrial feudal order.
- **A State of Perpetual Imbalance:** to keep people in control, the oligarchs manufacture endless crises. Scared, tired people enter a fatalistic mindset and accept "change" with resignation.
- **Centralized Control of All Education**
- **Centralized Control of All Foreign and Domestic Policies:** this is being achieved via "international agreements" like GATT and Agenda 21, and via such bodies as the EU, the UN, the IMF, the WHO, and the World Bank.
- **Empowerment of the United Nations**
- **Western Trading Bloc**
- **Expansion of NATO:** clearly, NATO is supposed to be the core of the future World Army.
- **One Legal System:** centred around the International Court of Justice.
- **One [Fabian] Socialist Welfare State:** "The Bilderbergers envision a socialist welfare state, where obedient slaves will be rewarded and non-conformists targeted for extermination."

In some of his interviews, Estulin also mentions the Malthusian aspect of the New World Order.

Notice again that the goals of the bankers and the communists largely coincide. Both groups desire a two-tier ("classless") society in which the state - or an equivalent conglomeration of monopolistic corporate power - possesses absolute control over every living soul on the planet Earth.

It is worth noting that many US Attendees violate the old dead-letter Logan Act, which prohibits the unofficial bantering between US persons of influence and foreign powers. Thus many of the US attendees are guilty of treason. Other countries likely have similar laws.

At its inner circles, the Bilderberg gang overlaps with the CFR, the Trilateral Commission, and the RIIA. In the interest of clarity, it should be noted that the Bilderberg group does not exactly make decisions. Rather, it sets the tone. It establishes a rough consensus, which all interested parties follow. But this is a technicality. Evidently, the men and women of Bilderberg and its sister societies wield sufficient power to direct the course of history.

5.6 Bohemian Grove

The Bohemian Grove is the property of the private Bohemian Club of San Francisco. Every year, the foam-de-la-foam of male America gathers for two weeks at the Grove to have a massive orgy.

One useful first-hand reference in regard to the Grove is Alex Jones's documentary *Inside Bohemian Grove*. In 2000, Jones went into the Grove and filmed the "Cremation of Care" ritual extravaganza, in which the owners of America (and not only America) revel every year. The ritual consists of the burning in effigy of a human body in front of the statue of an owl to the recording of someone (used to be Walter Cronkite) impersonating Satan. Bizarre and unbelievable, but we have it on video. But then, perhaps the good Bohemians were merely producing the sequel to *Rosemary's Baby* (1968). Nothing wrong in performing a good play with a few close friends, and burning a dummy in effigy... The symbol of the owl stands for magic, knowledge, wisdom, secrecy, and the afterlife. "Weaving Spiders Come Not Here" is the motto of the club. Supposedly, it means that the attendees forget about business and politics and focus on having good comradely fun & Owl worship.

One Peter Martin Phillips wrote a dissertation on the Bohemian Club in 1994 - *A Relative Advantage: Sociology of the San Francisco Bohemian Club*. What did he discover?

The Club was founded in the late 19th century, but has evolved since.

Between 1919 and 1931, the following men visited the Grove, as documented in the *San Francisco Chronicle*: Magnus W. Alexander - Consultant to General Electric and Manager of National Industrial Conference Board; Dr. Henry Pritchett - President of Carnegie Foundation; Douglas Fairbanks and Charlie Chaplin from Hollywood; Fred Olmsted - Sage Foundation, U.S. Housing Corporation; Dr. Nicholas Butler - President of Columbia University; Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf - Sweden; Waldorf Astor of the Milner gang; Nicholas Longworth - politician, Speaker of the House; Rupert Blue - Surgeon General; William Donovan - Assistant Attorney General, head of the OSS during WWII; Dwight Davis - Secretary of War; H.F. Stone - U.S. Supreme Court Justice; Arthur Capper - U.S. Senator from Kansas; W.B. Storey - President, Santa Fe Railroad; Roy Chapin - Chairman of Board, Hudson Motor Co.; Dr. Ray Lyman - Secretary of the Interior; Sir Hamilton Hart - Conductor, London Symphony Orchestra; Arthur Wood - Former Director of Chicago Stock Exchange; Gen. Adrian Fleming - U.S. Army, Retired; Cornelius Kelly - President, Anaconda Copper Co.; Gerry Heath - Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and August Pabst of brewing fame. Who knows how many other luminaries went there without the *Chronicle's* knowledge.

The Club dispenses memberships by invitation only.

Apart from politicians, businessmen, and military brass, the Club tries to attract the top media figures of the day. This is not done only to "promote the arts" or "to have fun." Whether the entertainers know it or not, entertainment plays a paramount role in the moulding of public opinion.

Outside of the summer Bacchanalia, the Club hosts regular (bi-)weekly events throughout the year. The Club organizes lectures on various subjects during the summer orgy. In 1993, the topics at the Grove Museum were: "Mining In The Jungle"; "Endangered Species in Somalia"; "Marble Carving"; "Hawaii"; "Nuclear Disaster"; "Population Growth" [it figures, does it not?]; "Redwoods"; "Eye On/In Iraq"; "Nineteenth Century Logging"; "Desert Storm's Aftermath In The Gulf"; "Art and Trail of Tears"; "Development and Conservation of Non-Traditional Oil Sources"; "Adaptive Complexity."

The topics speak for themselves.

Apart from the Museum lectures, there are "Lakeside" lectures. In 1994, Phillips listened to a former Green Beret "who runs an international security agency that consults to businesses and governments on corporate fraud, security issues and terrorism. ... About 1,000 men attended and they gave him a polite applause at the end." The next day, a Berkeley professor gave an "extremely political" lecture. Phillips goes over the content of the speech later in his work. In short, the Berkeley professor argued for the usual anti-democratic benevolent leadership from above that we have seen so often.

Like good Bacchanalians, the Grovers do some serious drinking during their two-week celebration. From a psychological perspective, we note that intoxication hastens the establishment of strong interpersonal relations, and transports one into a suggestible state of mind.

One of the main goals of organizations like the Grove is to allow the "movers and shakers" to get to

know each other. This is well understood, and every year many new wonderful friendships blossom under the redwoods and the owls.

On the "Democrats" vs "Republicans" scale, the Grove leans to the right.

The racial composition of the attendants of the 1994 summer camp that Phillips attended was almost entirely white, even though California in general and San Francisco in particular bustle with "minorities." No women attend the Grove, except for some "staff," though I have heard that the Grovers hire professional courtesans. This is highly likely. A band of wealthy, powerful, and drunk overgrown boys would inevitably succumb to a condition of acute dissatisfaction. Some would certainly seek release in the fraternal love that they learned about at boarding school. But many would require women.

I should also mention that pedophilia enthusiasm seems to be something of an open secret in certain oligarchical circles. One repeatedly runs into the topic during the research of oligarchy. The subject is too disgusting to bother with here; it cross-references with the issue of mind-control ("Manchurian candidates"); let me only note that it is corroborated by plenty of hard evidence. See, for example, Brice Taylor's *Thanks For The Memories ... The Truth Has Set Me Free!* (1999), Cathy O'Brien's *TRANCE Formation of America* (1995), the suppressed *Discovery Channel* 1994 documentary *Conspiracy of Silence* (now available on YouTube), and John DeCamp (Nebraska state senator) and Ted Gunderson's (head of L.A.'s FBI branch) research on the Nebraska Ring.

An analysis of the 1980s composition of the 905 members of the Bohemian Club produced the following breakdown for 853 Grovers: Business/Legal - 627; Theatre Arts/ Writing - 54; Non-Profit, Government and Military - 72; Academic - 81; Medical - 19. There is much overlap.

Matching the active 1991 Bohemian list with the 1991 U.S. directors resulted in showing that 141 Bohemians hold 286 directorships in the top 1,144 U.S. corporations. The data indicates that 13.2% of all Bohemians are directors of Fortune 1000 or Forbes 500 corporations, or that of the top 1,144 corporations in the U.S. 17.6% have a one or more Bohemian directors.

And this is only an underestimate of the extreme power of the Grovers.

Note that the Bohemian representation of Californian corporate power is particularly acute. One can regard the Bohemian Club as the focal point of the West Coast Establishment.

Phillips points out that "Dewey, Hoover, Wilkie, Eisenhower, Taft, Goldwater, Nixon, Bush, Ford, and Reagan have all been members or guests at the Grove along with significant numbers of cabinet members and White House officials." Georgie the Younger, Dick Cheney, Casper Weinberger, James Baker, and George Schultz were also members. The list includes all Republican presidents since 1928, plus a few of the unsuccessful Republican presidential candidates.

Historically, the CFR tended to be under-represented at the Grove. Since 1971, the CFR people have gained some presence at the Bohemian Club.

The American Enterprise Institute and the Hoover Institution thoroughly overlap with the Bohemian Club. Indeed, Herbert Hoover was a dedicated Grover.

In conclusion, let us quote the immortal words of America's "last liberal president," the inimitable Tricky Dick Nixon, who was a political hack and an unrepentant crook and a subject of manipulation, and also a protege of Nelson Rockefeller's:

(From the Watergate Tapes) The Bohemian Grove, that I attend from time to time - the Easterners and the others come there - but it is the most faggy goddamn thing you could ever imagine, that San Francisco crowd that goes in there; it's just terrible! I mean I won't shake hands with anybody from San Francisco.

5.7 Freemasonry

The bizarre cult/ religion/ brotherhood/ secret society/ club of Freemasonry surfaced in 1717 in England, when a few of the London lodges decided that the Brotherhood no longer needed function in secrecy, and could present itself to the world. There is evidence that secret Masonic lodges existed in Scotland by the late 16 century, and in England by the mid-17th century.

John J. Robinson in his *Born in Blood* (1990) argues convincingly that the Masonic cult stems from the medieval sect of the Knights Templar. Founded in the wake of the Crusades in the early 12th century, the Order of "The Knights of the Temple of King Solomon" quickly grew to become one of the dominant financial powers of Europe by the early 14th century. This they achieved, via 1) controlling a portion of the East-West Mediterranean trade; 2) the use of the rudiments of modern banking, in particular letters of credit (bank-notes); 3) the collectivist organization of the Order, which demanded that every initiate hand over all his earthy possessions to the Order; and 4) the high prestige of the Order, which brought regular and generous donations from the European aristocracy; 5) the extensive and secretive communications network, which went along with the mercantile and financial activities of the Order.

The connection between the Templars and the modern banker cartel is a significant, but murky one. Suffice to say that the sigil of the semi-sovereign City of London, which is the focal point of the world banking system, is the red cross of the Knight Templars. The sigil was adopted sometime in the 14th century. It should not be a surprise that the highest concentration of Masonic lodges in the world is in the City of London. In fact, the Grand Lodge of England lies in the City, just a few streets away from the ancient Temple of the Templars.

During their philandering in the Holy Land, the Templars made contact with the other notorious secret society of the era, that of the Hashashins, or Assassins. Legend says that the founder of the Sect of the Assassins, Hassan-i Sabbah (c.1050-1124), invented the following stratagem of brainwashing: he built a beautiful complex of gardens and palaces inside a secluded hidden valley. For good measure, Hassan populated the paradise with a fair amount of fair maidens. To acquire fanatically faithful recruits, Hassan drugged unsuspecting dupes with liberal doses of hashish (dope), and transported them, in their slumber, to the hidden valley of delights. After a day or two of good fun, the dupes were drugged again, and transported back to Hassan's castle. The exercise left many with the impression that Hassan commanded the access to Heaven and Hell, and deserved obedience in all things great and small. So maniacal was the fanatics' loyalty to their leader, that, the legend goes, an assassin would plunge to his death from the highest precipice, at but the hand-sign of the Master of the sect.

How much the Templars borrowed from their Oriental fellows, it is hard to tell. It stands to notice, however, that the Templars indulged into various rites, initiations, and ceremonies, and exhibited considerable internal cohesion and solidarity.

By the early 14th century, two major factors rendered the Templars into a problem for the budding, yet-unborn nation-states of Europe. First, the Templars had become a major power unto themselves, and second, the Arabs had reclaimed the Holy Land, and, in consequence, the Templars, along with their brethren of the Order of the Hospitaliers (which is alive and well today, as we shall see), were stuck on Cyprus with not much to do.

Worse yet, rumors criss-crossed the high courts of Europe, rumors to the effect that the Templars had been corrupted by greed and by contact with the infidel, and secretly engaged in heresy, blasphemy, and anathema.

In 1300, as at almost any time between the fall of Rome and the fall of Napoleon, France was the premier kingdom of Europe (note that for some of that long age, the Byzantines were mighty in the East, and the Venetians held sway over the Mediterranean). Thus, most of the Templars were French, and the power of the Templars was the greatest in France. Confronted with such a major autonomous force within his own realm, a true state within the state, and one not bound by feudal fealty; and one, moreover, to which the French Crown was indebted to, King Philippe le Bel (Philip

IV the Fair) (1268-1314, King 1285-1314) decided to clean house.

On Friday, 13 October 1307, Philip's troops descended upon Templar enclaves across all of France. The Master of the Order, one Jacques de Molay (c.1250-1314), was captured in Paris, where he had attended the funeral of Philip's sister-in-law.

The subsequent trials of the Templars have been subject to undying historical controversy. That Philip held the then Pope Clement V (1264-1314, Pope 1305-1314) - who moved the entire Papal court to Avignon in March 1309 - in his pocket; and that the interrogators of the Templars resorted to brutal torture to exact confessions, further complicates any serious investigation into the matter. For the crimes of which the Templars were accused, and to which many confessed under vicious torture, were grave: Philip IV and Clement V accused the Templars of spitting on the cross during initiation, of kissing initiates in the "navel, posterior, and mouth," of telling initiates that "unnatural" lust was perfectly fine, of worshipping idols (in particular the goat-head of Baphomet - which is the symbol of the Devil), and of perverting the Mass (which is the central rite of Catholicism). Those were the original charges; more than a hundred additional lurid accusations accumulated on the dossier of the Templars before the episode culminated.

On March 19, 1314, Jacques de Molay burned on a small island in the Seine. He swore undying vengeance with his last breath. And indeed, in less than a year both the Pope and Philip had died. A coincidence? Divine retribution? The long tentacles of the underground Templar organization? Who can tell?

Did Philip justly torture the Templars for their egregious crimes, or did the man suppress a rival political faction in a move motivated by cold Realpolitik? Once again, it is hard to tell. Modern historians lean toward the second view - but it must be understood that the academic and historical establishment of the last two centuries has been heavily penetrated by the Masons, who venerate Jacques de Molay and the Templars. The Masonic Youth organization is named after de Molay.

One ideology that ties the Templars, the Assassins, the Masons, and a variety of other cults, is the creed of Gnosticism. The dogma is an ancient one, and survives, though under some camouflage, until today.

"Gnosticos" is the Greek word for "sage." The doctrine of Gnosticism states that the world was created not by a well-meaning God, but by a neutral or malicious God, and that therefore salvation lies in the discovery of occult, esoteric personal "gnosis" (knowledge). In the long run, some sects preach, men can become as Gods by the power of gnosis. Note that the above definition is a necessary simplification of a rather complex and multi-faceted phenomenon. Not coincidentally, this dogma agrees with the creed of eugenics. Masonry is Gnostic, as we will see; and so is, for that matter, the influential Jewish Cabala. Some other historical Gnostic sects were the ancient Persian Zoroastrians (Zoroastrianism evolved into the once widespread Manichaeist religion), the Hashashins, the Bogomils of Bulgaria, the Cathars of France, and, it is said, the Templars.

But back to the Masons. Following the October 1307 purge in France, Philip requested (via the Pope) that the King of England conduct a suppression of the English branch of the Knights Templar. Edward II of England (1284-1327, King 1307-1327), one of the weakest kings in the history of the Albion, and the puppet of his homosexual lovers, conducted a half-hearted crack-down on the Templars, who, warned of the impending calamity, fled to Scotland. And so, the story goes, the Knights Templar hid in Scotland, where they formed a secret society, which, after four centuries in the shadows, re-emerged as the cult of Freemasonry.

A few words on the structure of the society: Freemasonry is an international "brotherhood," historically centred in Britain, but also prominent in North America, France, Germany, and to a lesser extent, the rest of Europe and indeed the world. New Masons enter the so-called "Blue" Lodge, which dispenses the first three degrees of Masonry. Those who attain the third degree may proceed to join either the Scottish Rite, which goes up to a 32nd degree, or the York Rite, which goes up to a 13th degree. The Scottish Rite is by far the more popular one. It also features a special honorary

33rd degree, which hangs above the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge. The 33rd degree Masons seem to be the puppet masters of the whole cult.

The titles of the (Northern) Scottish Rite degrees are good for a few laughs: 4th - Secret Master, 5th - Perfect Master, 9th - Master of the Temple, 10th - Master Elect, 11th - Sublime Master Elected, 12th - Grand Master Architect, 15th - Knight of the East, 16th - Prince of Jerusalem, 19th - Grand Pontiff, 22nd - Prince of Libanus, 25th - Master of Achievement, 27th - Knight of Jerusalem, 30th - Grand Inspector, 32nd - Sublime Prince of the Royal Secret. Pompous? Childish? You decide.

At each new level of Masonic experience, the Masons go through bizarre pagan ceremonies, and swear oaths to the following effect: secrecy, loyalty, and obedience. In short, Masons must help their brethren, must obey their Masonic superiors, and must keep mum on matters relating to the Brotherhood. The oaths go along with a heavy dose of mumbo-jumbo, which, for all that I can see, serves no purpose beyond that of brainwashing. Masons, however, take their gibberish very seriously. Masonic writers have authored huge swaths of Masonic literature over the last three centuries. Most of the works reside in massive private Masonic libraries. In general, the Masons like to say that their cult goes back to the mystery religions of antiquity. Indeed, the ancient mystery religions bear some resemblance to Freemasonry. Whether there exists an unbroken continuity from Babylon to modern Freemasonry, or some inventive 18th century Freemasons cooked their cult by the recipe of the ancients, is hard to tell.

Masonic lodges are semi-independent, though there exists a hierarchy of Grand Lodges, which dictate Masonic Law. The Lodges span a network via mutual recognition and via Warrants/ Charters of constitution issued by the Grand Lodges.

To recognize each other, the Masons have developed a set of secret handshakes, stances, gestures, and phrases. For example, when a Mason needs help - say, in court, in front of a judge who may happen to be a Mason - he raises and drops his arms, and says something along the lines of "Oh Lord my God, is there no help for the widow's son?" The Masons also have a schizoid obsession with symbolism. Let us quote George Carlin in passing:

I leave symbols to the symbol-minded.

In particular, the Masons revere (among other things) the compass, the square, and the sun. To a certain extent, Masonry is a sun-cult - in fact, the summer equinox (around June 22-24) is Masonry's top holiday, the equivalent of Christmas, which is the Christianized version of the pagan holiday for the winter equinox.

Two other favourite symbols of the Masons are the triangle and the circle. Masons also enjoy pyramids. The careful observer will notice countless pyramids and dots-in-a-circle (symbolizing something best left to the reader's imagination) in the logos of the major and minor corporations and firms on our age.

The Masons also love obelisks. The Washington monument in DC is thoroughly Masonic. New York has an obelisk, as does the City. Paris has an obelisk in the middle of the Place de la Concorde. Even the Vatican has an obelisk, though that one should be of non-Masonic origins (But is it? Meaning, why in the world does the Vatican have an obelisk? What for?). The obelisks are ancient pagan phallic symbols.

Note that the Masonic symbolism plays the role of a type of a secret language. What look like silly little circles and pyramids to the outsider, are telling signs to the Masonic eye.

Speaking of which, the Eye of Horus is another Masonic golden oldie.

Because of Masonry's extreme historical influence and power over the English speaking world, the English language itself sports a number of purely Masonic phrases. For example, being "on the square" is a thoroughly Masonic expression.

Masons constantly babble about how their society promotes brotherhood, charity, learning, and so on. This propaganda deserves nothing more than mild condescension. The Masons do indeed practice brotherhood - among themselves. They are charitable - toward their own. They share learning and information - among themselves. How such a fifth column could possibly benefit the larger

community is anyone's guess. Sure, the opulent Masonic organization does sometimes dish out a bit of charity to non-Masons. This is called public relations.

Freemasonry is a males only outfit. A few "Masonry for women" organizations exist - for example, the Order of the Eastern Star - but those are regarded as a joke.

The Anglophone Masons require that initiates believe in some type of a God. The Continental (French-based) Masons removed that requirement in 1877, causing a schism with their British fellows, though one suspects that the two branches co-ordinate at the highest levels. The Masonic God is called the "Great Architect." Masonry has all the requirements for a full blown religion. Of course, the Masons deny that their cult is a religion.

Why should we care about Masonry? Unfortunately, Masonry is extremely important, simply because Freemasons wield and have wielded inordinate power on this planet and in the Western world in particular.

Here is a brief list of a notable Masons:⁵ Sherman Adams, Ike's Chief of Staff and a Governor of New Hampshire; Agustín I the Emperor of Mexico in the post-Napoleonic era; Nelson W. Aldrich the banker, father of the Federal Reserve, grandfather of Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller, Senator from Rhode Island; Buzz Aldrin the astronaut (for reasons of secrecy NASA favoured the recruitment of Masons - thus, many astronauts were Masons); Alexander I of Yugoslavia, king during the interbellum; Salvador Allende of Chile; Field Marshal Earl Alexander of British WWII fame; Leo Amery of the Milner gang; Edward Victor Appleton the Noble-winning physicist; Voltaire; John Jacob Astor who made the American Astor fortune in the first half of the 19th century; Atatürk; Gene Autry the actor; Michael Baigent the author of *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*; Mikhail Bakunin the papa of Anarchism; Edvard Bene the pre- and post-WWII President of Czechoslovakia; R.B. Bennett the Prime Minister of Canada; Irving Berlin the composer; Silvio Berlusconi; Simón Bolívar; Andrés Bonifacio the leader of the Philippine Revolution of the late 19th century; Robert Borden the PM of Canada; Mackenzie Bowell the PM of Canada; William D. Boyce the founder of the Boy Scouts⁶; Omar N. Bradley the general; Johannes Brahms; Breivik the Norwegian zombie terrorist of recent (2011) notoriety; William Jennings Bryan; James Buchanan the US President; Edmund Burke; Harry F. Byrd the Governor and Senator of the oligarchical Byrd family that owns the Virginias; Cagliostro the legendary charlatan; Carol II the pre-WWII King of Romania; Casanova; Walter Chrysler; Randolph and Winston Churchill, son and father; André Citroën; DeWitt Clinton the sixth Governor of New York; Samuel Colt; Marquis de Condorcet; Davy Crockett; Aleister Crowley; Erasmus Darwin (grandfather to Charles); Cecil B. DeMille the famous director; Thomas Dewey the 47th Governor of New York; Porfirio Díaz who ruled Mexico for 36 years around the turn of the 19th century; Senator Bob Dole who lost the presidency to Rhodesman Bill Clinton; James Doolittle the general; Tommy Douglas the creator of the Canadian health-care system; Arthur Conan Doyle; Philip the Bacillus (he joined against his will, at the behest of his father-in-law the King, and does not practice actively); Edward VII son of Victoria; Edward VIII; Gustave Eiffel; Douglas Fairbanks the actor; Johann Gottlieb Fichte, who was instrumental in the implementation of modern compulsory schooling, and who was the dominant German philosopher between Kant and Hegel; W. C. Fields the drunk and actor; Geoffrey Fisher the 99th Archbishop of Canterbury; Alexander Fleming (penicillin); Ben Franklin the Founding Father; Clark Gable; Giuseppe Garibaldi the international revolutionary; George IV; George VI; Edward Gibbon the great historian; King C. Gillette; Goethe the founder of modern German literature; D. W. Griffith the director; Virgil I. Grissom the astronaut; Manly P. Hall the top 20th century Masonic writer; Habibullah Khan the Emir of Afghanistan for two decades at the turn of the 20th century; John Hancock of the signature; Warren G. Harding the US President; Thomas Michael Holt the industrialist and Governor of North Carolina; J. Edgar Hoover

⁵I draw on Wikipedia's well-documented "List of Freemasons" page; also see William R. Denslow's *10000 Famous Freemasons*.

⁶So a man by the name of BOYS founded the BOY Scouts. Sometimes I wonder.

the cross-dressing director of the FBI; Harry Houdini; William Howley, the 90th Archbishop of Canterbury; Andrew Jackson the US President; Jesse Jackson the Civil Rights pastor; Andrew Johnson the US President; Benito Juárez the Mexican revolutionary; Alexander Keith the brewer; Rudyard Kipling the writer and imperialist and burdened white man; Marquis de Lafayette the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary; Leopold I of Belgium; Charles Lindbergh; Franz Liszt; Louis Philippe II, Duke of Orléans, who played a major role in the French Revolution; Douglas MacArthur the legendary general; John A. Macdonald the first PM of Canada; John Bayne Maclean the Canadian publishing magnate; Harpo Marx of the Marx Brothers; Louis B. Mayer of Hollywood; Giuseppe Mazzini the revolutionary; John McCain I and John McCain II, admirals both, the grandfather and father of the John McCain III the senator and would-be president; William McKinley the US President; Robert Menzies the PM of Australia; James Monroe the US President; Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart; James K. Polk the US President; Alexander Pope; Alexander Pushkin the founder of modern Russian literature (was a third generation Mason); Alf Ramsey who managed the 1966 English footballers; Cecil Rhodes; Michael Richards from *Seinfeld*; Theodore Roosevelt the US President; FDR; Nathan and Jakob Rothschild of the original brood of five (their descendants have stuck to the Masonic tradition); Generalissimos Santa Anna of Mexico; Friedrich Schiller; Walter Scott the Victorian novelist; Richard Seddon the PM of New Zealand; Peter Sellers the actor; Jean Sibelius the composer; Joseph Smith the swindler who invented Mormonism; Alphonso Taft the founder of *Skull and Bones*; Talaat Pasha of the Young Turks and the destroyer of Armenians; Nicolae Titulescu the Romanian President of the League of Nations; Harry Truman the US President; Harry, Jack and Samuel Warner the Bros; Earl Warren the post-WWII Chief Justice of the US; Washington and most of his generals; John Wayne; Adam Weishaupt of the Illuminati; Oscar Wilde; Steve Wozniak the co-founder of Apple; Christopher Wren the architect; William Wyler the director; Adolph Zukor the producer.

The Romanian, Serbian and Filipino ruling castes of the late 19th century and the early 20th century were totally penetrated by Masonry. This shows us the extreme cross-border power of the cult. Napoleon was a Masonic sympathizer. He set up his brother as Grandmaster of the French Masonry, and instructed his generals to join the Lodge.⁷

In total, about a third of all American presidents have been Masons. We also ferreted out three *Skull and Bones* presidents and Clinton the Rhodesman. Then there are the obvious puppets of the ilk of Carter of the CFR/ Trilateral Administration. How can anyone aware of these elementary facts not suspect a conspiracy or at least widespread foul play? The problem is that these societies, being secret and powerful, have done a good job in maintaining a low profile. For myself I can say that: for a long time I never even heard of Masonry; when I began to see references to Masonry, I dismissed them as "conspiracy theory"; finally, I looked at the cult. My findings shocked me. An organization with members such as the ones above is not merely important - it is crucial. And if they mean well, then why all the secrecy? Why the hierarchy?

About a fifth (estimates vary) of the signers of the American Constitution were Masons. Many US Supreme Court Judges have been Masons.

Imperial Britain was utterly rife with Masons. Well into the current age of information, the British oligarchy is heavily Masonic.

As we have seen, the founders of Hollywood were many of them Masons. So were many of the more famous US generals; so were various successful industrialists. So were many bankers, politicians, and scientists, and all other types of prominent figures. The focal point of Freemasonry is in the English-speaking world, but the cult's tentacles extend across the globe.

It should be understood that not all Masons are automatically evil conspirators. By and large, low-level Masons are dupes, brainwash jobs, naifs, and mercenaries. They do not see the big picture.

⁷See <http://freemasonry.bcy.ca/aqc/napoleon.html>, accessed on November 21, 2011.

Some, often unconsciously, treat Masonry as a religious outlet. At the higher levels, there are true believers who really think that Masonry is good for humanity, and cold-blooded manipulators who know that Masonry is good for bankers and for oligarchs. Freemasonry is merely a tool of control - a powerful and useful tool, but one that nevertheless has limitations.

Another problem in the research of Masonry is the distinction between individual Masons and the cult itself. The foul principle of collective guilt must be avoided. So how do we distinguish between "bad apples" and systemic Masonry-enabled wrongdoing? I leave this problem to the reader. I think the structure of the Masonic secret(-ive) society is sufficient for an *a priori* condemnation of the whole cult. A private individual who minds his own business has absolute right to privacy. A political figure, or a private "businessman" who has power over millions, must relinquish some privacy because of his influence over society. And in particular, a secret organization (or, as the Masons put it, an "organization with secrets") comprising of thousands of powerful political and mercantile elements, can not be allowed to exist in a democratic community.

At the same time, most Masons must merely be curious people who joined the Masonic cult to satisfy their understandable and commendable human urge for exploration and discovery. The problem is that such people can become unwitting pawns under the corrupting influence of the higher levels of the Masonic organization. The problem is not with Masonry per se. The problem lies with the structural qualities of secret societies.

The observant reader will have noticed that the list of Freemasons reads like a who's who among the revolutionaries of the last two and a half centuries. There are two reasons for this: first, Masonic clubs across the world did undertake revolutionary activity (i.e. destabilization) for the benefit of the British Empire; and second, a serious revolution requires serious secret organization, and Masonry provides a ready-made infrastructure to all ambitious revolutionaries.

Conspicuous in the list is the absence of the top communists. My impression is that the communists have done a great job in hiding their Masonic roots. I have seen some evidence to the effect that many top communist revolutionaries were Masons, and they must have been, because of the revolutionary opportunities which Masonry provides. Let the reader compare the sickle & hammer of the communists with the compass & square of the Masons. The two symbols are almost identical - and that could hardly be a coincidence. We will see an additional connection between the two secret societies when we look at the Illuminati.

There are in excess of a quarter of a million Masons in England (600,000 in the 1980s), and about two million Masons in the States (fluctuations in the 2-4 million range between 1920 and 2000 - note the US population has gone from about 100 million in 1920 to about 300 million in 2000) - a proportion of half to one percent of the general population, or double that out of the male population. Note that Masons concentrate into the more powerful segments of society, and thus their influence is disproportionate to their already impressive numbers. Also note that only the scions of Masons can join before the age of 25. Thus most Masons are in the 30 years old plus male segment of society. This further boosts the degree of Masonic penetration - expressed as a simple proportion of the relevant population - in the modern Anglo-American community.

Masons claim that politics and religion are forbidden in their Lodges - but surely that is a joke. Moreover, politics and religion all too often fall second to Business, of which the Masons do plenty. Masons furthermore claim that theirs is an "egalitarian" society. It is, however, an open secret that anyone willing to pay his dues can quickly become a 32nd degree Mason. How an hierarchical organization governed by a Grand Master who belongs to the British royal family can claim to have anything to do with egalitarianism surely constitutes one of the greatest Masonic mysteries of all.

To join the Masons, one must furnish references from one or two of Mason friends. Usually, people join the cult at the behest of Mason relatives or Mason colleagues.

Masons like to promote their organization on the "enemy-of-my-enemy" principle by saying that the Nazis and the Communists banned Freemasonry. The Nazis and the Communists could do nothing else. Hitler and Stalin were professional revolutionaries, who fully understood the political and revolutionary potential of secret societies. They had to ban Masonry. If the Gambinos wipe out the Bonnanos, does that make the Gambinos good? No.

Having mentioned the communist link to Masonry, we can not in good fate except the Nazis from our analysis. And indeed, the Nazi party originated from the Bavarian Masonic-Theosophist Thule Gesellschaft ([secret] society). It is said that Hitler never attended joined the Thules; on the other hand, the Nazi obsession with the occult is well known.⁸ The Nazi mania with the occult is an interesting topic.

It is hard to tell how much influence London exerts on the non-British branches of Masonry. At the least, we can take it for granted that the national Masonic branches operate under the jurisdiction and direction of the national Grand Lodges. Do the latter correspond with London, and, more importantly, do they take orders from London? I don't know. The 33rd degree Scottish Rite Supreme Council, however, is a fully international organization, and the 33rd degree people seem to be in charge of the cabal. The focus of the Supreme Council is in Charleston, South Carolina, where Albert Pike had operated. Historically, South Carolina was the nexus of American Masonry.

The Masons like to refer to non-Masons as "the Profane." Are you a Mason, dear reader? Or are you Profane?

Perhaps because of their Templar heritage, the Masons in their literature obsess over the Holy Land and exult in talking about Jerusalem and the Orient. In this regard, note that there is some connection between Masonry and the Jews, which I will not discuss here.

Except for the Templar link, the data above is easily verifiable through a few basic online searches. But let us take a look at Stephen Knight's 1984 book *The Brotherhood*. As far as I know, the American equivalent of Knight's research can be found in Paul Fisher's *Behind the Lodge Door* (1991), which I have been unable to procure.

Knight had been given a contract for a book on Masonry following his research into the notorious Jack the Ripper murders (which likely involved high-ranking Masons). Though Knight knew that publishing circles "had traditionally been rife with Freemasonry," he was amazed at the cloak-and-dagger antics of his employers, who insisted on total secrecy, and paid Knight via a contract for a book with a bogus title. The paranoia proved justified, when a few months later the new ownership of the publishing company killed Knight's book for Masonic reasons. Knight eventually found another publisher. When *The Brotherhood* came out, the Grand Lodge forbade Masons from owning, reading, or discussing the book. This is standard behaviour for a cult facing exposure.

Knight shows that the English police force is, and has been for more than a century, so heavily Masonic that it beggars belief - particularly in its higher echelons. In certain areas it was near-impossible to rise in the ranks without joining the Brotherhood. This is an obvious function of secret societies. Once a secret society penetrates to the top of an organization, it must use its newly acquired power to install its members in all key positions within the organization. Such behaviour is intrinsic to secret societies, and by itself is reason enough to ban all members of secret societies from public office.

Worse, some Mason cops co-operated with Mason gangsters to transact what we may call business. Masons also love to infiltrate the judiciaries of host countries. England's judiciary system is thor-

⁸As one can see in the admittedly highly dramatized Spielberg-Lucas Indiana Jones movies. Also see Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke's classic *The Occult Roots of Nazism* (1985, 1992). The book is based on the man's PhD thesis. Also see the History Channel's four-episode series, *The Occult History of the Third Reich* (1991).

oughly Masonic. The figures cited in Knight's book are: 60-70% of judges in England were Masons around 1960, and about 50% were Masons around 1980. One suspects that most of these judges were serious and decent people. At the same time, their Masonic obligations would have made them blind to crime at the higher levels of society, where crime can do real damage.

The top lawyers in England are the so-called barristers. To become a barrister, one must pass "the bar" and join one of the four Inns of Court in London. The four inns, (Ch. 20) "established between 1310 and 1357, are Lincoln's Inn, Gray's Inn, the Middle Temple and the Inner Temple. Prior to the establishment of the latter two Inns, the Temple, which lies between Fleet Street and the River Thames, was the headquarters of the Knights Templar. ... From the beginning the men of law were linked with Freemasonry." The Bar is thoroughly Masonic. For a few more interesting links between the British legal system and the Templars, including the origins of the concept of the "Bar," refer to Robinson's *Born in Blood*.

As far as solicitors go, around 1980 about four-fifths of the 40,000 English and Welsh solicitors belonged to the Law Society, which is (Ch. 21) "one of the most masonic institutions in the world. This has proved an almost insurmountable obstacle to certain 'profane' individuals involved either willingly or unwillingly in litigation with Masons, because it is the Law Society whose job it is - with the Department of Health and Social Security - to decide who will be awarded legal aid and who will not. ... A great many of the sixty-odd members of the Law Society Council as well as a high proportion of the Society's staff and committees - one estimate puts it as high as ninety per cent of all male staff above the age of thirty - are ardent Freemasons."

What could possibly go wrong?

Indeed, all the professional groups in England - architects, lawyers, professors, doctors, bureaucrats in the education system, etc. - suffer from some degree of Masonic penetration. The situation is not dissimilar in the other English-speaking countries, as well in some non-English-speaking places. Unfortunately, for reasons of secrecy it is hard to gauge the extent of the problem.

Banking is particularly rife with Freemasonry. The Bank of England even has its own lodge. This alone should make it clear that the stock market is a rigged game. The mix of investment banking and Freemasonry can only produce insider trading. But then, this point is patently obvious. The notion that high-level investors do not engage in insider trading is absurd. Their own profit-based ideology demands insider trading.

Knight also points out that Masonry is incompatible with Christianity. This is correct. Masonry is a religion in itself. Then there is the Luciferian angle, which we will examine shortly.

High-level Masonic defectors keep mum out of sheer fear. Not fear of murder, perhaps - nothing so crass. But fear of subtler reprisals - such as a firing, a dirty story in the newspaper, or a lapse in fellowship with personal friends who have retained their Masonic convictions.

Masonry acts as a private intelligence network. If a Mason wants to learn about you, all he has to do is contact a Masonic doctor in your hospital, a Masonic clerk in your bank, a Masonic bureaucrat in your school district - and *la voila*.

One standard way of ruining a person whom certain Masonic elements dislike is via bogus lawsuits:

(Chapter 3.16, emphasis mine) I asked how this 'action' might be taken.

'Solicitors are very good at it,' said Christopher. 'Get your man involved in something legal - it need not be serious - and you have him.' Solicitors, I was told, are 'past masters' at causing endless delays, generating useless paperwork, ignoring instructions, running up immense bills, misleading clients into taking decisions damaging to themselves.

Masonic police can harass, arrest on false charges, and plant evidence. 'A businessman in a small community or a person in public office arrested for dealing in child pornography, for indecent exposure, or for trafficking in drugs is at the end of the line,' said Christopher. 'He will never work again. Some people have committed suicide after experiences of that kind.'

...

'Only the fighters have any hope of beating the system once it's at work against them,' he told me. 'Most people, fighters or not, are beaten in the end, though. It's... you see, I... you finish up not knowing who you can trust. You can get no help because your story sounds so paranoid that you are thought a crank, one of those nuts who think the whole world is a conspiracy against them. It is a strange phenomenon. By setting up a situation that most people will think of as fantasy, these people can poison every part of a person's life.

...

'There is no defence against an evil which only the victims and the perpetrators know exists.'

As Eustace Mullins correctly observed, the next time you go to prison, take a good look at all the inmates. Every one of them had a lawyer.⁹

The Masons are adept at keeping their secrets. Knight furbishes a number of examples of people who worked in Masonic firms for years never suspecting that everybody around them belonged to the Lodge.

A particularly malignant pathological influence of Masonry is the "if you can't beat them..." syndrome. Those touched by the cold slimy tentacles of the Masonic octopus sometimes decide - and, unfortunately, with good justification - that the only way to defend oneself from Masonry is to join Masonry.

In regard to Masonry in government, a sentence from Chapter 23 of Knight's book should suffice:

Almost every local authority in the country has its own Freemasonic Lodge, the temple often situated actually within the Town or County Hall.

As mentioned before, the City of London is Masonic Central. This point bears repeating, because the City is the locus of power in the United Kingdom, and the most important financial node in the world along with Wall Street. If the Masons control the City - and it seems that, in some sense, they do - they must control Britain (in conjunction with RIIA and similar inter-connected groups) - if not completely, then at least to a large extent. Britain was the top world power between 1815 and 1918, and has retained a foremost position in world affairs even since the collapse of its empire in the wake of World War II. Moreover, the British have their "special relation" with the heavily Masonic United States, and the States have owned much of the world since the war. Thus, the influence of Masonry can not be over-stated. At the same time, one must avoid placing excess emphasis on Freemasonry. The Craft is only a tool - one of many - of the global Oligarchy.

Historically, the Vatican has been vociferously anti-Masonic. The reasons for this attitude are simple: 1) Masonry is a religion incompatible with Catholicism; 2) the 18th century Illuminati sect, which aimed for the destruction of the Holy See, had managed to infiltrate Masonry to the point where it was hard to distinguish between Masonry and Illuminism; 3) Masonry came from England, which has harboured anti-Catholic sentiments for half a millennium. Knight remarks that (Ch. 25) "...the wall-of-silence policy conceals, perhaps inadvertently, a more sinister situation in Rome, where I have evidence that the Vatican itself is infiltrated by Freemasons." I also have evidence to that effect, and will present it in a subsequent chapter.

Knight mentions that the KGB always treated Freemasonic organizations as prime targets for infiltration. This is a natural mode of attack, which we have already discussed in our structural analysis of secret societies.

To summarize, Freemasonry is a powerful secret society and a quasi-religious cult of worldwide following and an illustrious three hundred-plus year tradition. We will see more of Freemasonry as

⁹Mullins was an aficionado of lawsuits and always represented himself. There is a lecture of his on the legal system floating around YouTube. The lecture is as informative as it is hilarious.

we progress. Let us conclude this section with the following quote from Albert Pike's (1809-1891) *Morals and Dogma* (1871). Pike's book is the most revered and respected Masonic work in history.¹⁰

The true name of Satan, the Kabalists say, is that of Yahveh reversed; for Satan is not a black god, but the negation of God. The Devil is the personification of Atheism or Idolatry.

For the Initiates, this is not a Person, but a Force, created for good, but which may serve for evil. It is the instrument of Liberty or Free Will.

...

The Apocalypse is, to those who receive the nineteenth Degree, the Apotheosis of that Sublime Faith which aspires to God alone, and despises all the pomps and works of Lucifer. LUCIFER, the Light-bearer! Strange and mysterious name to give to the Spirit of Darkness! Lucifer, the Son of the Morning! Is it he who bears the Light, and with its splendors intolerable blinds feeble, sensual or selfish Souls ? Doubt it not!

...

To prevent the light from escaping at once, the Demons forbade Adam to eat the fruit of "knowledge of good and evil," by which he would have known the Empire of Light and that of Darkness. He obeyed; an Angel of Light induced him to transgress, and gave him the means of victory; but the Demons created Eve, who seduced him into an act of Sensualism, that enfeebled him, and bound him anew in the bonds of matter.

A more explicit Luciferian Pike quote floats around the Internet, but I will omit it, since it comes from the works of the discredited Leo Taxil.

The two other most important Masonic writers are Albert Mackey (1807-1881) and Manly P. Hall (1901-1990). From Hall's *The Lost Keys of Freemasonry* (1923):

When the Mason learns that the key to the warrior on the block is the proper application of the dynamo of living power, he has learned the mystery of his Craft. The seething energies of Lucifer are in his hands and before he may step onward and upward, he must prove his ability to properly apply energy.

Follows a quote from Mason Walter Leslie Wilmshurst's *The Meaning of Masonry* (1922):

This - the evolution of man into superman - was always the purpose of the ancient Mysteries, and the real purpose of modern Masonry is, not the social and charitable purposes to which so much attention is paid, but the expediting of the spiritual evolution of those who aspire to perfect their own nature and transform it into a more god-like quality.

More quotes of a similar nature can be provided, but this should suffice.

So do Masons believe in Lucifer? First of all, the Masonic mumbo-jumbo receives a new re-interpretation at every new rank of Masonry. So the vast majority of Masons know nothing of Pike's infatuation with Lucifer. There are indications, however, that at the higher levels, Lucifer does play a role.

How do we interpret the Masonic Luciferian doctrine? Hideous Satanic cults not unlike the one depicted in Polanski's *Rosemary's Baby* do exist, though not necessarily in conjunction with Masonry. From what I can tell, the high-level Masons take the Promethean view of Lucifer. Prometheus was the Greek semi-deity who brought fire (i.e. knowledge) to mankind, and suffered for the transgression. Thus Luciferian worship can mean the gnostic worship of hidden knowledge. In itself, knowledge is a fine thing. The problem arises from the extension of the pursuit of knowledge into the metaphysical drive for Godhood. In simple terms, it seems that some top oligarchs, having everything in this world, want to become veritable Gods. This is an old idea, as old as Augustus Caesar and the Egyptian Pharaohs. Except that today we have the technology to, perhaps, truly

¹⁰Thanks to A. Ralph Epperson for providing the following references in his book *New World Order*.

meddle with the essence of humanity.

The perceptive reader will have noticed that we are dealing with exactly the creed of Transhumanism. That idea came from the Mason-infested upper circles of the British oligarchy, so the Masonic connection should have been expected.

My issue with Transhumanism is that by definition, the transcendence of Man means the destruction of Man. If mankind "evolves" by mechanical means into a new species, then the old mankind may suffer utter destruction, or some new type of racism (species-ism). Then there is the classic Frankenstein problem. I think that Transhumanism is megalomania which borders on raw hubristic insanity. The view that humans are "imperfect," or could use some improvement anyway, leaves me cold. How can one tell? We have much to learn about being human, and we have much to accomplish with humanity in its current form.

Note that Christian-minded researchers tend to obsess over the Luciferian aspect of Masonry. They miss the point to a certain extent. Masonry is indeed incompatible with Christianity - not because the Masons "worship the Devil," whatever that means, but because: 1) Masonry is a religion in itself; and 2) because, at its higher levels, Masonry preaches the doctrine of transcendence through the completion of the work of God (meaning Man), which is anathema to those Christians (or people who share certain aspects of the Christian ideology) who believe in the idea of Man having been created perfect in the image of God.

Let us only venture into the metaphysical realm with great care.

5.8 Illuminati

We next examine the legendary Bavarian Order of the Illuminati, founded in 1776 by the Jesuit-trained Professor of Canon Law at the Ingolstadt University, Adam Weishaupt (1748-1830).

I draw mainly on the classic 1798 source *Proofs of a Conspiracy* by John Robison, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, the first General Secretary to the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and a partner of James Watt of the steam engine fame.

The other classic reference on the Illuminati is Abbé Augustin Barruel's 1798-1799 *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobinism*.

Also see Terry Melanson's excellent paper on the Illuminati.¹¹ His *Perfectibilists: The 18th Century Bavarian Order of the Illuminati* (2009) is the best recent English-language source on the Illuminati.

A gnostic sect by the name of Los Alumbrados existed in Imperial Spain in the 15th and 16th centuries. The Inquisition suppressed these Alumbrados with some bloodshed. Curiously enough the founder of the Jesuit Order, Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556), was pursued by the Inquisition in regard to his connections with the Alumbrados. Whatever the case, two and a half centuries later, Adam Weishaupt, who had a Jesuit education but no Jesuit sympathies, decided to take over the world, or at least a substantial portion thereof. To that purpose, Weishaupt created the secret society of the Illuminati on May 1st 1776.

Robison notes in his introduction that, having examined Masonry for decades as a member of the Lodge, he noticed that: (emphasis Robison's)

I have been able to trace these attempts, made, through a course of fifty years, under the specious pretext of enlightening the world by the torch of philosophy, and of dispelling the clouds of civil and religious superstition which keep the nations of Europe in darkness and slavery. I have observed these doctrines gradually diffusing and mixing with all the different systems of Free Masonry; till, at last, **an association has been formed** for the express purpose of **rooting out all the religious establishments, and overturning all the existing governments of Europe**. I have seen this Association exerting itself

¹¹<http://www.conspiracyarchive.com/NW0/Illuminati.htm>, November 25, 2011.

zealously and systematically, till it has become almost irresistible: And I have seen that the most active leaders in the French Revolution were members of this Association, and conducted their first movements according to its principles, and by means of its instructions and assistance, *formerly requested and obtained*: And, lastly, I have seen that this Association still exists, still works in secret, and that not only several appearances among ourselves show that its emissaries are endeavoring to propagate their detestable doctrines among us, but that the Association has Lodges in Britain corresponding with the mother Lodge at Munich ever since 1784.

Robison next says that (he wants to show that) "the Leaders of this Association disbelieved every word that they uttered, and every doctrine that they taught; and that their real intention was to abolish all religion, overturn every government, and make the world a general plunder and a wreck."

Startled by his discoveries, Robison proceeded to accumulate as many first-hand documents as he could. Fortunately, a bizarre sequence of events had exposed some of the Illuminati cabal to the Bavarian authorities in 1786. Thus, primary documents relating to the conspiracy could be found by the inquisitive researcher.

Robison dedicates the first (of four) Chapter of his work to a brief historical examination of Freemasonry. For our purposes let us only note that as Masonry spread to Europe, and particularly to France and Germany, it fractured into a myriad of little orders and lodges, which operated under the most bizarre hierarchies and rituals. Because of the secrecy of the Lodges, the various "freethinkers," "philosophes," and would-be revolutionaries of the era swarmed to Freemasonry like moths to a light. The idle rich aristocrats, in search for amusement, also joined the Lodges in droves. As a result, Europe of the Enlightenment was rife with secret societies whose membership consisted of true sages, ridiculous charlatans, debauched libertines, noble and perverse aristocrats alike, superstitious naifs, dedicated Cabalists, fanatical revolutionaries, and all other sorts of ramshackle detritus and hard polished marble. As Dickens memorably explained,

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct the other way - in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only.

An interesting time - and a time not unlike our own.

In this cacophony of madness and invention did Weishaupt spawn his cult. Three questions loom large in regard to the Illuminati - what was their doctrine, what was the structure of their organization, and how widespread was their influence?

5.8.1 Structure and Doctrine

The Order was founded, in effect, as a society within the society of Freemasonry. The express high-level goals of the Illuminati were: the surreptitious conquest of the world via the abolition of all existing religions and the abolition of all existing civil governments. Ambitious, yes, but I suppose that Weishaupt thought that if you are going to do something, you might as well do it right.

In 1884, a few whistle-blowers summarized the professed ideology of the order as follows: (Robison, Chapter 2)

The Order was said to abjure Christianity, and to refuse admission into the higher degrees to all who adhered to any of the three confessions. Sensual pleasures were restored to

the rank they held in the Epicurean philosophy. Self-murder was justified on Stoical principles. In the Lodges death was declared an eternal sleep; patriotism and loyalty were called narrow-minded prejudices, and incompatible with universal benevolence; continual declamations were made on liberty and equality as the unalienable rights of man. The baneful influence of accumulated property was declared an insurmountable obstacle to the happiness of any nation whose chief laws were framed for its protection and increase. Nothing was so frequently discoursed of as the propriety of employing, for a good purpose, the means which the wicked employed for evil purposes; and it was taught, that the preponderancy of good in the ultimate result consecrated every mean employed; and that wisdom and virtue consisted in properly determining this balance. This appeared big with danger; because it appeared that nothing would be scrupled at, if we could make it appear that the Order could derive advantage from it, because the great object of the Order was held as superior to every consideration.

To summarize: 1) free sex & drugs / destruction of the family; 2) euthanasia permissible, and if you die for the Cause, you live forever - a collectivist mentality; 3) internationalism; 4) pseudo-egalitarianism; 5) abolition of property; 6) the ends justify the means; 7) the Order is always right. Note that one must distinguish between the **real** and the **apparent** beliefs of the Illuminati. Any political organization or ideology need appear decent, benevolent, and noble to attract any reasonably non-psychotic true-believer initiates.

Melanson, in his *Perfectibilists* (Supplement One), agrees with Nesta Webster's list of five major doctrines of Illuminism:

- (*Perfectibilists*, p. 175) 1. Abolition of Monarchy and all ordered Government.
 2. Abolition of private property and of inheritance.
 3. Abolition of patriotism.
 4. Abolition of the family (i.e., of marriage and all morality, and the institution of the communal education of children).
 5. Abolition of all religion.

To those, Melanson adds the general doctrine of primitivism along Rousseauian lines. Anarchism and Communism both sported dogmas unmistakably derived from Illuminism.

Following the Bavarian crackdown on the Order, Weishaupt went into the service of one Ernest Lewis (Ernst II Ludwig), Duke of Saxe Gotha (1745-1804) - a fellow Illuminatus. Note that the pan-European Monarchy of the turn of the 20th century was largely Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, and indeed related to Ernest.¹² Ernest Lewis was a Knight of the Garter - the top Chivalric Order of the English, dating back to the 14th century. Interesting fellow! We see in him the convergence of 1) the Illuminati/ Masons, 2) the British Oligarchy, and 3) the European (Black?) nobility.

As an important noble, Ernest had the privilege of repeatedly hosting Goethe, who was an Illuminatus.

Weishaupt kindly explained that his object always was - what else? - **the happiness of the human race**, emphasis his.

The outer ring of the Illuminati consisted of the Minervals. Those were recruited from, among others, suggestible Freemasons, and all other types of willing dupes. Above the Minervals were a group of Superiors (inner circle), who reported to a Council (innermost circle).

Prospective candidates were observed for a time, and if found amenable to the goals of the Order, were invited to swear the following oath:

¹²For the family tree, see, for example, p. 294 of Melanson's *Perfectibilists*.

"I N. N. hereby bind myself, by mine honor and good name, forswearing all mental reservation, never to reveal, by hint, word, writing, or in any manner whatever, even to my most trusted friend, any thing that shall now be said or done to me respecting my wished-for-reception, and this whether my reception shall follow or not; I being previously assured that it shall contain nothing contrary to religion, the state, nor good manners. I promise, that I shall make no intelligible extract from any papers which shall be shewn me now or during my noviciate. All this I swear, as I am, and as I hope to continue, a Man of Honor."

This is a vow of secrecy.

A Superior then proceeds to indoctrinate the fresh Minerval via liberal doses of careful brainwashing and mumbo-jumbo. To lower level initiates, the Illuminati liked to appear moral, Christian, and idealistic. The Novice and the Mentor were only known to each other to avoid exposure of the Order in the event of betrayal or calamity. In other words, the Order followed the classic cell-structure of the various conspiratorial organs of history.

Having 1) convinced the Minerval as to the "noble" purposes of the Order, and 2) satisfied themselves as to the Minerval's suggestibility and potential usefulness to the Order, the Illuminati inducted the Minerval into an Illuminatus Minor. The goal of the Order is further explained in the following terms: the goal is "to make of the human race, without any distinction of nation, condition, or profession, one good and happy family." And the new Illuminatus Minor must follow the orders of his wise superiors so that the Order achieves its goal and humanity becomes "a happy family." Here, with a sword-point at his breast, the initiate swears a new oath:

"I, N. N. protest before you, the worthy Plenipotentiary of the venerable Order into which I wish to be admitted, that I acknowledge my natural weakness and inability, and that I, with all my possessions, rank, honors, and titles which I hold in political society, am, at bottom, only a man; I can enjoy these things only through my fellow-men, and through them also I may lose them. The approbation and consideration of my fellow-men are indispensibly necessary, and I must try to maintain them by all my talents. These I will never use to the prejudice of universal good, but will oppose, with all my might, the enemies of the human race, and of political society. I will embrace every opportunity of saving mankind, by improving my understanding and my affections, and by imparting all important knowledge, as the good and statutes of this Order require of me. I bind myself to perpetual silence and unshaken loyalty and submission to the Order, in the persons of my Superiors; here making a faithful and complete surrender of my private judgment, my own will, and every narrow-minded employment of my power and influence. I pledge myself to account the good of the Order as my own, and am ready to serve it with my fortune, my honor, and my blood. Should I, through omission, neglect, passion, or wickedness, behave contrary to this good of the Order, I subject myself to what reproof or punishment my Superiors shall enjoin. The friends and enemies of the Order shall be my friends and enemies; and with respect to both I will conduct myself as directed by the Order, and am ready, in every lawful way, to devote myself to its increase and promotion, and therein to employ all my ability. All this I promise, and protest, without secret reservation, according to the intention of the Society which require from me this engagement. This I do as I am, and as I hope to continue, a Man of Honor."

In short, total obedience.

Follows more brainwashing, the goal of which is the insemination of doubt in regard to religion and the then-current forms of governments into the mind of the victim. Historically, such brainwashing is accomplished via the tried-and-trusted methods of: the use of voluminous grandiose imagery; the submersion of sparkling nuggets of truth within a river of lies; subtle (or not so subtle) flattery, combined with appeals to the wisdom of sanctified authority figures - something along the lines of "we see that you are a very smart fellow indeed, and therefore we are not surprised that, unlike all these

other idiots, you agree with the learned ideas of our great master and guru Whatshisname.”; plus a variety of standard logical fallacies, like the false dichotomy, false generalization, circular reasoning, and so on.

The Minors were given a Minerval pupil or two to instruct, in order to get some taste for power, and to more fully adopt the views of the Order.

In particular, the Minors were informed of the evils of superstition (i.e. accepted religion and certain of its core principles), and of the evils of despotic government (i.e. non-Illuminati controlled government). Now, it is obvious enough that both religion and government often go along with banality and corruption. However! - both religion and government are highly complex entities consisting of various sometimes conflicting elements. One must reduce both to their elementary components, and work with those; while at the same time appreciating the nature of the whole. Do you discard a friend just because he sometimes acts improperly? Do you abominate a government for its minor errors, or do you seek to correct those? Moreover, should you dismantle one government, what guarantee exists that the next one - and a new one will come - will be better? Do you renounce Christian compassion because of the political lunacy of the Inquisition and the uncertainty of the existence of God? We must tread carefully in the labyrinth of human ideas.

In particular, for obvious reasons the Illuminati tried to obtain avenues of indoctrination. Thus, they became professors at the institutions of learning, and the tutors of the young nobles. With this ingenious strategy, the Illuminati managed to infest a great many minds. There were a number of nobles, and many academics, including almost all the “chairs” (faculty?) of the University of Ingolstadt.

The Illuminati adopted Classical codenames. Thus, Weishaupt was Spartacus, his crony Zwack became Cato, “Knigge was Philo. Bassus was Hannibal. Hertel was Marius. Marquis Constanza was Diomedes. Nicholai, an eminent and learned bookseller in Berlin, and author of several works of reputation, took the name of Lucian, the great scoffer at all religion. Another was Mahomet, &c.”

It is remarkable, that except Cato and Socrates, we have not a name of any ancient who was eminent as a teacher and practiser of virtue. On the contrary, they seem to have affected the characters of the free-thinkers and turbulent spirits of antiquity. In the same manner they gave ancient names to the cities and countries of Europe. Munich was Athens, Vienna was Rome, &c.

Robison quotes a 1778 letter from “Spartacus” to “Cato.” Thence, Weishaupt explained that he intended to target the literati via “the lure of science.” During indoctrination, the Illuminati would extract the initiate’s inner beliefs and guiding worldview. Inductees would be made to spy on each other for the benefit of their superiors. They would be instructed to read certain books in a certain order.

Weishaupt explains that (emphasis his) “The allegory on which I am to found the mysteries of the Higher Orders is the fire-worship of the Magi. We must have some worship, and none is so apposite. **Let there be light, and there shall be light.** This is my motto, and is my fundamental principle.” This sounds like the Luciferian/ Promethean doctrine of the high-level Freemasons, which we saw earlier. It is highly likely that Illuminism survived among the higher ranks of Masonry well beyond the 18th century.

In another letter, Zwack explains how the Illuminati would use sex to gain leverage over their thralls. They intended to provide their more amorous initiates with recipes for abortion, access to Illuminated women, and so on. The more puritanical initiates would, one suspects, have been profiled into a mind-state of true-belief in Utopianism. Those members capable of seducing others would have been taught the rudimentaries of spy-work.

As insurance against discovery, the Illuminati set up various fronts (often reading societies) and sister organizations, one of which, according to Robison, was the German Union of Charles Frederick

Bahrddt. In this way, the Order became a subaquatic hydra - upon decapitation, new heads sprouted left and right below the surface of the bloodied water.

One remarkable and memorable quotation of Weishaupt's is the following: (emphasis in the original)

Spartacus says, speaking of the priests degree, "One would almost imagine, that this degree, as I have managed it, is genuine Christianity, and that its end was to free the Jews from slavery. I say, that Free Masonry is concealed Christianity. My explanation of the hieroglyphics, at least, proceeds on this supposition; and as I explain things, no man need be ashamed of being a Christian. Indeed I afterwards throw away this name, and substitute Reason. But I assure you this is no small affair; a new religion, and a new state-government, which so happily explain one and all of these symbols, and combines them in one degree, You may think that this is my chief work; but I have three other degrees, all different, for my class of higher mysteries, in comparison with which this is but child's play; but these I keep for myself as General, to be bestowed by me only on the Benemeritissimi. The promoted may be Areopagites or not. Were you here I should give you this degree without hesitation. But it is too important to be intrusted to paper, or to be bestowed otherwise than from my own hand. It is the key to history, to religion, and to every state-government in the world."

Spartacus proceeds, "There shall be but three copies for all Germany. You can't imagine what respect and curiosity my priest-degree has raised; and, which is wonderful, a famous Protestant divine, who is now of the Order, is persuaded that the religion contained in it is the true sense of Christianity. **O man, man! To what may'st thou not be persuaded.** Who would imagine that I was to be the founder of a new religion."

The important point here is the concept of substituting the religion of Christianity with some type of a religion of "reason," i.e. "science." This is exactly what we have today, when people blindly accept anything presented to them as "science," i.e. occult information stemming from the ivory towers. Marxism (or rather, "the historical dialectic"; or "dialectical materialism") is "science," economic liberalism is "science," and eugenics is "science." Unfortunately, since it is hard to keep up with all developments in science, past and present, people find themselves forced to trust authority figures. But this is an obvious point.

For those who will tell me that Marxism is not real science - I agree. My point is that, since certain segments in even the Western universities dabble with the Marxist interpretations of this and that, and since here we childishly define "science" as whatever is done at the universities and the think-tanks, Marxism qualifies as "science." I used the quotation marks for a reason.

A related point here is that Masonry, like its subset of Illuminism, only pretends to adhere to Christianity. Again, this is obvious to anyone who bothers to study Masonry. Only the most dedicated double-thinkers among Christian Masons reconcile the two creeds.

To throw away the Princes and introduce their Nomenklatura in the stead of the aristocracy, the Illuminati intended to energetically rave about "Liberty and Equality" to inspire revolutionary zeal. The French and Russian revolutions and their accompanying reigns of terror showed what was meant by "Liberty and Equality." Note that to this day "Fraternity, Liberty and Equality" remains a motto not only of France but also of Freemasonry. Fraternity, liberty and equality are pleasant but largely meaningless concepts. Forget slogans and focus on realities. At the same time, note that names matter. To use a favourite example of Tarpley's, "Tobin Tax" means nothing to most people, while "Wall-Street sales tax" sums up the idea in four words. Moreover, "Wall-Street sales tax" sounds fair - we pay a sales tax, so why should not Wall Street? On the other hand, "Robin Hood Tax" reeks of banditry, particularly to the Americans.

The specific Masonic ranks of Illuminism were: the Nursery ranks - Preparation, Novice, Minerval, Illuminatus Minor; the Masonry ranks - apprentice, fellow craft, master (these are the standard Blue Lodge ranks), Illuminatus Major, Illuminatus dirigens; the Lesser Mysteries ranks - Presbyter, Priest, Prince, Regent; and the Greater Mysteries ranks - Magus, and Rex.

Melanson stresses that while Weishaupt chided the storytelling of the Masons, the Rosicrucians, and of the various other sects, Weishaupt was nevertheless quite taken with the ideas of the ancient Mystery Schools. The Illuminati followed in the footsteps of the various Gnostic cults.

Follow the opinions of two academic historians (Reinhart Koselleck and Sabine Roehr), as quoted in Melanson's book:

(*Perfectibilists*, p. 196)

Weishaupt's political intention to undermine the state and render it redundant was imputed to nothing other than the work of a history which would sooner or later have its effect. Insofar as the future that was to be brought about was announced as the imperative of objective history, one's own intentions assume an impulsive force which is all the greater by virtue of its simultaneous supply of the guarantee of one's innocence. Future history whose outcome is foreseen serves in this way as a relief [(Melanson) i.e. fatalism] - one's will becomes the executor of transpersonal events - and as a legitimation which enables one to act in good conscience. In precise terms, history constructed in this way becomes a means of strengthening the will to hurry the advent of the planned future.

Weishaupt, the founder of the order, developed a philosophy of history that postulated three steps: the original state of nature, despotism, and the kingdom of reason and virtue. He thought that secret societies were the necessary means to that ultimate end of nature, the state in which reason alone would prescribe the laws to humankind.

We see here, in Illuminism, doctrines which, on the one hand, resemble those of the Communists (historical inevitability, the seizing of power via secret societies) and the Anarchists (primitivism, abolition of the state); and on the other hand, those of the British Oligarchy, i.e. Darwinism and Economic Liberalism (both of which deify and demand the return to a certain conception of "nature").

By 1786, the Illuminati had infiltrated Lodges in all the major European provinces. Naturally, Germany was the most penetrated. The cult had thousands of initiates, many of them extremely influential in Germany and indeed Europe.

The Illuminati also had some influence in the United States. George Washington had the following to say on the subject:

(September 25, 1798 letter to Reverend G. W. Snyder)

I have heard much of the nefarious, and dangerous plan, and doctrines of the Illuminati, but never saw the Book [Robison's] until you were pleased to send it to me. The same causes which have prevented my acknowledging the receipt of your letter have prevented my reading the Book, hitherto; namely, the multiplicity of matters which pressed upon me before, and the debilitated state in which I was left after, a severe fever had been removed. And which allows me to add little more now, than thanks for your kind wishes and favourable sentiments, except to correct an error you have run into, of my Presiding over the English lodges in this Country. The fact is, I preside over none, nor have I been

in one more than once or twice, within the last thirty years. I believe notwithstanding, that none of the Lodges in this Country are contaminated with the principles ascribed to the Society of the Illuminati. With respect I am &c.

(October 24, 1798 letter to Reverend G. W. Snyder)

Revd Sir: I have your favor of the 17th. instant before me; and my only motive to trouble you with the receipt of this letter, is to explain, and correct a mistake which I perceive the hurry in which I am obliged, often, to write letters, have led you into.

It was not my intention to doubt that, the Doctrines of the Illuminati, and principles of Jacobinism had not spread in the United States. On the contrary, no one is more truly satisfied of this fact than I am.

The idea that I meant to convey, was, that I did not believe that the Lodges of Free Masons in this Country had, as Societies, endeavoured to propagate the diabolical tenets of the first, or pernicious principles of the latter (if they are susceptible of separation). That Individuals of them may have done it, or that the founder, or instrument employed to found, the Democratic Societies in the United States, may have had these objects; and actually had a separation of the People from their Government in view, is too evident to be questioned.

My occupations are such, that but little leisure is allowed me to read News Papers, or Books of any kind; the reading of letters, and preparing answers, absorb much of my time. With respect, etc.

Also see Vernon Stauffer's (PhD, Dean and Professor of New Testament and Church History Hiram College) *New England and the Bavarian Illuminati* (1918).

5.8.2 The French Revolution

We can best judge the extent of the influence of the Illuminati by Robison's (and Barruel's) claim that the French Revolution was in fact an Illuminated Revolution.¹³ The long Chapter 4 of Robison's book deals with the momentous events of 1789 and beyond. Also see Ch. II of Nesta Webster's *The World Revolution* (1921), and Ch. 3 of Melanson's *Perfectibilists*.

The French anti-British intervention in the American Revolution had all but bankrupted the Royal Treasury, and had introduced republican idealism among the French intelligentsia. Widespread obsolescent traditions clogged the French bureaucracy and stank of crass corruption. France's government had reached an impasse. Seeds of revolt blossomed in the kingdom.

Of those key people who supported the French Revolution by pen or by sword, Robison identifies, first, the Count Mirabeau (1749-1791), as an Illuminatus. Mirabeau was a smart man, but also one given to the seduction of women best left alone, and to the accumulation of excessive debts. His transgressions had once landed him in prison. Robison relates the following anecdote regarding a conversation between Mirabeau and his tipsy brother:

Mirabeau: "How can you, Brother, so expose yourself?"

Brother: "What! says the Viscount, how insatiable you are - Nature has given you every vice, and having left me only this one, you grudge it me."

Mirabeau was on close terms with the British manipulator Shelburne (William Petty, 1737-1805). Following a diplomatic mission to Berlin in 1786, Mirabeau managed to create a diplomatic scandal by publishing an inflammatory book on the Prussian Court.

This eclectic man was among the more important figures of the first two years of the Revolution. He died of natural causes in 1791.

Rejected by his fellow nobles, Mirabeau attained election into the Estates-General as a commoner. Prior to the Revolution, Mirabeau had been one of the key organizers of the transformation of a

¹³Also see Nesta Webster's *The French Revolution, Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, and *World Revolution*.

major Parisian Masonic Lodge into the Jacobin Club that would later become legendary. Robison claims that the Lodge was an Illuminist Lodge, and that in the months before the revolution, the Lodge sent for help from their German Brethren, who promptly dispatched a deputation to partake in the upcoming revolutionary festivities.

One of these noble deputies was the important Illuminatus Johann J.C. Bode (1730-1793), who did visit France just prior to the Revolution, and who, if we are to believe Barruel, Illuminized the Grand Orient (French) Freemasonry on the even of the events of the summer of 1789. James Billington, whose writings we will soon consult, acknowledged Bode's Illuminating effect on the Revolution. (See Melanson, p. 263.)

Another main player in the fiasco of the French Revolution was the notorious and pathetic figure of Louis Philippe II, the Duke of Orléans (1747-1793). Cousin to Louis XVI, Philippe aided the Revolution in the hope of becoming King. Having changed his name to Philippe Égalité, Orléans proved along with his cousin Louis and the madman Robespierre, that the guillotine is the ultimate equalizer. In a twist of fate, Philippe's son Louis-Philippe (1773-1850) gained the throne in 1830, to lose it during the 1848 wave of destabilization.

Robison tells us that Orléans found Illumination in the hands of Mirabeau. The opulent Duke proved a most useful tool. His wealth helped finance the early Revolution. As a member of the Jacobin Club and a person of royal descent, Philippe allowed his fellow conspirators to plot in the security of the Palais-Royal, which was off-limits to the royal censors. Because of this unique quality of discretion, the Palais-Royal became the epicentre of the French Revolution - it was both the key Parisian nexus of ideological ferment, and a notorious house of debauchery and degeneracy, replete with pornography, prostitution, and drugs.

Let us interject that the case of Philippe gives us another reason to protest against the great accumulation of wealth into the hands of private individuals - for should an individual of vast means fall prey to the machinations of knaves, nothing but trouble can ensue. Let some people be rich - but within limits!

Note that Philippe was another Anglophile. Worse yet, he travelled to London in late 1789 - why? One can not help but suspect that the whole Revolution was a British plot for the destruction of France - one that succeeded in the end, after 20 years of total war.

During the march on the Versailles in October 1789, which had been organized at his Palais-Royal, the Duke appeared in gay spirits, undoubtedly due to the fact that the mobs cheered him as "notre Roi Orléans."

Tellingly, Philippe was the Masonic (Grand Orient) Grandmaster of France during the momentous events of the Revolution.

Now, one of the immediate trigger of the Parisian unrest in the summer of 1789 was the famine (or near-famine) of the same year. Webster, in her *The French Revolution* (1919), quotes original sources claiming that the famine had been organized by the Orleanist circle. The king, though he tried to relieve it, was blamed for the famine.

Furthermore,

(Webster, *World Revolution*, Ch. II, p. 32) The most remarkable instance of engineered agitation during the early stages of the Revolution was the extraordinary incident known to history as "The Great Fear," when on the same day, July 22, 1789, and almost at the same hour, in towns and villages all over France, a panic was created by the announcement that brigands were approaching and therefore that all good citizens must take up arms. The messengers who brought the news post-haste on horseback in many cases exhibited placards headed "Edicts of the King," bearing the words "The King orders all châteaux to be burnt down; he only wishes to keep his own!" And the people, obedient to these commands, seized upon every weapon they could find and set themselves to the task

of destruction. The object of the conspirators was thus achieved - the arming of the populace against law and order, a device which ever since 1789 has always formed the first item in the programme of the social revolution.

It is said that the idea originated with Adrien Dupont and has therefore been attributed to the Orléaniste conspiracy, but Dupont was not only an *intime* of the Duc d'Orléans, but an adept of illumined Freemasonry, and the organization of the "Great Fear" may well have been masonic.

Of course, the subsequent revolution was anything but "democratic" (or pluralistic). Trade-unions ("working-men's corporations) were abolished, and only the wealthy were given the vote.

The Revolutionary abolition of religion and inauguration of "Feasts of Reasons" is straight out of Weishaupt's writings.

As Webster points out, and as is obvious, this is not to say that all the Revolutionaries were Illuminists. Only a few key members at the top of the organization would have sufficed! This is the principle of Leverage.

Robespierre was, likely, not an official Illuminatus; he was, however, apparently the member of an Illuminated Masonic Lodge; and he was, crucially, an admirer of the "savage noble" doctrines of Rousseau, who was a major influence on Weishaupt.

One buried aspect of the Revolution, of monumental importance in light of subsequent developments, was the Malthusian programme underlying the Reign of Terror.

(Webster, *World Revolution*, Ch. II, p. 46) But towards the end of 1793 it became evident that there was no possibility of absorbing the residuum created, for the attacks on the manufacturing towns of France had dealt the final blow to trade and the Republic found itself faced by hundreds of thousands of working-men for whom it could not find employment. It was then that the Comité de Salut Public, anticipating the Malthusian theory [1798, formulated earlier by the Venetian Ortes], embarked on its fearful project - *the system of depopulation*.

That this plan really existed it is impossible to doubt in the face of overwhelming contemporary evidence. In *The French Revolution* I quoted in this connection the testimony of no less than twenty-two witnesses - all revolutionaries; and since then I have found further corroboration of the fact in the letters of an Englishman, named Redhead Yorke, who travelled in France in 1802 and made particular inquiries on this question from the ally of Robespierre, the painter David:

I asked him whether it was true that a project had been in contemplation to reduce the population of France to one-third of its present number. He answered that it had been seriously discussed and that Dubois Crancé [(1747-1814)] was the author.

In another passage Yorke states:

Monsieur de la Métherie assured me that during the time of the Revolutionary Tribunals, it was in serious contemplation to reduce the population of France to 14,000,000. Dubois Crancé was a very distinguished and enthusiastic partisan of this humane and philosophical policy.

It will be noticed that there is here a discrepancy in the exact figures; the population of France at that period being twenty-five millions, the proposal to reduce it to one-third was to bring it down to approximately eight million. The difference then lies between the projects of reducing it *by* one-third or *to* one-third - issues which Yorke evidently confused; but it was precisely on this point that the opinions of the Terrorists differed.

Some argued for more murder, and some for less murder! What a conundrum they faced!

If the hecatombs carried out all over France never reached the huge proportions planned by the leaders; it was not for want of what they described as "energy in the art of revolution." Night and day the members of the Comité de Salut Public sat around the green-covered table in the Tuileries with the map of France spread out before them, pointing out towns and villages and calculating how many heads they must have in each department. Night and day the Revolutionary Tribunal passed on, without judgment, its never-ending stream of victims, whilst near by the indefatigable Fouquier bent over his lists for the morrow, and in the provinces the proconsuls Carrier, Fréron, Collot d'Herobis, Lebon toiled unremittingly at the same Herculean task.

Compared to the results they had hoped to achieve the mortality was insignificant; compared to the accounts given us by "the conspiracy of history" it was terrific. The popular conception of the Reign of Terror as a procession of powdered heads going to the guillotine seems strangely naive when we read the actual records of the period. Thus during the great Terror in Paris about 2800 victims perished, and out of these approximately were of the aristocracy, 1000 of the *bourgeoisie*, and 1000 working-class. These estimates are not a surmise, since they can be proved by the actual register of the Revolutionary Tribunal published both by Camprardon and Wallon, also by the contemporary Prudhomme, and they are accepted as accurate by the Robespierriste historian Louis Blanc.

According to Prudhomme the total number of victims drowned, guillotined, or shot all over France amounted to 300,000 and of this number the nobles sacrificed were an almost negligible quantity, only about 3000 in all.

At Nantes 500 children of the people were killed in one butchery, and according to an English contemporary 144 poor women who sewed shirts for the army were thrown into the river.

Moreover, the anti-industrial spirit of the Revolution, combined with its anarchistic tendencies, ruined the manufacturing of France. The great nation would not fully recover for decades.

The parallels to the Bolshevik Revolution are obvious. The Reds, in perfect accord with Marx's creed, were willing to exterminate as many people as necessary to achieve their aims. The suffering in Russia between 1917 and 1945 is a horror to be remembered forever.

In his list of known Illuminati, Melanson omits Mirabeau, but includes Philippe's right-hand man Roettiers de Montaleau (1748-1808), "a veritable "Mason's Mason." Roettiers was "an auditor in the Paris Chamber of Finance in 1775, its Director in 1787, and later Director of Finance for France (1791-1797)." Roettiers was heavily involved with the Masons and ensured their survival during the Reign of Terror. So here we have a strong connection between 1) Philippe d'Orléans, 2) Masonry, 3) banking, 4) the Illuminati, 5) the Revolution.

Another interesting character is that of Daubermensil (1748-1802). Melanson speculates (In Ch. 3 of his book) that Daubermensil suggested the adoption of bee symbolism to Napoleon. Weishaupt had considered renaming his order to "Society of the Bees."

More importantly, Daubermensil promoted a creed of "Theophilanthropy," which Melanson describes (p. 92) as "a state-sponsored, secular, deist sect/religion intended to replace Christianity." Could this Theophilanthropy have been the precursor of Blavatsky's Theosophy? Because Theosophy was certainly invented as a replacement for Christianity.

As Melanson relates, some have traced Theophilanthropy to "the deistic society of David Williams and Benjamin Franklin in London in the seventies."

Daubermensil has not been identified as an Illuminatus, but did have notable links to known Illuminati.

Other major revolutionaries such as Condorcet (1743-1794) and Rochefoucauld (1747-1827) were also high-ranking Masons. So great is the Masonic role in the French Revolution - and we speak here of the French Grand Orient, rather than the British Masonry, which may or may not have exerted influence on the debacle - that it is fair to say that the French Revolution was a Masonic Revolution, and, at that, one of Illuminist overtones. Indeed, the whole Revolution was organized, propagandised, and executed through the extensive network of French Masonic Lodges. Rochefoucauld, by the way, fled to England in 1792.

One of the members of delegation of the Illuminati was Johann J. C. Bode, codename Amelius, "the next person in the order to Spartacus and Philo." Another was the German officer "Bussche, called in the Order Bayard." The two joined the French Masonic clubs and went along their business of indoctrination and infiltration. Says Robison, "When such was the state of things in Paris, it is plain that the business of the German deputies would be easily transacted. They were received with open arms by the *Philalethes*, the *Amis de la Vérité*, the *Social Contract* [Masonic Lodges all], &c. and in the course of a very few weeks in the end of 1788, and the beginning of 1789 (that is, before the end of March) the whole of the Grand Orient, including the *Philalethes*, *Amis Reunis*, *Martinistes*, &c. had the secrets of Illumination communicated to them." Illuminism, thus, provided the connection between Freemasonry and Jacobinism.

Indeed, as Melanson explains (Ch. 3, p.104), the Mainz Jacobin club's founders were "nearly all" Illuminati. The other German Jacobin clubs - in Trier, Speyer, and Worms - were also full of Illuminati. That the Illuminati sympathized with the French Jacobins is clear; but does that mean that the Paris Jacobins were members of the sect? Or were they merely ideologically influenced by the Illuminati via the channels of Freemasonry and common Enlightenment traditions? It is hard to tell.

The storm thus having been prepared, all hell broke loose as 1789 progressed. France was turned over its head. The Revolutionaries abolished God and the King, and established a despotic all-powerful collectivist communist state. But France was not ready for so radical an about-face, and, after a decade of instability and bloodbaths, Napoleon took charge of the country, to reign as a military dictator more absolute than Louis XVI had been - for though the communist state had partly been dismantled, it remained more powerful than in the days of the late-feudal Ancien Régime.

Two more important matters must be discussed in regard to the Illuminati.

First, Illuminism and Communism are so close in goals and modus operandi, that the latter surely was an extension of the former. We will see more evidence of this in the next section. Moreover, the goals and methods of the Illuminati largely coincide with the apparent goals of the bankers, the Fabians, and certain other groups and subgroups of the amorphous global conspiracy that we are examining.

It also appears that while the communists adopted both the exoteric and the esoteric Illuminist doctrines, Bakunin settled for the basic surface precepts of Illuminism in establishing his relatively vague yet beautifully simple Anarchist dogma. Remove the Church and the State, figured Mikhail, and everything else would sort itself out. The man certainly had a great big heart in exactly the right place, but perhaps in his ardour he failed to think things through.

Second, an operation such as that of the Illuminati must have garnered funding from somewhere - but from where? Perhaps the British? It is plausible. The rise of the Illuminati accompanied the rise of another bizarre yet powerful historical cabal, one that is still with us - namely, the House of Rothschild of Frankfurt. The important Illuminatus the Baron Knigge (1752-1796) of Frankfurt, who helped move the focus of the Order from Munich to Frankfurt for a while, gives us a strong connection between Weishaupt's Order, and, if nothing else, the Rothschilds' city. A stronger connection yet can be found in Karl Theodor, Baron Von Dalberg (1744-1817), the Grand Duke of Frankfurt-on-the-Main, who is a confirmed Illuminatus. Rothschild was Dalberg's court banker, though only

after 1800 (Niall Ferguson points this out in his official biography of the Rothschild dynasty). Since their holdings remain largely private, the true extent of the Rothschild's wealth is unknown (perhaps because the Rothschilds own, among other things, Reuters) - but it is vast. The Rothschilds quietly hold behind-the-curtain positions of vast influence in Britain and France.

Of course, the Rothschild situation offers another problem - how did the Rothschilds suddenly spring into prominence and amass such wealth? Surely, the European nobility, certain segments of which were and remain extremely rich, could have easily squashed the Jewish upstarts, who commanded no peoples and no armies. Yet they did not - which suggests that the Rothschilds acted with the permission of the so-called Black Nobility, meaning the true powers of Europe, whoever they were. The notion that Nathan Rothschild could have brazenly walked into London at the age of 21, and proceeded to amass a huge fortune without the permission of the British Oligarchy, is absurd. Note that in the course of the 19th and 20th centuries, the Rothschilds assimilated into the Euro-British oligarchical structure via intermarriages.

My suspicion is that the Rothschilds - and the Illuminati - acted as the agents of a greater power, most likely that of the British-connected (or led) pan-European Oligarchy. In regard to the French Revolution, the British had means, motive and opportunity - the motive was the standard policy of divide and conquer against the major continental power, combined with the thirst for revenge for the French involvement in the American Revolution; the means were the British intelligence network and perhaps Masonry; and the opportunity was the momentary internal weakness of France, and the corruptible nature of luminaries such as Mirabeau and, particularly, Philippe d'Orléans. This topic merits further research; but let us move on.

Perhaps the man Dalberg along with a few like-minded high aristocrats invented both the Illuminati and the Rothschilds as fronts for their ambitions. This theory certainly makes far more sense than the notion that a Jewish shop-owner of Frankfurt, or a bright professor at Ingolstadt, could have conceivably tried to take on the whole world alone.

Melanson's work contains more proven direct connections between the Illuminati and the Rothschilds.

As mentioned before, Skull & Bones may have been an Illuminati branch. Melanson (in Ch. 4 of his work) points out that the Skull & Bones crypt contains a slogan found in the higher degrees of the Illuminist program. Another somewhat remote connection can be found in the Greek philosopher Demosthenes (who died in 322 BC, 322 being the "Chapter" number of S&B). The book *The Life and Opinions of Trastram Shandy, Gentleman* was a common favorite of the Illuminati and the Bonesmen. The initiations ceremonies of the Brotherhood of Death borrow certain aspects of the rituals of the Illuminati.

Each connection, taken in isolation, may be explained away as coincidental. Taken together, these links suggest that the powerful Order of Skull and Bones is indeed a branch of the 18th century Bavarian Illuminati.

The Minerval Owl is a core symbol of the Illuminati, of the California Bohemian Grovers, and of Hegel. Indeed, (*Perfectibilists*, p. 208) the Journal of the Hegel Society of North America is the "Own of Minerva."

Some researchers (e.g. Bob Chapman, an astute analyst) use the term "Illuminati" for those whom I call "the Oligarchs" with capital O. I dislike the term "Illuminati" for two reasons: first, it is not entirely accurate, in the sense that the old Order of the Illuminati has vanished over the ages, though some of its reincarnations still exist; and second - and I speak of myself - whenever a person unaware of the conspiratorial angle of history hears the word "Illuminati," he switches off. On the other hand, the term "Oligarchs" is as unambiguous as the rather awkward term "banksters." Moreover, the term "oligarchs" is entirely negative, while the term "Illuminated" carries connotations of "Enlightenment," which is a positive word.

Let us now proceed to see how the scions - in doctrine or spirit, if not in organization - of the Illuminati fared in the 19th century.

5.9 Mazzini & Co

I draw on James Billington's *Fire in the Minds of Men* (1980) and Nesta Webster's *The World Revolution*.

Nesta Webster was a British independent historian of the first half of the 20th century.

Billington (1929-) is a Rhodes Scholar and the thirteenth Librarian of the United States Congress since 1800. His resume includes stints at the Office of National Estimates, Harvard, and Princeton. He was director of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, where he founded the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies. Billington is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, an elected member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, a Chevalier and a Commander of the Order of Arts and Letters of France, a Commander of the National Order of the Southern Cross of Brazil, a bearer of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic, and a Knight Commanders Cross of the Order of Merit by the Federal Republic of Germany. Prestige, Billington has of plenty. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and an acquaintance of David Rockefeller's.

And here is what Billington wrote:

(Introduction, emphasis Billington's) This book seeks to trace the origins of a faith - perhaps *the* faith of our time. Modern revolutionaries are believers, no less committed and intense than were the Christians or Muslims of an earlier era. What is new is the belief that a perfect secular order will emerge from the forcible overthrow of traditional authority. This inherently implausible idea gave dynamism to Europe in the nineteenth century, and has become the most successful ideological export of the West to the world in the twentieth.

...

At center stage stood the characteristic, nineteenth-century European revolutionary: a thinker lifted up by ideas, not a worker or peasant bent down by toil. He was part of a small elite whose story must be told "from above," much as it may displease those who believe that history in general (and revolutionary history in particular) is basically made by socio-economic pressures "from below."

...

The revolutionary faith was shaped not so much by the critical rationalism of the French Enlightenment (as is generally believed) as by the occultism and proto-romanticism of Germany. This faith was incubated in France during the revolutionary era within a small culture of literary intellectuals who were immersed in journalism, fascinated by secret societies, and subsequently infatuated with "ideologies" as a secular surrogate for religious belief.

...

The heart of revolutionary faith, like any faith, is fire: ordinary material transformed into extraordinary form, quantities of warmth suddenly changing the quality of substance. If we do not know what fire is, we know what it does. It burns. It destroys life; but it also supports it as a source of heat, light, and- above all-fascination. Man, who works with fire as *homo faber*, also seems foredoomed in his freedom to play with it as *homo ludens*.

...

The flame of faith had begun its migrations a century earlier, when some European aristocrats transferred their lighted candles from Christian altars to Masonic lodges. The flame of occult alchemists, which had promised to turn dross into gold, reappeared at the center of new "circles" seeking to recreate a golden age : Bavarian Illuminists conspiring

against the Jesuits, French Philadelphians against Napoleon, Italian charcoal burners against the Hapsburgs.

...

A recurrent mythic model for revolutionaries - early romantics, the young Marx, the Russians of Lenin's time - was Prometheus, who stole fire from the gods for the use of mankind. The Promethean faith of revolutionaries resembled in many respects the general modern belief that science would lead men out of darkness into light. But there was also the more pointed, millennial assumption that, on the new day that was dawning, the sun would never set. Early during the French upheaval was born a "solar myth of the revolution," suggesting that the sun was rising on a new era in which darkness would vanish forever. This image became implanted "at a level of consciousness that simultaneously interpreted something real and produced a new reality."

The new reality they sought was radically secular and stridently simple. The ideal was not the balanced complexity of the new American federation, but the occult simplicity of its great [Masonic] seal: an all-seeing eye atop a pyramid over the words *Novus Ordo Seclorum* [roughly translated as "New World Order"].

The credibility, erudition, and eloquence of the source necessitates another hefty quotation:

(Chapter 4, emphasis Billington's) Historians have never been able to unravel the tangled threads of this tapestry - and in recent times have largely given up trying. The most important recent study confines itself to tracing the history of what people *thought* about the secret societies rather than what the societies in fact were. But the problem will not go away simply because we lack The Occult Origins of Organization documentation on the numbers and the nature - and at times even the very existence - of these organizations.

The plain fact is that by the mid- 1810s there were not just one or two but scores of secret revolutionary organizations throughout Europe - extending even into Latin America and the Middle East. These groups, although largely unconnected, internationalized the modern revolutionary tradition and provided the original forum for the general debate in the modern world about the purposes of political power in a post-traditional society. And it was they who in the process of modernization pioneered a phenomenon by now [1980] familiar: impatient youth forming their own organizations to combat monarchical-religious authority.

The story of the secret societies can never be fully reconstructed, but it has been badly neglected - even avoided, one suspects - because the evidence that is available repeatedly leads us into territory equally uncongenial to modern historians in the East and in the West.

In what follows I shall attempt to show that the modern revolutionary tradition as it came to be internationalized under Napoleon and the Restoration grew out of occult Freemasonry; that early organizational ideas originated more from Pythagorean mysticism than from practical experience; and that the real innovators were not so much political activists as literary intellectuals, on whom German romantic thought in general - and Bavarian Illuminism in particular - exerted great influence.

And there we have it. Nesta Webster wrote to the same effect more than a half century earlier, though in a language far more partisan and incriminatory than Billington's. To be fair, it is hard for anyone familiar with 1) the basic facts about Freemasonry, 2) John Robison's work, and 3) the creeds and dogmas behind the French and Bolshevik Revolutions, to conclude anything but that the Illuminists and the Masonic type secret-societies have had an enormous effect on 19th century Europe, and therefore on the whole post-Enlightenment world.

Two other crucial points that Billington makes in the Introduction of his work, are:

1) That "Revolutionaries were generally sustained in such loneliness and despair - and protected from ridicule and indifference - by secularized nineteenth-century versions of the old Judaeo-Christian belief in deliverance-through-history. At a deep and often subconscious level, the revolutionary faith was shaped by the Christian faith it attempted to replace."

2) "...revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces often lived in a kind of symbiotic relationship. The same writer who first prophesied a new revolutionary society for France in the late 1760s also coined in the early 1780s the prophetic phrase *les extremes se touchent*. We shall repeatedly have occasion to note the interaction and often unconscious borrowing between the extremes of Right and Left."

We have made both points repeatedly in this work - but they bear repeating. First, supposedly anti-religious ideologies like communism, secular humanism, and, indeed, Darwinism, do not seek to *negate* religion as much as they seek to *supplant* or *subsume* religion. Moreover, most such creeds came from three key sources: 1) the Christian culture which lies under the entire superstructure of the Western world, 2) the occult mysteries of the various heresies and sects of the Ages, including Masonry and the Jewish Cabala, and 3) the medieval alchemy and occultism, which to a certain extent unite the previous two points. We will discuss religion in more detail later. For now, note that some branches of the 19th century ideologies which define the modern world were metaphysical and quasi-religious in nature, even as they pretended to be "scientific" and philosophical.

In regard to the second point - that the extremes touch each other - it is abundantly clear to anyone who bothers to look. I will provide two contrasting and yet complementary examples.

First, Fascism and Stalinism, which Billington correctly labels National Socialism and Socialist Nationalism respectively, were almost identical in structure. Both systems had a cult of the personality epitomized in Adolf and Uncle Joe. Both relied on extreme brainwashing from an early age. Both had youth organizations - the Hitlerjugend and the Pioneers. Both featured massively choreographed propaganda rallies. Both had a police organ for political repression - the Gestapo and the NKVD. Both were hysterically nationalistic and jingoistic. Both attempted to supplant Christianity with a new half-secular half-occult faith. Both abolished unionism and merged the corporations and the state.¹⁴ Both glorified labour as an end unto itself. Both were technocratic systems, in which a state bureaucracy drawn from the state's sole party managed affairs. Both were highly centralized, hierarchical, collectivistic, top-down systems.

The delusion that Fascism and Stalinism differ from each other stems from the shrill war-propaganda of the Reich and the USSR, and the Allied need for Soviet support during the war. In reality, the two systems are near-identical, with, admittedly, some major differences - most crucially, the Soviets were not particularly racist. They killed on the basis of factors other than race.

Note apropos that the Trotskyite branch of communism differed from Stalinism in that Trotskyism was internationalist while Stalinism was nationalist.

For our second example, let us look at Libertarianism and Anarchism. The former supposedly lies on the extreme right, and the latter on the extreme left. For purposes of clarity, let the Libertarians be the eponymous self-identified section of right-wing Americans; and let the anarchists be those of the classic Latin European anarchist movement (represented by, say, the famous Anarchists of Barcelona). Both ideologies proclaim that the state is inherently evil and that the less state, the better. Both crowds say that people should be allowed to do whatever they want to do as long as they do not harm each other in obvious ways. Both argue for extreme individualism and free co-operation among individuals. The main difference between the creeds lies in their approach to private property. The American Libertarians fetishize private property, money, debt, and the contract, while the classical Anarchists tend to espouse the "property is theft" motto. Another difference lies in the Anarchist views on violence and religion. The Anarchism of Bakunin was vociferously atheistic and violent, while the Anarchism of Count Lev Tolstoy was pro-Christian (though not necessarily pro-Church) and peaceable. Note that whatever their protestations, all non-insane offshoots of Anar-

¹⁴Mussolini famously defined his Fascism as the merger of state and corporate power. Lenin (and Bukharin), on the other hand, called his system State Capitalism. *Les extremes se touchent*.

chism build on the assumption of Christian charity and compassion. Unfortunately, some Anarchists are completely nuts and glory in destruction for destruction's sake.

Another amusing point here is that Communism and Anarchism, though almost totally contradictory in nature, are both supposed to be "far-left" ideologies.

One last point: Anarchism came from the writings of the Russian high aristocrats Bakunin, Kropotkin, and Tolstoy, who in turn built on the writings of certain Frenchmen, particularly Proudhon. Libertarianism, from what I can tell, came from the ideas of the British Utilitarians and economic liberalists, many of them with BEIC connections, namely Adam Smith, Thomas Malthus, Jeremy Bentham, David Ricardo, and Bentham's protege John Stuart Mill. In the 20th century, some Libertarians allied themselves with the Austrian and Chicago School economists, as well as the bizarre "Objectivist" prophetess Ayn Rand. It must be understood that those boys (and gal) advocated for total freedom - within the bounds of the contract and the "free market." Their system is a system in which monetary wealth dominates everything else. We will discuss this again later.

The American Libertarian tradition also hearkens to the Anarcho-Primitivistic ideas of Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862), who said - I've had enough of this! - and set up shop out in the woods at his Walden to live the good simple life. Thoreau's ideas were highly popular among some segments of the 1960s New Left.

Note that, for some reason, in France "Libertarianism" means what we defined as Anarchism.

The point remains that the left and the right often touch each other in subtle and not so subtle ways. This is why one must avoid vague terms like "left" and "right," and focus on specific well-defined issues.

Now, the French Revolution rested on the principles of *liberté*, *fraternité*, and *égalité*. In the 19th century context, the three words translated into the following ideologies:

The notion of liberty tied with constitutionalism and sought to limit monarchical power via a rule of law and some type of a parliament after the Anglo-American model.

The notion of brotherhood rapidly grew into the creed of nationalism, which, in its extreme form, was a religion. In effect, nationalism glorified the people and the territorial nation, and conflated the notion of God with the notion of the nation of ethnically / linguistically / culturally homogeneous people. Certain French writers expressly resorted to the term '*peuple-Dieu*.'

The notion of equality evolved into the communist tradition. Proponents of this idea sought the unifying simplicity of a basic pseudo-scientific metaphysical doctrine of absolute equality; moreover, influenced by the Positivism and Hegelianism of the 19th century, the communist-type ideologues wanted to create some type of a perfect society, and to direct history. These fine folks put their God in the Promethean ideal of the sublimity of human thought expressed in the revolutionary intellectual, who would, it was hoped, eventually become a Philosopher-King who would guide the human herds as well as History herself.

Fanatic adherents to the second and third creeds saw the future Revolution as a sort of a Second-Coming, which would cleanse the Earth of all sin in an apocalyptic orgy of violence and redemption, which would culminate in a post-revolutionary singing tomorrow.

The zealous atheism of many of the revolutionaries stemmed from the obvious principle, explained by Machiavelli and others, that the prince who conquers a principality must first massacre the dynasty of the old ruler in order to legitimize his own claim to the throne. Thus, the Jacobins had to slaughter Louis XVI, and the Bolsheviks had to shoot Nicholas II - and moreover, to install their new "secular" religions, both bands had to do away with the old official religion of Christianity.

Note that Prometheus, the favourite of both Weishaupt and Marx, stands tall and proud in New York in front of the Rockefeller Centre.

The three notions of liberty, brotherhood, and equality are deceptively simple. On the surface, what is there not to like? Liberty - great; brotherhood - fantastic; equality - magnificent! However

- the existence of a constitution does not mean that the governing oligarchy will follow the constitution, or that it can not dominate society within the bounds of the constitution. The existence of the nation-state does not mean that the nation will be wholly independent, or that the people will be better off on their own than within a larger federal (perhaps even imperial) superstructure. And equality can be the equality of slaves under the absolute dictatorship of a Robespierre or Stalin.

At the same time, an enforced just constitution can be of great use; a patriotic nation-state living in harmony with its neighbouring nation-states can accomplish great things; and a certain level of egalitarianism, in which no one starves and no one owns his own private kingdom, should be a principal goal of human society.

5.9.1 Fraternité

On the European continent in the early 19th century, nationalistic conspiracies held centre stage. Following the abortive 1796 communistic Babeuf (1760-1797) conspiracy of the Directorate era France, the egalitarians germinated for the better part of a half-century, before coming to the forefront around 1860, when revolutionary nationalism had run its course and had transformed into reactionary jingoism and domestic collectivist ultra-nationalism.

The conspiratorial centres of Europe were London, Paris, Brussels and Switzerland (particularly Geneva). Of those, Brussels was the capital of the British-created buffer-state of Belgium, Switzerland was, after 1815, the designated banker haven of Europe, and Paris was, for much of the 19th century, in the hands of Anglophile despots. Louis Philippe, the son of Orléans, King of France from 1830 to 1848, was a close friend to the Duke of Kent, the son of George III and the father of Victoria. Napoleon III, who governed France between 1848 and the fiasco of Sedan of 1870, was in England immediately before and immediately after his reign. He also spent much time in Switzerland. He followed a generally pro-British policy, and contributed to the Albion's Crimean adventure in the mid-1850s. The British were simply following their traditional policy of suppressing the top European power via an alignment with the secondary powers. After 1815, Russia had to be put in its place. After Sevastopol (1854-1855), the British allowed Prussia to teach a lesson first to the Hapsburgs and then to the French. After 1871, it was Germany's turn to suffer - and hence the First World War.

Palmerston (1784-1865), the top man in England in the early-to-mid 19th century, had visited Paris in 1829, and had predicted the fall of the Bourbon Monarchy, which he despised.¹⁵

The premier nationalist revolutionary of the 19th century was the arch-conspirator Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872). Born in 1805 to a Jacobin father, Mazzini joined the Italian Masonic-type secret society of the Carbonari ("Charcoal Burners"), and in time became the key ideologue of the Italian re-unification, as well as the master co-ordinator - or at least progenitor - of a panoply of European movements for national independence.

After spending some time in exile in Geneva and Paris in the 1830s, Mazzini moved to London in 1837, where, over the years, he was in contact with, among others, Marx. In London in 1837, Mazzini formed his *Giovine Italia* (Young Italy) secret society, the first of a series of Young This-and-that movements, one of which, Young Bosnia, would a generation later provide the spark which would ignite the First World War.

Driven by dedicated idealists, the Young societies led a number of doomed national independence rebellions, which rocked the stability of Europe in the mid-19th century, to the benefit of the Albion, which, apart from the Irish problem, suffered little domestic instability in the 19th century. The most tragic of those were the Polish insurrections of 1830, 1846, 1863, and 1905, all suppressed in rivers of blood. In reality, the Poles had no real chance of attaining independence against the combined might of the hegemonic Prussian, Hapsburg, and Romanov empires. Poland only regained independence in the aftermath of World War I, when the Entente Allies decided to set up Poland as a buffer state between the Germans and the Soviets. Twenty years later, the Allies let the Nazis and the Soviets partition Poland again, in the hope that the two behemoths would eventually fall at each

¹⁵ Also see Tarpley's essay *Lord Palmerston's Multicultural Human Zoo* from *Against Oligarchy*.

others' throats - which they did. After World War II, Poland was a Soviet satellite, and after 1989, Poland became a Western satellite. Today it is in the EU. The reality is that in the modern era, Poland was always too weak to act on its own, and could only possess some independence as either a buffer state or a member of a larger confederacy. The Polish insurrections, however, undermined the stability of the Holy Empires, and provoked reaction from the three emperors. The revolt of 1863 was particularly useless, because it antagonized the reform-minded Alexander II the Liberator (1818-1881), who would, perhaps, have been receptive to the idea of limited Polish self-government. Alexander II did in fact grant such a boon to Finland in 1863, and had relaxed the Russian rule in Poland in 1862.

The Liberator was blown up by fanatical anarchist terrorists in 1881. His successor, Alexander III (1845-1894), was among the most reactionary autocrats of the era. The absurd fiasco of Alexander II's assassination highlights the self-destructive streak of the revolutionary zealots of the 19th century, who repeatedly shot themselves in the foot in their efforts to make a difference. For every Garibaldi there were ten suicidal useful idiots.

The other great center of 19th century nationalist fervour was fractured Italy. Partitioned since the Empire of Rome, and the home, over the ages, to the maritime Venetian Empire, the Holy See, and the powerful medieval-renaissance industrial centres of Milan and Florence, Italy entered the 19th century inspired for unification. The dream of a politically homogeneous Italy had been around since at least Machiavelli, and now its time had come.

Hapsburg Austria was the main victim of the Italian Risorgimento. By the end of the Risorgimento in 1870, Austria, having suffered battering from the north, the west, the south, and from inside, was all but finished as a major Power.

The Carbonari, who at their best numbered in the hundreds of thousands, rebelled in the Kingdom of Naples in 1820, and in Piedmont in 1823, and all over the place in 1830. The 1831 suppression smashed the Carbonari, but their splinters continued to operate through various Masonic and proto-Masonic fronts, under the guidance of Mazzini. Billington notes in Chapter 5 of his work, that the Carbonari were highly hierarchical and their Grand-Master wielded great power.

More insurrections occurred in 1848, when Garibaldi (1807-1882) and Mazzini took over Rome for a short while.

In the end, however, the Realpolitik of the Mason Cavour (1810-1861) combined with the conspiratorial and romantic antics of the two Giuseppes to finish the job. As the man in charge of the powerful Piedmontese Kingdom (around Turin and Genoa), Cavour participated in the Crimean War to gain the favour of Britain and France.

Now, Napoleon III (1808-1873) had been a Carbonaro in his youth. In 1858, the Carbonaro Felice Orsini (1819-1858) attempted to blow up the French Emperor in front of what would become the Parisian Opera Garnier. To provide us with another British connection, Orsini went to procure his bombs in London in late 1857. Though he managed to massacre 8 people and wound another hundred and fifty, Orsini failed to kill Napoleon III. The French sentenced Orsini to death. On the eve of the execution, Napoleon III visited Orsini's cell. It is said¹⁶ that Orsini greeted Napoleon III as a fellow Carbonaro, and admonished him for forsaking the unification of Italy. Napoleon responded favourably, perhaps on account of a desire to avoid further assassination attempts. Soon after Orsini's rendezvous with the guillotine, Napoleon and Cavour signed a secret pact against Austria. War followed in 1859 - a war, which was utterly inimical to the interests of France, but which completed a large part of the work of the Carbonari. After defeating the Austrians at Magenta and Solferino, Napoleon III, sickened by the carnage of what was a proto-industrial war, sued for

¹⁶Quigley mentions in his surviving 1974 interview (procured, from what I gather, by Dr Stan Monteith), that his tutor, the Rhodes Scholar Crane Brinton, wrote a doctoral dissertation to refute Nesta Webster's claim to the effect that the French Revolution was an Illuminist revolution. Toward the end of his life, however, Brinton felt that, likely, he had been wrong! To top this development, Brinton's student, Elizabeth Eisenstein, "a marvellous researcher," wrote a dissertation on the Illuminist Babeuf conspiracy. The man behind that conspiracy, Buonarotti, was also the founder of the Carbonari. Quigley proceeds to recount the story, which I tell above.

peace without realizing the full ambitions of the Carbonari. By March 1860, Piedmont controlled northern and central Italy minus the Papacy and Venice. Enter Garibaldi, who added the South to the whole in a Romantic campaign, which left the world dumbfounded. The Italians won Venice during the 1866 Austro-Prussian war, and captured the French-protected Rome in 1870 during the Franco-Prussian war. The Carbonari had won. Italy remained a hotbed of Masonic activity well into the 20th century, as the notorious P2 scandal of the 1980s demonstrated.

One important clone of the Carbonari was the Alta Vendita society, whose mission in life was the destruction of the Papacy.

The Germans obtained their unification under the military supremacy of Prussia and the Realpolitik of Bismarck (1815-1898).

A major reason for the Hapsburg weakness in the 19th century was the multi-ethnic composition of the Hapsburg Empire. As long as the Empire's subjects swore fealty to a king, the Hapsburg imperial throne was a perfectly serviceable vehicle of government. But when the French Revolution and Mazzini's machinations aroused the ardour of nationalism in the minds of the denizens of the Empire, its entire edifice collapsed in the course of one painful century.

The Hungarians had their revolt in 1848 under Kossuth (1802-1894). The Mason Kossuth had learned English while in prison in the 1830s. After his massive revolution was suppressed by the Tsar's army, Kossuth fled first to America and then to England. In London, Kossuth enjoyed the hospitality of the Lord Mayor of the City of London. After a while, Kossuth repaired for America, where he enjoyed his celebrity status, and where, as a noble lover of the idea of the Republic, he failed to condemn slavery, to the chagrin of William Lloyd Garrison. In the late 1850s, Kossuth returned to England, where he maintained close contact with Mazzini.

Following two disastrous wars, in 1867 Franz Joseph (1830-1916, Emperor 1848-1916) decided to at least rid himself of the Hungarian problem. Accordingly, he set up the joint Austro-Hungarian Empire, in which the Hungarians had a fair degree of autonomy. This move went along a vicious crackdown on Slavic nationalist interests, a crackdown now supported by the content Hungarians. Franz Joseph had, however, no intentions of allowing the prickly Kossuth back into the Hapsburg domain. So Kossuth spent his later years in Italy, where he died in 1894.

The Ottoman Empire suffered from the same problem and gradually collapsed over the 19th century. It should be understood that the processes of increasing nationalistic favour and the collapse of the multi-ethnic empires were synergistic. National rebellions led to reaction and suppression, which in turn led to further dissent. The German and French empires were relatively homogeneous in ethnic composition, and the Russians had the advantage of the doctrine of Pan-Slavism. In southern Europe, however, the Ottoman and Hapsburg arrangements were irreparably obsolescent by the mid-19th century. The Ottoman Empire only survived as long as it did, because the Western Powers feared the potentially destabilizing - in terms of the European and global balance of power - Russian influence in the Balkans. The British in particular dreaded the prospect of a Russian-controlled Constantinople.

The Greeks achieved their independence via the Masonic Filiki Eteria ("Company of Friends") society of Odessa. Filiki Eteria benefited from the support of wealthy Greek exiles with ties to the Anglo-American establishment. The revolt exploded in 1821. Istanbul replied with vehemence. The English champion of the Romantic movement, Byron (1788-1824), went to die in Greece in 1824. This act of madness provoked the British into action. The Russians never baulked from warring with Turkey. And so, in 1827, the French, British and Russian fleets smashed the Ottoman fleet and effectively sealed the independence of Greece, which came officially in 1832, after a period of fighting and negotiations. The lesson here is that without a Piedmont or Prussia, small ethnic groups had no chance of achieving independence sans the intervention of the Great Powers. Even the Hungarians,

who were a large ethnic group, got their piece of the pie only after the French and the British had smashed Russia, and the French and the Prussians had wrecked the Hapsburgs.

Belgium was created as a British puppet in 1830 to secure the channel passing and to provide the British with a buffer between the Dutch, the French, and the Prussians. For a while, Belgium, in the historically highly developed regions of northern France, Flanders and Brabant, was the most industrialized nation in the world. Today, Brussels, in a broken Belgian state, houses the European Parliament.

By 1866, the nationalist movements had died down, because as much as could be accomplished had already been accomplished. The Russian 1877-1878 campaign in the Balkans finished the era of the movements of national independence by creating the nation-states Bulgaria, Romania, and Serbia. All three newly minted states and Greece entertained a complex mixture of territorial claims on each other and on the nearby Great Powers. The Balkan powder-keg had come into existence. The stage for World War I was set.

But before 1914, a last Young revolution took place in Europe - that of the Young Turks (1908), who proceeded to massacre thousands of Armenians.

Mazzini died in 1872, passing the torch of illumination to the banker and Mason Adriano Lemmi (1822-1906). Billington mentions in the context of an ideological conflict between Buonarrotti and Mazzini, that (Chapter 6) "Buonarrotti in turn denounced Mazzini's links with rich Lombards, arguing against any attempt to invade Piedmont without the aid of France."

And also: (Chapter 12)

Suspicion of nationalism grew in eastern Europe after the revolutionary events of 1848-49. Nationalism had bred repression of one people by another - Russian against Hungarian, and Hungarian against other Slavs. In western Europe, Cabet and others attacked the symbol of liberal national revolution - Mazzini - in a brochure of 1852, *French Socialists to Mr. Mazzini*. He was denounced at greater length in a manifesto of December 1858, *To the Republicans, Democrats and Socialists of Europe*, which accused Mazzini of becoming a wealthy apologist for "law and order":

...the Italian patriot, the representative of the republican bourgeoisie, who has inscribed on his banner "law and order."

Having told the proletariat to "put off social problems," he should now at least tell "his friends to put aside their plutocratic tendencies."

The point is that Mazzini's contacts with "plutocrats" were notorious. To be fair to Mazzini, a national revolution requires financing and support from influential quarters.

Nationalism had started as an idealistic movement of brotherhood and ill-understood liberation. By the late 19th century, the ideology had metamorphosed into a brutal religion. Powered by industry, and increasingly aware of the brainwashing propensities of the press, the Great Powers sought to externalize internal social problems via jingoistic and imperialistic foreign adventures. The era of Total Imperialism had dawned, to die a few decades later in the era of Total War. The Great Powers scoured and devoured the world, and by 1900, hardly a spot on the Globe lay outside of the influence of Britain, France, Germany, Russia, the US, and the other minor powers plus the (essentially) land-locked Hapsburgs and the decrepit Ottomans. The cult of nationalism required further sacrifice - and that it got.

Let us clarify the following point: humans naturally feel a sense of love for the place of their birth and the community thereof. Call this sentiment "patriotism." The feeling of patriotism, combined with a recognition of other people's patriotism, is natural and commendable. But we also have the virulent, quasi-religious, collectivistic, jingoistic, xenophobic idea of extreme nationalism. This idea elevates

the vague notion of the nation and the people into a God and a highest good. Under nationalism, the smallest un-reclaimed piece of "national" soil becomes a perpetual *casus belli*, and the destruction or enslavement of foreign nation states becomes a glorious manifestation of the strength of one's nation and people. Nationalism we can live without. Patriotism, which our Oligarch friends seek to destroy, we should try to preserve. Note that patriotism and nationalism are neither mutually exclusive nor complementary. One can have both and one can have neither. We will discuss more aspects of the tribal mentality in the next chapter.

For now, let us also note that the state can exist independently of the nation. A classic case in point is Yugoslavia, which was a reasonably successful state consisting of a number of nations for the larger part of a century, before the Westerners decided to blow up the whole thing via an elementary appeal to the latent religious and national lines of division in the western Balkans.

Three other useful examples are Belgium (which has also been blown up - politically if not militarily), Canada (which survived a Bilderberger attempt at dismemberment in the 1990s - see Estulin's book), and Switzerland, which reconciles French, German, Italian, and even Latin-speaking elements, as well as Protestants and Catholics, under a federation. Note that Switzerland has been allowed to exist undisturbed, because of its function as the world's banking sanctuary and the world's center of clandestine revolutionary and intelligence-gathering activity.

The ideology of nationalism had allowed the bankers and the various other interests 1) to destabilize Europe via the medium of national revolts; 2) to guide history via the manipulation of alliances between the Great Powers; and 3) to turn a good profit by financing all sides of all wars. By the end of the First World War, nationalism had been rendered obsolete, and the bankers quietly sought to supplant it with the divisive factor of the 20th century - the ideological split based on the evolved doctrines of liberty and equality.

Mazzini is said to have been in contact with the leader of the American Masonry Albert Pike.

Let us now return to the French Revolution to pick up the thread of the creed of *égalité*, which connected the Illuminism of Weishaupt and Babeuf with the Communism of Marx&Engels and Lenin.

5.9.2 *Égalité*

Filippo Giuseppe Maria Ludovico Buonarroti (1761-1837), a minor Florentine noble and a descendant of Michelangelo, was one of the currently least known but most important revolutionaries of his era. The Freemason Buonarroti, an Illuminist (in approach if not membership) and a Jacobin, spawned a good many secret societies, among them the Sublime Perfect Masters (or Adelfi Society), and Monde. He had been a member of the Illuminist-Communist Babeuf conspiracy. Buonarroti promoted both communism and a cult of nature, which resembles the modern New Age cult. After the collapse of the French Revolution, Buonarroti settled in Switzerland. After the 1830 revolution, he moved to Paris.

Writes Billington, (Chapter 4):

Buonarroti's organization called for a morality of its own; a kind of moral Manicheanism within the revolutionary elect. They were the agents of good against evil, freedom against tyranny, equality versus egoism. His inner circle, the "great firmament" of Nature, was a political authority clearly superior to Napoleon, let alone other petty princelings.

That is the modus operandi of both Weishaupt and Lenin. Further,

Most important for our story, Masonry was deliberately used by revolutionaries in the early nineteenth century as a model and a recruiting ground for their first conspiratorial experiments in political organization.

...

If Freemasonry provided a general milieu and symbolic vocabulary for revolutionary organization, it was Illuminism that provided its basic structural model. The organizational plan that Buonarroti distilled from two decades of revolutionary experience in Geneva (and basically remained faithful to for the rest of his life) was simply lifted from the Bavarian Order of Illuminists.

The question arises - did Buonarroti simply "lift" the Illuminist model, or did he inherit and reconstitute the organization? The second possibility is not implausible, considering Buonarroti's experience in the 1790s, when he certainly established contact with certain members of the Illuminati. Billington notes that there are "hints" that Buonarroti may have been an Illuminatus.

Billington concludes, cautiously, that:

Such borrowings from Illuminism seem substantial enough to challenge the long-accepted judgment of the leading student of the subject that, after 1790, Illuminism "having disappeared from history... lived on only in legend." There seems good reason to believe that Illuminist influence... was not so much a "legend" as an imperfectly perceived reality. The same historian's perplexed observation that "the police legend" about Illuminists began to "develop with more amplitude and originality" in the Napoleonic era points to a surprising source of Illuminist influence. Illuminist ideas influenced revolutionaries not just through left-wing proponents, but also through right-wing opponents. As the fears of the Right became the fascination of the Left, Illuminism gained a paradoxical posthumous influence far greater than it had exercised as a living movement.

One of the key ideological disciples of Buonarroti was the influential proto-communist Blanqui (1805-1881). The origins of the Carbonari are also traceable to Buonarroti. We note apropos that the roots of the Mafia also rest in the 19th century secret societies, not least the Carbonari.

Melanson discusses Buonarroti in Chapter 4 of *Perfectibilists*. Serious links existed between Buonarroti and known high-level Illuminists. The man was probably a convert. (*Perfectibilists*, p. 147) Buonarroti's book on Babeuf (*Conspiracy of Equals*) was a major influence on the mid-19th-century Communists.

Billington establishes a connection between Buonarroti and Marx: "The Buonarrotian legacy of radical republican journals and secret societies affected Belgium throughout the thirties. And Brussels became the residence of Karl Marx during 1845-47, when he was formulating the ideas for his Communist Manifesto, and the site of many of the meetings that led to the formation of the Communist League."

Blanqui's key contribution to revolutionary thought was the notion, later realized by Lenin, that a small but dedicated and highly organized group of revolutionaries can capture the key nodes of a country and from thence institute a communist re-structuring of society. In 1839, Blanqui rebelled in Paris shoulder to shoulder with members of the League of the Just, which was the precursor of Marx's Communist League. Blanqui spent the rest of his life in between prison and the sites of armed insurrection. He was a man of action - one could call him a terrorist. The armchair revolutionaries Engels and Marx sought to distinguish themselves from Blanqui, who, in their opinion, lacked a fully developed revolutionary "theory" (i.e. creed). Blanqui expressly did not bother himself with organizing the people. He just wanted to single handedly take over France like some kind of a Romantic superman. Somehow he managed to survive until the age of 75 before dying in Paris in 1881.

One 20th century admirer of Blanqui was the Duce - Benito Mussolini.

Billington identifies the doctrines of Saint-Simon and Hegel as the keystones of Marxism: (Chapter 8) "Both Saint-Simon and Hegel had developed new views of the world precisely to end revolutionary

disruption; yet their followers were at the forefront of renewed revolutionary agitation. Although the influence of both Saint-Simon and Hegel was protean and diverse, it was most decisive on revolutionaries. The impact of both men converged on Karl Marx.”

Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) was a French aristocrat who contributed to the development of the ideas of communism, positivism, sociology, technocracy, and more. Saint-Simon had various adventures in his youth - he fought side by side with George Washington, tried to organize an industrial combine during the French Revolution, barely survived the Reign of Terror, and lost a fortune to a swindler business partner. At the age 35, tired of action, Saint-Simon decided to turn to thought. He spent the rest of his life as a poor writer. The titles of Saint-Simon's work convey the general content of his ideas: *L'Industrie*, *L'Organisateur* (1819), *Introduction aux travaux scientifiques du XIX siècle* (1807), *Du système industriel* (1821), *Catéchisme des industriels* (1823-1824).

Prematurely disappointed with the insignificant effect of his works, Saint-Simon shot himself in the head 6 times in 1823. He survived sans one eye.

Saint-Simon's general idea was that production is good and that war and idleness are bad, because they interfere with production, and those who best organize production should rule society. The last notion has found fertile ground amidst both "left-wing" revolutionaries and reformers, and "right-wing" industrialists and bankers.

Regarding Saint-Simon's Illuminist roots: (Chapter 8)

The crucial link in the apostolic succession from the Babeuf Conspiracy to the birth of ideology under Saint-Simon is provided by a minor revolutionary playwright and editor, Jacques Rigomer-Bazin, with whom Saint-Simon lived in Paris at several important points during this decade. Bazin may have been linked with Bonneville's Social Circle and was almost certainly connected to the Babeuf Conspiracy while still working as a revolutionary journalist in provincial Le Mans. After moving to Paris, he became close to Maréchal and other survivors of the conspiracy through a circle of radical intellectuals which began to meet regularly at the Café Manège in 1799. The Paris police arrested Bazin in May 1804, and confiscated his *Sketch for a new plan of social organization*, which apparently called for an authoritarian elite of thirty savants to help the poor and create social equality.

Bazin was living with Saint-Simon at the time of his arrest; and the latter clearly borrowed extensively from Bazin in his writings of this period. His *Letter of an Inhabitant of Geneva* (1802-3) called for twenty-one men of genius to open a subscription before the tomb of Newton and begin the scientific reorganization of society. His next work of 1804 adopted the very title of Bazin's confiscated work, adding to Bazin's previous call for a scientific elite an idea shortly to be developed more fully by Bazin: the artist should be the moralist of the new scientific era; and a new type of writer, the *littérateur*, its propagandist.

Let us now look at Hegel.

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) was Fichte's successor as the Chair of Philosophy at the University of Berlin between 1818 and 1831. Hegel's influence over the philosophical thought of the last two centuries is immeasurable. As Billington put it, in the context of Hegel's own view of himself and his theories, "Who could be more important to history than the key figure in the key institution of the key state?"

Glenn Magee's recent (2001) work *Hegel and the Hermetic Tradition* argues that Hegel was decisively influenced by the Hermetic tradition of occultism, Cabala, Millenarianism, Rosicrucianism, theosophy, and so on - the Gnostic alchemic components of both Freemasonry and Illuminism.

Hegel "publicly associated himself with known occultists, like Franz von Baader." This von Baader (1765-1841) was born in 1765, and briefly studied medicine at Ingolstadt in his youth. This puts him at the core of the Illuminati domain a few years after the inception of the cabal. Robison identifies a Baader - Franz's father - as an Illuminatus. This gives us a strong connection between Hegel and

the Illuminati. Melanson reports that Ferdinand Baader (1747-1797), Franz's father, was not only an Illuminatus, but also the last original Illuminatus to receive the highest degree of Illumination - that of *Rex*.

Also note that Franz von Baader was reputed to be a member of the Gold and Rosy-Cross society, which tended to be anti-Illuminist. The web is so tangled it boggles the mind. Apart from everything else, we need to remember that *les extremes se touchent*. The German Wikipedia mentions that Franz's father Ferdinand joined the Gold-and-Rosy Cross in 1784.

It is also of great interest that Franz von Baader resided in England between 1792 and 1796.

To give you an idea of the nature of Hermeticism - and it revolves around the same Promethean notion that keeps recurring in our research - I quote from the introduction of Magee's book:

It is surely one of the great ironies of history that the Hegelian ideal of man as magus, achieving total knowledge and wielding Godlike powers to bring the world to perfection, was the prototype of the modern scientist.

Hermeticism also ties with gnosticism, though the two are not identical, and neither submits to easy definition. Magee also had a hard time defining Hermeticism; he settled for the following:

(emphasis in the original) There is, however, one essential feature that I shall take as definitive of Hermeticism. [Tuveson] suggests that Hermeticism constitutes a middle position between pantheism and the Judaeo-Christian conception of God. According to traditional Judaeo-Christian thought, God utterly transcends and is infinitely distant from creation. Furthermore, God is entirely self-sufficient and therefore did not have to create the world, and would have lost nothing if He had not created it. Thus the act of creation is essentially gratuitous and unmotivated. God creates out of sheer abundance, not out of need. This doctrine has proved dissatisfying and even disturbing for many, for it makes creation seem arbitrary and absurd. Pantheism, by contrast, so thoroughly involves the divine in the world that *everything* becomes God, even mud, hair, and dirt - which drains the divine of its exaltedness and sublimity. Thus, pantheism is equally dissatisfying.

Hermeticism is a middle position because it affirms *both* God's transcendence of the world and his involvement in it. God is metaphysically distinct from the world, yet God needs the world to complete Himself. Thus the act of creation is not arbitrary or gratuitous, but necessary and rational.

...

But there is more. Hermeticists not only hold that God requires creation, they make a specific creature, man, play a crucial role in God's self-actualization. Hermeticism holds that man can know God, and that man's knowledge of God is necessary for God's own completion.

...

This Hermetic doctrine of the "circular" relationship between God and creation and the necessity of man for the completion of God is utterly original. It is not to be found in earlier philosophy.

...

If Hegel did not believe that man could literally become God, he certainly believed that the wise man is *daimonic*: a more-than-merely-human participant in the divine life.

...

To summarize, the doctrines of the Hermetica that became enduring features of the Hermetic tradition can be enumerated as follows:

1. God requires creation in order to be God.
2. God is in some sense "completed" or has a need fulfilled through man's contemplation of Him.

3. Illumination involves capturing the whole of reality in a complete, encyclopedic speech.
4. Man can perfect himself through gnosis: he becomes empowered through the possession of the complete speech.
5. Man can know the aspects or "moments" of God.
6. An initial stage of purification in which the initiate is purged of false intellectual standpoints is required before the reception of the true doctrine.
7. The universe is an internally related whole pervaded by cosmic energies.

...

(Magee argues that:)

- ... 3. Hegel's philosophy is *encyclopedic*: he aims to end philosophy, for all intents and purposes, by capturing the whole of reality in a complete, circular speech.
4. Hegel believes that we rise above nature and become masters of our own destiny through the profound gnosis provided by his system.

...

He tells us - again with a straight face - that the state is God on earth.

In discussing the Illuminati in Ch.2, Magee notes that "Weishaupt appears to have endowed the order with Hermetic trappings merely as window dressing, to entice members and, perhaps, to discourage the authorities from investigating."

In the same chapter, Magee points out that "Hegel was an enthusiastic reader of the quasi-Masonic journal *Minerva*, which, among other things, disseminated the radical thoughts of the French Jacobins." For obvious reasons, it is highly likely that this journal was an Illuminist front.

From Chapter 4, in which Magee discusses Hegel seminal *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807):

Jacques d'Hondt and others have claimed that the Phenomenology's "initiation" was inspired by the Masons. John Burbridge writes that the Phenomenology, "with its lengthy and arduous process of initiation, came at a time when Hegel was frequenting the company of known Masons, some of them graduates of the banned Illuminati."

Melanson also discovered that Hegel (*Perfectibilists*, p. 11) "was directly influenced by members of the Illuminati during his lifetime." Crucially, his "philosophy of history" bore heavy resemblance to landmark Illuminist doctrines.

Follow some more connections, taken from Melanson's book.

(p. 247) Jacob Friedrich von Abel (1751-1829) was a major Illuminatus, and a "mentor" to Hegel.

(p. 317) Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803) was another top Illuminatus and key influence on Hegel (and also on Kant, under whom he studied, and on Goethe).

(pp. 329-330) Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi (1743-1819) was also an Illuminatus who had an effect on Hegel's thinking. Jacobi was the president of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences in the early 19th century.

Then we have Christoph Meiners (1747-1810), an Illuminatus who shaped young Hegel's thinking during the latter's student days.

Another key Illuminatus connected to Hegel was Karl F.K. Wundt (1744-1784). This Wundt was the grandfather of the disgustingly important 19th century kook, pseudo-psychologist, proto-behaviorist and professor at Leipzig, Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920). As we will see later, the younger Wundt effectively founded the American behaviorist tradition, which, in turn, defined American 20th century education, not without the help of key Skull and Bones cadres. For more on Wundt's immense pernicious influence, read Gatto's *History*.

Speaking of education, we should take a brief look at (Melanson, p.376) Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827), a.k.a. the Illuminatus Alfred, a.k.a. "the father of modern educational science."

Pestalozzi attracted the attention of the Illuminati in the 1780s, when he published various pieces on education. The Illuminati, good conspirators that they were, wanted to control education, and naturally attempted to convert pedagogues as a matter of principle. Pestalozzi joined the gang in 1782, and founded the Zurich branch of the society in 1783. In the wake of Napoleon's passage through Switzerland, Pestalozzi ended up with a gaggle of orphans in his hands. His time had come. He set up his school. His fame spread far and wide, and various potentates dropped by to see him in action. His ideas spread. Pestalozzi's pal Fichte spread Pestalozzi's ideas across (what would become) East Germany.

So what made Pestalozzi's ideas so popular with the rulers of the world?

Melanson explains that (p. 379) "Pestalozzi's practical theories were enthusiastically applied by those in power simply because they didn't threaten the existing class structure." Melanson proceeds to quote the following excerpt from Clarence Karier's *The Individual, Society, and Education* (1986). Karier was a notable American "educator."

(*Perfectibilists*, p. 379, Karier quote, emphasis in original) Pestalozzi ... proposed a practical way of educating the masses to love God and country and to become more effective workers, without threatening the elite class of wealth and power... [Pestalozzi] argued for a practical education for the new proletariat and was looked upon with favor by the power elite for suggesting that "the poor must be educated for poverty for in order to enjoy the best possible state, both of soul and body... it is necessary to *desire and be content with still less.*" Under the circumstances, it is little wonder that Fichte's call for the rejuvenation of the Prussian nation along Pestalozzian lines could be met with such electrifying and positive support by the aristocratic classes of Prussia. Here was an education which could meet the needs of the masses and the nation without threatening the class structure.

And there you have it, reader. Modern schooling was invented partly by an Illuminatus, and enjoyed the support of the powerful, who wanted obedient workers.

It is also worth mentioning that the currently prevalent psychological monitoring of children so vociferously derided by the perceptive Bev Eakman, had been patented by the Illuminati.

For our purposes, let us summarize Hegel as follows: 1) he was deeply immersed into the occult and had critical connections with the Illuminati, the Masons, and various other sects; 2) he came up with something like a "complete," unified philosophy centred around the notion of a synthesis between God and the state, and an idealism for consciously bringing about an end to history (both ideas having been popularized in one form or another by the Illuminati); 3) his ideas were terrifically influential and led directly to the development of both Fascism and Communism.

In particular, to go back to Billington, Marxism was the unification of the Saint-Simonian notion of a technocratic egalitarian society governed by a self-appointed elite, and the Hegelian notion of the state and the end of history. Lenin adopted the Blanquist concept of the revolutionary concentrated clandestine seizure for power to complete the picture. Note that the Nazi doctrines and strategies were not much different, though the Nazis operated along the Romantic 19th century axis of thought, in contrast with the Communist, who aligned themselves with the positivist-rationalist tradition.

As we have seen, ideologically, Communism stems from Illuminism, in both doctrine and in personal association between historical figures. Was Karl Marx a member of an Illuminati-type society? That is hard to tell. Some point out that the Lion's Paw gesture in Marx's famous portrait (right hand under the coat, next to the heart, in a fist) is a Masonic-Illuminist sign. This argument is reasonable, but does not constitute sufficient proof unto itself.

Let us conclude this section with a brief analysis of the various forms of 'socialism.'

5.9.3 Currents of Socialism

As the Marxist doctrine took shape in the middle of the 19th century, two other creeds that have been often described as "socialist" developed in parallel. Those were, roughly speaking, the ideas of anarchism and syndicalism. Both stemmed, to a degree, from the writings of the influential 19th century writer (but not quite philosopher) Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865). Having examined anarchism above, let us now focus on the tenets of the syndicalist ideology.

Marx, the megalomaniac hypocrite that he was, loathed the two theories so incongruous with his own cherished communism. Proudhon - who was another Freemason - and Marx first quarrelled in 1845. In effect, the two clashed as the champions of their movements and ideologies.

The difference between Marx and Proudhon was that while Marx sat in the British Museum and pondered the intricacies of *Kapital* and the Historical Dialectic, Proudhon tirelessly agitated and organized the working class into a movement conducive to an immediate betterment of conditions. While Marx dreamed of investing absolute power into a dictatorship of the "proletariat," i.e. a Saint-Simonian council of wise men, which would fix everything, Proudhon said, forget politics and revolution, and let's just demand privileges here and now. It was Proudhon who said "property is theft," though he likely was not the first to make the observation. Marx wanted to abolish property by relegating everything to the state. Proudhon, on the other hand, wanted to give the factories and the fields to the workers and the peasants who actually did all the work. Marx was a consummate elitist, while Proudhon was a true "man of the people." The former was the product of the Prussian university system, while the latter was a self-educated cow-herder. Marx wanted an absolute centralization of the sources of credit into the hands of the state, whereas Proudhon advocated the creation of local publicly owned banks - or rather, credit unions - all over the place, banks which would dole out unlimited (interest-free) credit to stimulate productive activity among the population.

Though often identified with Anarchism, of which he was indeed a founding father, toward the end of his life Proudhon argued for a de-centralized federate state. In a posthumously published work, Proudhon reached the conclusion that (Wikipedia) "property is the only power that can act as a counterweight to the State."

Proudhon called his theory "mutualism." Two other names for the ideology are syndicalism and anarcho-syndicalism. Some identify Proudhon's ideology with "socialism," but since "socialism" can mean either communism or Fabianism in other contexts, it is a useless term.

The general characteristics of the syndicalist ideology are: ideally, the workers should own the means of production; barring that, they should at least get their share of the pie; to achieve their goals, the syndicalists should put less accent on political elections or revolutionary activity, and should instead organize in syndicats - meaning trade unions; the main weapon of the unions is the mass strike. Some branches of the ideology favored violence and terrorism as counter-measures to state/ corporate ("capitalist") repression, but, by and large, the syndicalists have been a peaceful lot.

Proudhon had all the right ideas. Historically, the syndicalist/ trade-unionist approach has been the favoured approach in the most developed countries, particularly Britain, France, and the USA. Howard Zinn's renowned *People's History* (1980), and Billington's *Fire in the Minds of Men* (1980) show that the workers of the United States engaged in a wide-spread, militant, decades long, often violently suppressed struggle for attaining privileges (meaning fair wages, etc) in the 19th and 20th centuries. They never quite managed to wrestle the means of production out of the grasp of the oligarchs, but they did attain, by the golden 1950s, the 40 hour week and the package of living wages and reasonable benefits.¹⁷

Note that the concept of the factories belonging to the workers is exactly the "small business" American ideal. Observe, moreover, that unions are eminently American. The Nazis and the Communists banned trade unionism, not the Americans! Unfortunately, this fairly obvious points has been bashed

¹⁷Also see Joe Bageant's *Deer Hunting with Jesus* and *Rainbow Pie*.

out of the heads of the Americans after a half century of truly astounding propaganda fuelled by television. Unionism in the States has been in steady decline since Reagan declared a war on the unions back in the 1980s. As the unions have fallen, so have the living standards of the Americans. Another key point here is that, by and large, the Americans contended themselves with (more or less) fair wages rather than true ownership over the means of production and the management of labour.

As John Taylor Gatto has pointed out, there exist two excellent examples of the syndicalist system in action - the Amish community in the States (around Pennsylvania, where Gatto grew up), and the Mondragon organization in the Basque region, a historical hotbed of anarcho-syndicalism. Both groups are content, prosperous, and proud - meaning self-confident rather than haughty. There are about a quarter of a million Amish and about a hundred thousand Mondragon workers, which should translate into about a quarter of a million of people dependant on the organization. The Amish are somewhat inbred and suffer from the consequences. At the same time, for obvious reasons they are far healthier than their neighbours - (Wikipedia) "Overall cancer rates in the Amish population are 60 percent of the age-adjusted rate for Ohio and 56 percent of the national rate." This has little to do with smoking - the cause lies in differences in diet. The Amish grow and cook their own food. Another cause for the discrepancy is the Amish propensity toward self-management. People who like their jobs and manage their own affairs are happier and live longer than people who work jobs they hate and lack control over their lives.

Another highly indicative Amish statistic found in Wikipedia tells us that "Suicide rates for the Amish of Lancaster County were 5.5 per 100,000 in 1980, about half that of the general population and a third the rate of the non-religious population."

The principles of syndicalism work, and should be pursued in combination with various other useful ideas.

Let us last look at the type of "socialism" most prevalent today - the "nanny state," or "Fabian" socialism of the West.

Nanny socialism should be properly defined not as the *negation* of monopoly/corporate capitalism, but as its necessary palliative *complement*. To put it bluntly, wage slavery without welfare is mass torture approaching genocide. That is what Britain and America had in the 19th century, and it caused enormous social unrest. In America today, the unofficial unemployment is about 20%, about 17% of the population depend of food stamps, and about a quarter of the population relies on medicare and/or medicaid. An unemployed person is a person who seeks but can not find work. A person on food stamps is someone who has not enough money to eat. A person on medicare/medicaid is someone who can not afford health insurance. More importantly, many of these folks have no one to turn to. It must be understood that the state has the absolute obligation to provide for these people. This is a matter of life and death, and therefore not subject to question, except by Malthusian minded individuals, or by those blind fools who feel that sacrifice at the altar of the "free market" is a fitting tribute to a mighty if somewhat inhuman deity.

The wage system of industrial "free market" capitalism must have welfare to exist at all. This is well understood at the top. In general, the American social security system is highly efficient. The problem with the governmental health insurance programs lies not in the bureaucracies, which are quite efficient, but in the overall structure of the American health care industry. That health care can be an "industry" is an affront to humanity, and to the ancient principle of the Oath of Hypocrates, but never mind that.

What happens in reality is that the corporate-owned governments use the various welfare-type systems to bleed, indoctrinate, and control the population. This was the Fabian conception of socialism. The Fabians set out to use "socialism" to control society, and they have done well. We have here a classical Hegelian dialectic - create the problem, namely industrial rape via wage slavery - introduce the solution, namely welfare - and provide the synthesis, namely the corporate all-intrusive eugenicist nanny state.

Who pays for all of this? The three segments of society that bear the burden are: the self-employed, "small-business" type people who manage to earn a living largely on their own; the union members who have managed to win some concessions; and the salaried white collar professionals. The corporations and the corporate-owned government give with one hand, to take with the other.

Thus people pay taxes to fund the "free" educational system of indoctrination - but only at the lower levels. To get a university degree, people must sink into debt. Much of the school money goes straight to the corporations in the form of the purchases of expensive textbooks full of drivel, computer classrooms which never see use, security cameras in the classrooms and the hallways, and other such amenities. In the field of health care, tax revenues go back to the pharmaceutical companies, which charge exorbitant prices for poisonous pills and often unnecessary treatments. At the same time, the corporations can afford to jack-up the prices of health care, thus eliminating various small business owners who can not afford the insurance. And so on - we have discussed many of these issues at length.

Certain functions of civilized society should be handled via the "socialistic" approach. Moreover, "nanny" socialism divested of crony capitalism and the Fabian mania of controlling everything, can be an efficient approach to organizing society. The problem is not ill-defined 'socialism' per se. The problem is not the state. The state, like the kitchen knife, is just a tool. When somebody tries to disembowel you with a kitchen knife, do you blame the knife, or the crazed samurai who holds the knife?

To summarize, at the end of the 19th century there existed roughly four general streams of what some call "socialism":

- 1) The Marxist idea of Communism, which wanted a totalitarian technocratic state obtained through violent revolution.
 - 2) Anarchism, which consisted of the abolition of the state and the church. Some Anarchists wanted a violent revolution. Some wanted to abolish the church but preserve Christianity, while others wanted to destroy both.
 - 3) Syndicalism, which proclaimed that the workers should own the means of production, and that their key weapon should be the mass strike implemented through the unions.
- And 4) Fabian Socialism, which was the insidious complement of monopoly capitalism.

Of these, Marxism and Fabianism were eminently elitist, and always had the support of the more perceptive elements of the Oligarchy. Pure Anarchism was largely utopian and unworkable. The more violent-minded anarchists were often co-opted for propaganda or destabilization purposes. Syndicalism was the system that worked. The Oligarchs have vehemently tried to suppress and destroy unions across the globe for a century and a half.

One should be careful in labelling leaders as "communists" or "socialists" or "fascists." Was Batista worse or better than Castro? Hard to tell. "Right-wingers" should realize that in the 1950s, Cuba was something like an American colony, something between a sugar plantation and a casino, and that Castro only turned to the USSR after seeing that certain American circles meant him no good. Earlier, he had repeatedly distanced himself from communism. Castro was a nationalist, a hothead, and a romantic. "Left-wingers" should realize that Castro did not just win a revolution with his dozen comrades, and that he could have been evicted long ago, particularly since 1991. The Americans promised not to pull Eastern European countries into NATO and not extend their missile shield to the east - and they broke their promise; likewise they could have broken their promise not to molest Castro. Then there are Castro's links to Rockefeller, which we need not examine. It seems like Washington does not mind having a bogeyman in its backwaters. Castro may also have been a part of a miscalculated regime change operation.

Before we continue, let us shed some light on a fifth strand of "socialism," in which the state only interferes where it has to interfere. The crux here is the following question: Why on Earth should private individuals draw profits from public utilities such as: a) electrical plants and networks, b) insurance, c) health care, d) energy production, e) credit creation - and so on? Why in the name of

all that is good and, if you are so inclined, holy?

The standard answer is that those who make things should benefit from them. That is all very well, but let us move beyond platitudes. Take an electric power station. Suppose now that a banker "builds" an electric station in your town and proceeds to skin you alive for the privilege of your using your toaster. What exactly happened? Did the banker build the station with his own hands? No, the workers did. Did the banker come up with the station's blueprint? No, some engineer or professor did a while ago, and now the blueprints are public knowledge. So what did the banker do? He brought in credit ("capital"), i.e. the impetus toward the movement of resources toward the building of the power station. Now, why should the banker provide that credit in the stead of the *public* local, state, or federal government? Local and state officials you can reasonably influence - but you can never elect a banker! So why should he wield a power, which the city or the province can possess for itself?

Suppose the provincial and federal governments own the oil fields and the refineries in the nation. They can subsidize gas prices and use whatever profits remain to build useful infrastructure. Moreover, the oh-so-noble profit motive remains - what is to stop a provincial government from building up its oil revenues? To the argument that this concentrates too much power in the hands of the gov'ment, I have two points to make: First, at least you get to elect the your provincial government. You have a degree of control. How is a Rockefeller domination, over which you have zero control, any better? Second, by forcing control over resources at the lowest possible level - county or state where possible - we achieve true decentralization. Consider, in contrast, the gargantuan power of companies such as Standard Oil (Exxon and Chevron), BP, and Shell (the latter both connected with the British Oligarchy).

Were your government to own the oil industry, and subsidize gas prices, you would have to pay less at the pump, and you would enjoy better infrastructure, than if you paid the Rockefeller combine to social-engineer you.

And therein lies true "socialism" of the type that the sharper "left-wingers" would like to espouse. One could just as easily call a system of the above genre an American Capitalist one - on the pre-Civil War model. (Gonzo free-marketeering is British in origin.) Let the government merely do what it is supposed to do - sell you cheap gas and ensure that you pay a low health insurance - and from there on, what you do with the gas, and what doctors you seek, should be affairs of your own. That is what "socialism" should be, but often is not. It is worth noting that Qaddafi's Libya, and the currently (early 2012) reviled Syria, practiced, to a degree, policies of exactly this kind. It should also be noted that the American Constitution is amicable to the ideas related above (Section 8), and that in particular, the Constitution *demand*s that the state owns the power of credit creation (Section 8 again).

Two more observations: Whenever a private individual "builds up" a vital industry from scratch, the government does not have to unfairly take over "his" stuff. It can pay the fellow. And moreover, a degree of government control over vital industries does not negate the cherished "free-market" entrepreneurial economy (which does exist to an extent) - on the contrary - all non-crucial industries can very well remain "private," subject to some anti-trust laws. Let autobusiness and the manufacture of electronic gadgetry remain private. If people want to, let the corporations "innovate" new ways of selling garbage to the PR-brainwashed masses.

But when the issues are those of life and death, the representatives of the people must defend the interests of the people - "We the People of the United States, in Order to... promote the general Welfare... do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Having examined "socialism," we should also look at "capitalism." But let us do that later.

For now, let us continue on the trail of the Revolution into the 20th century. Our examinations continues with the Bolshevik Revolution.

5.10 Communists

For this section, we draw mainly on Antony Sutton's landmark *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* (1974), and its addendum *The Best Enemy Money Can Buy* (1986).

Antony Sutton (1925-2002) was a British-born historian. After a stint at Cal-State L.A., Sutton worked as a research fellow at the prestigious Hoover Institution between 1968 and 1973. There, Sutton wrote *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development* (1968-1973), which Zbig referred to appreciatively in *Between Two Ages* (1970). Sutton had discovered that, in effect, certain segments of Wall Street and certain segments of the Nomenklatura worked in close co-operation. Naturally, Sutton's discovery brought him a heap of trouble, and soon enough the man found himself working as an independent historian. In this newly found capacity, he penned a set of conspiracy history booklets, the point of focus of which was an address - 120 Broadway in New York.

Structurally, Communism totally complies with our model for secret societies. Out of power, the Communists had a tight group of top honchos presiding over a network of dedicated operatives theoretically in charge of the masses of party-membership-card bearing dupes. After the revolution, there were the inner party, the outer party, and the worldwide communists.

Let us focus on the history of Communism in Russia, particularly in regard to the other players we have so far met.

As the industrial era progressed in unimaginable leaps of prosperity in the late 19th century, those European and particularly British Oligarchs possessed of a globe - and we refer to, in particular, the influential geo-strategist Halford Mackinder (1861-1947) - could not help but regard Russia with a profound terror. All that land - all those resources - that central position on the Eurasian landmass - that oil in Baku - that vast manpower - what if the Russians got their act together and modernized? Where would the British Empire find itself then? Worse yet was the prospect of an alliance between Germany and Russia. The two Empires complemented each other - together, they would be untouchable.

Thus, after Fashoda the British increasingly sought to ally themselves with the French, to set the Germans and the Russians against each other, to destabilize the Germans and the Russians, and to retain worldwide naval hegemony.

The two key tools employed in the emasculation of Russia were the ambitious Japanese imperialists, and the European fanatical revolutionaries with all their ties to London.

5.10.1 1905

Japan and Britain signed an alliance in 1902. The alliance precluded German assistance to Russia in the event of a war - and war was indeed in the making. Bismarck, deposed in 1890, had famously insisted on non-belligerent relations between Germany and Russia. His Realpolitik was no more. The neurotic Wilhelm II (1859-1941, Emperor 1888-1918), impressed and intimidated in turn by his uncle Edward VII (1841-1910, King 1901-1910), bungled Germany's foreign policy with disastrous consequences.

Who financed the Japanese side of the Russo-Japanese war? It was the usual suspects. From Professor Richard Smethurst's paper *Takahashi Korekiyo, the Rothschilds and the Russo-Japanese War, 1904-1907*:

In the 1890s, as a fledgling central banker, [Takahashi] helped in the process of Japan's entry onto the gold standard. During the war with Russia in 1904-1905, he sold 82 million [British pounds] of Japanese war bonds, almost half the cost of the war, in London and New York to British, American, and later German investors. After the war in 1905-1907, he negotiated in Europe the issuance of 48 million [pounds] more in bonds, largely

through the London and Paris Rothschilds.

Korekiyo (1854-1936) was the illegitimate child of a shogunal court painter and a 15-year old maid. Adopted by a low-ranking member of the nobility, Takahashi studied at the James Hepburn's Tokyo private school, and later at London. In 1867, he moved to the States, where he worked as a menial labourer. Takahashi returned to Japan in 1868. His Anglophile background, and his knowledge of the English language and the Anglo-American culture, propelled him up the ladder of the Meiji bureaucracy. By 1898, Takahashi was the vice-president of the Bank of Japan.

After the Russo-Japanese War broke out in February 1904, Takahashi was ordered to London to talk to the bankers. Travelling east, Takahashi found no support in New York. He crossed the Atlantic to arrive in London on the first of April. There, Takahashi met "Lord Revelstoke (John Baring), the top officials of Parr's Bank (Parr's, now part of the Royal Bank of Scotland Group, had ties with Japan dating from the 1880s), Sir Ewen Cameron of the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank, W.M. Koch and Arthur Francis Levita of Panmure Gordon, Sir Marcus Samuel and W. Foot Mitchell of Samuel, Samuel, Carl Meyer, and Otto Kahn." He was directed to the Rothschilds (Nathaniel and Alfred), whom he met on the 13th. On May 3rd, Takahashi wrote in his diary that

The House of Rothschild cannot come in openly during the war. If they did it will be known to Paris Rothschild and also to St. Petersburg. They cannot do anything that might inflict oppression on the Jews by the Russian Government. Lord Rothschild was for 30-50 thousands, but Alfred was opposed for above reasons.

The Rothschilds would join after the war. In the meanwhile, Takahashi managed to get things moving with an initial sale of 10 million pounds worth of Japanese bonds via the help of Jacob Schiff of Kuhn & Loeb. Smethurst speculates that the "shadowy" Ernest Cassel had intervened on the behalf of Takahashi.

Ernest Cassel (1852-1921) was a German Jew who made good in Victorian England. The bio on Wikipedia explains that although he "arrived penniless in Liverpool, England in 1869," Cassel "prospered and was soon putting together his own financial deals" after finding employment at a London bank in 1870. Such things do not just happen. Likely, powerful figures had decided that Cassel would make a good agent, and had turned him into an Oligarchy Made Man. A major figure by the late Victorian age, Cassel was pals with Edward VII, Asquith the PM between 1908 and 1916, and Winston Churchill. Such associations explain for Cassel's impressive collection of titles - Knight Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George (1899), Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order (1901), Privy Counsellor (1902), Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St Michael and St George (1905), Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order (1906), Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath (1909), Royal Order of Vasa (1900, Sweden), Grand Cordon of the Imperial Ottoman Order of Osmanieh (1903), Commander of the Légion d'honneur (1906), the Order of the Crown, first class (1908, Germany), the Order of the Rising Sun, first class (1911, Japan), the Order of the Red Eagle, first class with brilliants (1913, Germany).

Perhaps if the Romanovs had honoured the honourable Cassel, they would have had an easier time. But we editorialize.

One of Cassel's grand-daughters, Edwina, later married Louis Mountbatten, the powerful favourite uncle of our good friend Philip the Plague.

Along the way, Cassel converted to Catholicism.

Takahashi had almost certainly been in contact with Cassel:

On 22 April, Takahashi wrote that he had met with a man named H.R. Beeton, who recommended that he enlist the help of Sir Ernest Cassel, banker to the king and along with Lords Revelstoke and Rothschild, one of the three most prominent financiers in London.

Ironically, Schiff had helped Takahashi for the same reasons the Rothschild's had temporarily stayed out - because of the Tsar's supposed ill-treatment of the Jews.

In October 1904, the Japanese sold 12 more million pounds of bonds. Two more auctions followed in April and July 1905, when Japan had already effectively won the war, but the belligerent parties had yet not signed peace. Again, Schiff bought a hefty portion of the bonds, while the Rothschilds stayed put. Sergei Witte and the Japanese Foreign Minister Komura Jutaro signed the peace treaty on August 29 1905. Tokyo immediately cabled Takahashi, ordering him to get the bankers to cough up an additional 20-30 million pounds. Now the Rothschilds could join the fray. Takahashi went to the French Rothschilds with a letter of introduction from their British cousins. After the haggling, a deal was made, and in November 1905 the Paris and London Rothschilds, Kuhn & Loeb, and the German Warburg bought up 25 million pounds of Japanese bonds. Remember that the German Warburg, Max, was the brother of the New York Warburg, Paul, who was one of the creators of the Federal Reserve. The two brothers met at Versailles after World War I - on the opposite sides of the table! But it gets worse! Max was an advisor of Wilhelm II prior - and perhaps during - the Great War. Schiff was Paul Warburg's brother-in-law, and, thus, Max's cousin.

In 1906, Jacob Schiff took a trip to Tokyo, where he met everybody who was anybody.

So the City and New York financed the Japanese side of the 1904-05 war. We will examine the conspicuous Jewish angle in the next section.

The chronology of the Russo-Japanese War goes along the following lines: On 8 February 1904 the Japanese backstabbed the Russian Pacific Fleet at Port Arthur, commencing the hostilities hours before issuing a formal declaration of war. In May, the Japanese invaded Manchuria. On April 15, the Russians complained that British "war correspondents" were acting as spies to the Japanese. The English and the Japanese were indeed sharing intelligence. Port Arthur fell on 2 January, 1905. The Russian Baltic Fleet sank at Tsushima in late May 1905. The Russians sued for peace.

To complicated matters for the Russians, the Revolution of 1905 broke out soon after the fall of Port Arthur. A series of strikes led to George Gapon's march on the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg on January 22. The guards foolishly fired on the crowd, killing hundreds of people. This was the Bloody Sunday. Angered and spurred by underground propaganda, the Russian workers responded. Massive waves of strikes crippled the Empire. Widespread terrorism resulted in the deaths of a number of high-ranking officials and nobles. The Tsar agreed to the creation of a weak parliament - the Duma - to neutralize the situation. The move was largely successful. By December, the revolution had been quelled.¹⁸ In 1907, the Tsar disbanded the Duma.

Georgy Gapon (1870-1906) was a priest revolutionary. After Bloody Sunday, Gapon fled abroad, where he was welcomed by Lenin, Kropotkin, and Clemenceau - among others. Gapon returned to Russia in 1906. Rumours condemned him of being a double-agent. He was found hanged in his cottage in April 1906.

Modern revolutions do not just happen. They require organization and massive propaganda. And here again we find the sticky fingers of Mr. Schiff.

Follows a quote regarding the American explorer and Russophile George Kennan (not to be mistaken with his cousin the architect of the Cold War). Kennan (1845-1925) spent much time in Russia, where he travelled in Siberia and in the Caucasus. He was an ardent critic of both the Tsar and the Bolsheviks. Wrote the *New York Times* on March 24, 1917, in an article called *Kennan Retells History*:

An authority on Russian affairs, George Kennan, told of how a movement by the Society of the Friends of Russian Freedom, financed by Jacob H. Schiff, had at the time of the Russo-Japanese war spread among 50,000 Russian officers and men in Japanese prison camps the gospel of the Russian revolutionists. "And," said Mr. Kennan, "we know how

¹⁸Another interpretation, found in Goulevitch's *Czarism and Revolution*, suggests that the move only exacerbated the situation, because it was interpreted as a sign of weakness.

the army helped the Duma in the bloodless revolution that made the new Russia last week.”

—
He said that during the Japanese-Russian war he was in Tokio, and that he was permitted to make visits among the 12,000 Russian prisoners in Japanese hands at the end of the first year of the war. He told how they had asked him to give them something to read, and he had conceived the idea of putting revolutionary propaganda into the Russian Army. The Japanese authorities favored it and gave him permission. Later he sent to America for all the Russian revolutionary literature to be had. He said that one day Dr. Nicholas Russell came to him in Tokio, unannounced, and said that he had been sent to help the work.

”The movement was financed by a New Yorker banker you all know and love,” he said, referring to Mr. Schiff, ”and soon we received a ton and a half of Russian revolutionary propaganda. At the end of the war 50,000 Russian officers and men went back to their country ardent revolutionist. The Friends of Russian Freedom had sowed 50,000 seeds of liberty in 100 Russian regiments. I do not know how many of these officers and men were in the Petrograd fortress last week, but we do know what part the army took in the revolution.”

Of course, this is only the surface of the iceberg. That Schiff, having financed the Japanese, should have pushed anti-Tsarist propaganda, is only natural. His ties with the Russian Jewish community provided him with an excellent and discrete avenue for sabotage. The point here is that the Anglophile bankers helped contrive both the 1904-05 war, and, likely, the 1905 revolution.

5.10.2 1917

The 1905 exercise showed that the inept Nicholas II (1868-1918) was vulnerable. After an entr'acte of a dozen years, the main show commenced in 1917.

Where did Lenin and Trotsky come from, and who financed their operation?

Following an expulsion from France, Trotsky (1879-1940) landed in New York in January 1917. There, even though he did no work apart from some minor journalism, he gallivanted about in a limousine replete with a chauffeur. Trotsky, accompanied by a gang of thugs (that is, ”revolutionaries”) left the States on March 27. The Canadians apprehended him during a stop at Halifax. They discovered that the brave revolutionary carried \$10,000. After some frenetic correspondences with London and New York, Trotsky was released. He reached Russia on June 13, and entered bearing an American passport issued by President Wilson. Other bearers of American passports had a tougher time entering the country - writes Sutton in Chapter II, ”For example, on June 26, 1917, Herman Bernstein, a reputable New York newspaperman on his way to Petrograd to represent the *New York Herald*, was held at the border and refused entry to Russia.”

At the time the strange bird Charles Crane (1858-1939) resided in Petrograd. Crane was a wealthy businessmen with ties to Russia and Wall Street. He had been one of the major backers of Woodrow Wilson in the latter's 1912 presidential bid. To highlight one crucial but poorly understood point that we will have to examine soon, note that Crane was enamoured with Arab culture, and heartily opposed the notion of the creation of Israel.

According to the former ambassador to Germany William Dodd, Crane ”did much to bring on the Kerensky revolution which gave way to Communism.” And so Steffens' comments in his diary about conversations aboard the S.S. Kristianiafjord are highly pertinent:” ... all agree that the revolution is in its first phase only, that it must grow. Crane and Russian radicals on the ship think we shall be in Petrograd for the re-revolution.”

Speaking of Kerensky (1881-1970), the man was a high-level Mason, and, according to a report Sutton quotes, in the service of the Germans.

Sutton points out that Trotsky's funds were traceable to German sources.

(Chapter III of Sutton's book.) In the meantime, Lenin (1870-1924), along with a wolf-pack of 32 brave "revolutionaries," had in April left Switzerland for Petrograd by way of Germany. 32 is a favourite number of the Masons, and so is 1, and 32+1 is particularly sweet; whether that means anything, I can not tell.

The German General Staff had OKed the Lenin operation for the destabilization of Russia, apparently without consulting the Kaiser. Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg was the key German official in the scheme. Theobald (1856-1921) was the heir of the banking family of Bethmann of Frankfurt, who had made a killing in the late 18th century. As one would suspect, the houses of Bethmann and Rothschild were close to each other in the 19th century, sometimes in co-operation, sometimes in competition.

One of the intermediaries between Lenin and Bethmann-Hollweg was one Alexander Israel Helphand, a.k.a. Parvus (1867-1924). The creature Parvus had been an agitator and propagandist during the 1905 revolution, and had spent some time in Siberia. The great revolutionary also helped the Turkish revolution by "advising" the Young Turks. From Wikipedia "He worked closely with the triumvirs known as the Three Pashas - Enver, Talat and Cemal - and Finance Minister Djavid Bey. The triumvirs of Three Pashas planned and executed the Armenian Massacres in 1915." Parvus's firm had contacts with Krupp, Vickers, and the legendary merchant of death Basil Zacharoff (1849-1936). Rumours identified him as a British and a German agent in turn. But what if Parvus had merely been an agent of the international bankers? During the Great War, Parvus did work with the German Intelligence, and apparently came up with the idea of using the German desire to sabotage Russia in order to have the opportunity to complete the Revolution. He got his opportunity in 1917. It should be clear that Lenin was not a German agent. He was a revolutionary after the Blanquist tradition, and his interests momentarily coincided with those of the Germans.

The Anglo-Americans were well aware of the coming storm. London warned its citizens "at least six weeks before the revolution." The US State Department received reports of the upcoming collapse in September and October 1917.

After the action started, "On November 28, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson ordered no interference with the Bolshevik Revolution." Also, "As early as November 28, 1917, Colonel House cabled President Woodrow Wilson from Paris that it was "exceedingly important" that U.S. newspaper comments advocating that "Russia should be treated as an enemy" be "suppressed." "

Colonel House (1858-1938) was a major behind-the-scenes player of the era, and the author of the bizarre novel *Philip Dru: Administrator* (1912), which explicitly called for a socialistic revolution.

We find in Wikipedia that "House helped to make four men governor of Texas: James S. Hogg (1892), Charles A. Culberson (1894), Joseph D. Sayers (1898), and S. W. T. Lanham (1902). After the election House acted as unofficial advisor to each governor. Hogg gave House the title "Colonel" by promoting House to his staff." House was in Paris after the war, where he worked closely with Milner, and he helped set up both the League of Nations and the CFR. In 1930s he had some contact with FDR.

So far only Wilson, the Germans, and Crane have featured in our play. This is where the big guns - Rockefeller and Morgan - come in. In the early 20th century, John D. and J.P. commanded vast monopolistic empires in the United States. Rockefeller had the oil industry, the copper trust, railroads, and banks. His flagship, the City Bank, commanded the major insurers Equitable Life and Mutual of New York. Morgan had his great bank, G.E., the rubber trust, railroads, and more. Chase Manhattan was a Morgan operation before it merged with the Rockefeller interests later in the century. Morgan also controlled the important Guaranty Trust Company, which had been dominated by the Harrimans. Says Sutton, (Chapter IV) "at the end of World War I the Guaranty Trust and

Bankers Trust were, respectively, the first and second largest trust companies in the United States, both dominated by Morgan interests.”

The best-documented example of Wall Street intervention in revolution is the operation of a New York syndicate in the Chinese revolution of 1912, which was led by Sun Yat-sen. Although the final gains of the syndicate remain unclear, the intention and role of the New York financing group are fully documented down to amounts of money, information on affiliated Chinese secret societies, and shipping lists of armaments to be purchased. The New York bankers syndicate for the Sun Yat-sen revolution included Charles B. Hill, an attorney with the law firm of Hunt, Hill & Betts. In 1912 the firm was located at 165 Broadway, New York, but in 1917 it moved to 120 Broadway...

The bankers had also financed revolutions in Panama and Mexico. They knew what they were doing.

In affront to express prohibitions from the government, the Morgan interests had floated loans to the Tsarist government via Stockholm in the early years of the war. Their connection was Olof Aschberg (1877-1960), later known as the "Bolshevik Banker."

(emphasis mine) Olof Aschberg, the "Bolshevik Banker" (or "Bankier der Weltrevolution," as he has been called in the German press), was owner of the Nya Banken, founded 1912 in Stockholm. His codirectors included prominent members of Swedish cooperatives and Swedish socialists, including G. W. Dahl, K. G. Rosling, and C. Gerhard Magnusson. In 1918 Nya Banken was placed on the Allied black-list for its financial operations in behalf of Germany. In response to the blacklisting, Nya Banken changed its name to Svensk Ekonomiebolaget. The bank remained under the control of Aschberg, and was mainly owned by him. **The bank's London agent was the British Bank of North Commerce, whose chairman was Earl Grey, former associate of Cecil Rhodes.** Others in Aschberg's interesting circle of business associates included Krassin, who was until the Bolshevik Revolution (when he changed color to emerge as a leading Bolshevik) Russian manager of Siemens-Schukert in Petrograd; Carl Furstenberg, minister of finance in the first Bolshevik government; and Max May, vice president in charge of foreign operations for Guaranty Trust of New York. Olof Aschberg thought so highly of Max May that a photograph of May is included in Aschberg's book.

Here we have a connection with Milner's people; nor will it be the last.

While he funded the Tsarist government with one hand, Aschberg channelled German government funds to the Bolsheviks with the other.

After the revolution, Aschberg became the head of Ruskombank, the first Bolshevik international bank, heavily backed by the British. The bank later morphed into Vneshtorg. It was a major institution, and provided the international banker cabal with a quiet route of communication with the USSR.

True to their calling, the bankers had also managed to finance Germany via Guaranty Trust and the American International Corporation. Information to this effect was reported by U.S. Military Intelligence to the 1919 Overman Committee of the U.S. Senate. "The first loan, of \$400,000, was made about September 1914 by the investment bankers Kuhn, Loeb & Co. Collateral of 25 million marks was deposited with Max M. Warburg in Hamburg, the German affiliate of Kuhn, Loeb & Co." Other parties transacted a second \$1.3 million loan. Morgan's Chase Bank dished out a third, \$3 million loan. The affair also featured a spy scandal.

The various bankers had, of course, also financed Britain and France.

(Chapter V) The American Red Cross was mainly banker funded, and in 1917 it did the bidding of the bankers. In August 1917, a Red Cross mission, financed by William Boyce Thompson (1869-1930) the head of the New York Fed, embarked for Russia.

One contemporary observer dubbed the all-officer group an "Haytian Army":

The American Red Cross delegation, about forty Colonels, Majors, Captains and Lieutenants, arrived yesterday. It is headed by Colonel (Doctor) Billings of Chicago, and includes Colonel William B. Thompson and many doctors and civilians, all with military titles; we dubbed the outfit the "Haytian Army" because there were no privates. They have come to fill no clearly defined mission, as far as I can find out, in fact Gov. Francis told me some time ago that he had urged they not be allowed to come, as there were already too many missions from the various allies in Russia. Apparently, this Commission imagined there was urgent call for doctors and nurses in Russia; as a matter of fact there is at present a surplus of medical talent and nurses, native and foreign in the country and many half-empty hospitals in the large cities.

The mission actually consisted of 24 persons, of whom only five were doctors and orderlies. These doctors went home in disgust after about a month. In reality, the mission involved a gang of hard-core Wall Streeters plus a few attorneys. After the revolution commenced, the *Washington Post* informed its readers on February 2, 1918, that Thompson of the New York Fed had given the Bolsheviks a cool million dollars "for the purpose of spreading their doctrine in Germany and Austria." In return, the Bolsheviks allowed the National City bank (Rockefeller) to operate in Petrograd unmolested - City was the only foreign banks awarded that honour.

The Germans enjoyed a Communist revolt of their own in 1918. As they say, he who digs a grave for his neighbour... Sutton quotes a French report (Chapter VI) saying that "It appeared that Colonel Robins... was able to send a subversive mission of Russian bolsheviks to Germany to start a revolution there."

Thompson left for London. He left his assistant Raymond Robins (1873-1954) behind to manage affairs. Later, Robbins opined "that had the U.S. so recognized the Bolsheviks, 'I believe that we would now be in control of the surplus resources of Russia and have control officers at all points on the frontier.'"

The Red Cross is also the symbol of the City of London and the Knights Templar.

Sutton starts his chapter VI with the following quote:

Marx's great book *Das Kapital* is at once a monument of reasoning and a storehouse of facts.

Lord Milner, member of the British War Cabinet, 1917, and director of the London Joint Stock Bank

In London, Thompson had a private discussion with Lloyd George (1863-1945), who headed what really was the Milner government. Apparently, Lloyd George was also " beholden " to Basil Zaharoff.

(emphasis Sutton's) Zaharoff wielded enormous behind-the-scenes power and, according to McCormick, was consulted on war policies by the Allied leaders. On more than one occasion, reports McCormick, Woodrow Wilson, Lloyd George, and Georges Clemenceau met in Zaharoff's Paris home. McCormick notes that "Allied statesmen and leaders were obliged to consult him before planning any great attack." British intelligence, according to McCormick, "discovered documents which incriminated servants of the Crown as secret agents of Sir Basil Zaharoff *with the knowledge of Lloyd George.*" In 1917 Zaharoff was linked to the Bolsheviks; he sought to divert munitions away from anti-Bolsheviks and had already intervened in behalf of the Bolshevik regime in both London and Paris.

Basil Zaharoff (1849-1936) was born in Turkey, became a French citizen in 1908, and worked for Vickers (the British arms manufacturer) between 1897 and 1927. During his career, Zaharoff managed to sell munitions to most of Europe plus Japan and the United States. He was one the original

peddler of the Maxim machine gun, which was the first fully automatic machine gun. Zaharoff's corruption and disregard for law and morality were legendary.

Milner's man in Russia was one Bruce Lockhart (1887-1970).

Sutton summarizes the farce as follows:

In brief, behind and below the military, diplomatic, and political aspects of World War I, there was another battle raging, namely, a maneuvering for postwar world economic power by international operators with significant muscle and influence. Thompson was not a Bolshevik; he was not even pro-Bolshevik. Neither was he pro-Kerensky. Nor was he even pro-American. The overriding motivation was the capturing of the postwar Russian market. This was a commercial, not an ideological, objective. Ideology could sway revolutionary operators like Kerensky, Trotsky, Lenin et al., but not financiers.

I disagree with Sutton only in that financial profiteering constitutes an ideology unto itself. All the players were ideologically driven - and their ideologies were not even all that different, since they both pursued monopoly in power - only the Bolshevik tried to win their monopoly by capturing political power using "capitalist" resources, and the bankers tried to capture commercial power using true believers on long leashes. Who was the winner in this whole pantomime? Could the Bolsheviks, who before the war had been little more than a motley crew of bums, have outsmarted the Anglo-American banking cabal and its Franco-German sometime allies? No.

Back in the States, Thompson blithely promoted support for the Bolshevik government. His less informed Wall Street cronies thought the poor man had gone bonkers, or worse.

Meanwhile in Russia, the official ambassadors of the Allies - Francis, Buchanan, and Paleologue - witnessed the Revolution with undisguised horror and disgust (revolt?). In reality, Robins and Lockhart had taken over as the representatives of the States and Britain.

Many of the threads of Sutton's research met at the address of 120 Broadway, whence stood a building housing the offices of: Equitable Life Assurance Company, whose man in Germany was William Schacht, the father of Hitler's financier; The Bankers Club; the headquarters of the New York Fed; the offices of the American International Corporation; and other companies.

After attaining some hold of power in 1917 and early 1918, the Bolsheviks found themselves in a tight spot. Wall Street flew to their aid like a noble knight to the aid of a maiden in distress. The bankers also financed some of the Russian White opposition - perhaps to hedge their bets, or perhaps to control and disable the White threat.

The financiers commissioned large contracts with the Bolsheviks - for example, "The largest order in 1919-20 was contracted to Morris & Co., Chicago meatpackers, for fifty million pounds of food products, valued at approximately \$10 million. The Morris meatpacking family was related to the Swift family. Helen Swift, later connected with the Abraham Lincoln Center "Unity," was married to Edward Morris (of the meatpacking firm) and was also the brother of Harold H. Swift, a "major" in the 1917 Thompson Red Cross Mission to Russia." Sutton lists a number of 1919-1920 contracts to the tune of \$25 million. The Soviets used the money to buy materiel for their own operations. They also used the Tsarist imperial gold, which the financiers melted into bullion. By the mid-1920s, the bankers had leached up to \$20 million of Russian gold.

Another useful source on the matter of the financing of the Bolshevik Revolution is A. Goulevitch's insightful *Czarism and Revolution* (1931). Goulevitch lists three sources of Bolshevik funding: (Chapter X and footnotes thereof) 1) least important were the domestic, Russian funds, which came from

the few Russian persons of note who decided to aid the revolutionaries, and from the proceeds of revolutionary racketeering. 2) The main financiers of the Revolution were, in Goulevitch's opinion, those curious Anglo-American circles, which we have been examining. Specifically, Goulevitch reports that "in private I have been told that over 21 million roubles were spent by Lord Milner in financing the Russian Revolution." Goulevitch also fingered Jacob Schiff and the Warburgs. 3) The other major backers of the Revolution were the Germans. This checks with Sutton's findings. In particular, Goulevitch wrote the following:

On April 7, 1917, General Janin made the following entry in his diary ("Au G.C.G. Russe" - at Russian G.H.Q. - "Le Monde Slave," No. 2, 1927, pp.296-297): "Long interview with R., who confirmed what I had previously been told by M. After referring to the German hatred of himself and his family, he turned to the subject of the Revolution which, he claimed, was engineered by the English and, more precisely, by Sir George Buchanan and Lord Milner. Petrograd at the time was teeming with English... He could, he asserted, name the streets and the numbers of the houses in which British agents were quartered. They were reported, during the rising, to have distributed money to the soldiers and incited them to mutiny. He, personally, had seen in the Millionnaia Street persons who he knew were British agents handing 25 rouble notes to the men of the Pavlovski Regiment a few hours before it turned coat and joined the revolution."

Let us, then, look at Milner's man in Petrograd - Lockhart, who wrote about himself in a 1933 book called *Memoirs of a British Agent*.

Bruce Lockhart (1887-1970) was a Scotsman of an ancient bloodline. In his youth he was something of an adventurer with a penchant for learning languages and understanding foreign cultures. By the age of 25 he had seen Berlin, Paris, and Malaya, and had acquired a post as the British vice-consul in Moscow. As the war progressed, Lockhart found himself climbing up the hierarchical ladder thanks both to Fate and his own ability.

In Chapter 3.3 of his Memoirs, Lockhart exonerates Buchanan in strong language.

(3.7) Lockhart first met Milner in January 1917, on the eve of the first wave of the Revolution, when Milner travelled to Petrograd for the inter-Allied conference. Lockhart spent a full day with Milner, and found him "the most understanding and sympathetic" of "all the great figures in public life" whom he had met. A week later, Milner went to Moscow, where he met the Prince Lvov, who would but a few weeks later become the first Prime Minister of Russia. Lockhart acted as interpreter. Lvov told Milner that unless the Tsar acted quickly and decisively, a revolution would occur within three weeks. Indeed, the March 12 coup revolution occurred less than three weeks after the Allied delegates had left.

After the formation of the Lvov cabinet, Lockhart had access to the Prime Minister, whom he knew personally. Through him, Lockhart met Karensky, who "was only one man in the Cabinet who had any power."

Lockhart got himself fired over an amorous adventure. (4.1) He arrived in London six weeks before the October Revolution. A few weeks later, he met Milner at a discrete dinner party. The two men and the few other guests talked late into the night. Lockhart told Milner that in his opinion the British had to establish contact with the rulers of Russia, whoever those were. "Lord Milner was very sympathetic." This occurred around the time of Thompson's visit to London. On December 21, Lloyd George, under the influence of the Thompson visit, indicated that he would send Lockhart to Russia at Milner's request. On the 4th of January 1918, Lockhart was sent to Russia to act as an unofficial ambassador. He got to St. Petersburg in February. The Bolsheviks "welcomed" his arrival. Some American intelligence officers mistook Lockhart for a "dangerous revolutionary." On his third evening in St. Petersburg, Lockhart met Robins.

(4.3) "Although a rich man himself, he was an anti-capitalist. Yet, in spite of his sympathies for the under-dog, he was a worshipper of great men. Hitherto, his two heroes had

been Roosevelt and Cecil Rhodes. Now Lenin had captured his imagination. Strangely enough, Lenin was amused by the hero-worship, and of all foreigners Robins was the only man whom Lenin was always willing to see and who ever succeeded in imposing his own personality on the unemotional Bolshevik leader."

Strange indeed! "For the next four months we were to be in daily and almost hourly contact." Teddy Roosevelt (1858-1919) was an Anglophile, an imperialist, and a eugenicist. Naturally, his efforts earned him the Noble Peace Prize.

In March, everybody moved to Moscow, from where the Bolsheviks planned to consolidate their hold of the land. Robins was there, and he had frequent contact with Lenin and the rest of the commissariat. So did Lockhart.

Robins left in May "in order to make a personal appeal to President Wilson. The night before he left he dined with us. He had been reading Rhodes's life and after dinner he gave us a wonderful exposition of Rhodes's character."

The main goal of the British seems to have been to ensure that they rather than the Germans would exercise influence - of whatever type or degree - over the Bolshevik government of Russia. To this end, Balfour pressed for an acceptance of British support on the part of the Bolsheviks. Moreover, the spring of 1918 saw the Ludendorff offensive, and for a while the situation on the Western Front became critical. Wrote Lockhart:

(4.7) The British Foreign Office - I write Foreign Office intentionally, because the British War Office seemed to have a totally different policy - was pressing us hard for an immediate acceptance by the Bolsheviks of Allied military support. Presumably, although I do not think the conditions were ever laid down, they were prepared, in return for this consent, to guarantee to the Bolsheviks complete noninterference in Russia's internal affairs.

...

...one evening I received a telegram which was as long as a despatch. I sat up until late into the night deciphering it. It was from Mr. Balfour.

...

"...I have received your telegram informing me of Trotsky's request for British naval and technical experts. This is good news. If you can, indeed, persuade Trotsky to resist German penetration, you will have earned the gratitude of your own country and of all humanity."

In May, Lockhart had the privilege of meeting the official American Ambassador - a complete dolt, who knew banking and poker but not Pushkin, and whose favored mode of behaviour was frequent expectoration in the direction of his "travelling spittoon."

Soon after, Lockhart met Sidney Reilly (1873-1925), "the mystery man of the British secret service and known today to the outside world as the master spy of Britain." Reilly had been sent behind Lockhart's back to talk with the Bolsheviks.

A few days later, Lockhart helped smuggle Kerensky out of Russia.

(4.8) All the while, London's confidence in Lockhart was draining. The Bolsheviks also had begun to have their doubts.

On July 22, an official British Economic Mission composed of William Clark, Leslie Urquhart, Armistead, and Peters, "arrived in Moscow. They had come to discuss the possibilities of trade relations with the Bolsheviks. Their arrival staggered me. As far as I knew - and I had no certain knowledge - our intervention was only a matter of days." There is no indication that the men were part of Milner's circle. Lockhart was shocked by their arrival and decided that "one department in Whitehall not knowing what the other was doing." The delegation left a couple of days after arriving.

Reilly kept doing his stuff, whatever that was.

The intervention started almost immediately after. It was a joke, designed to fail:

(4.9) We had committed the unbelievable folly of landing at Archangel with fewer than twelve hundred men.

It was a blunder comparable with the worst mistakes of the Crimean War. In the chaotic state of Russia it was obvious that, if intervention was to be a success, it must start well. It had begun as badly as it could, and no individual gallantry could ever repair that initial mistake.

It should be understood that Lockhart had informed London of the real prospects of an intervention. Those in charge knew what they were doing. The Allied intervention always was nothing more than a gesture designed to pacify domestic anti-Bolshevik elements.

The consequences of this ill-conceived venture were to be disastrous both to our prestige and to, the fortunes of those Russians who supported us. It raised hopes which could not be fulfilled. It intensified the civil war and sent thousands of Russians to their death. Indirectly, it was responsible for the Terror. Its direct effect was to provide the Bolsheviks with a cheap victory, to give them a new confidence, and to galvanise them into a strong and ruthless organism. To have intervened at all was a mistake. To have intervened with hopelessly inadequate forces was an example of paralytic half-measures, which in the circumstances amounted to a crime.

Lockhart's stint ended in the crackdown, which followed the August 30 assassination attempt on Lenin. Lockhart was arrested, released, arrested again and imprisoned for a month. Following the harrowing experience, he left Russia - for good.

We can make the following conclusions: 1) Milner had his finger on the pulse of the Bolshevik wrist via his intermediary Lockhart, who was a perfect agent by virtue of being largely unaware of the larger picture; 2) the British deliberately sabotaged the anti-Bolshevik efforts of the Allies and the White Russians; 3) other British agents, such as Reilly, were up to no good in Moscow in 1918; 4) there are indications to the effect that the British anticipated the February (March) 1917 insurrection.

Guido Giacomo Preparata's excellent *Conjuring Hitler* offers a number of useful insights into the whole affair. As we have pointed out, one of the main goals of World War I always was the destruction of both Russia and Germany. Some worthwhile points, drawn from the first chapter of the book: In 1915, in order to keep Russia, who had little to gain from the war, in the game, the British had promised Istanbul to the Tsar. That the promise was hollow and the Tsar naive to believe it goes without saying. But this promise also gives the British a motive for the desire to remove the Tsarist government. Writes Preparata,

On January 12, 1917, Lord George Buchanan, British ambassador in St. Petersburg, conferring with the Czar, was informed by the latter that a peace conference, 'the final one,' was to be expected soon. Buchanan rejoined that the Czar should take after the British government, and draw into the Imperial Cabinet an exponent of the 'moderate Left' so as to reach the twofold objective of soothing social disquiet while pursuing the offensive against the Germans. The Czar did not seem to decipher the message, and reiterated his intention of seeking the peace with Wilhelm II. Veiling a threat, Buchanan alluded mysteriously to the possibility of revolution and dropped the hint that he had had foreknowledge, by a week, of Rasputin's assassination. Nicholas paid no heed. Like his German counterparts, he could not fathom how determined Britain was to prevent any form of dialogue between Russia and Germany.

The Bolshevik Revolution, which was always going to end in a civil war, also merited support from the point of view of the British for the plain fact that it would plunge Russia into an orgy of destruction. The parallel German Communist insurrection was created for a similar reason. Not for nothing had Marx head-quartered in London. Another advantage of the Bolsheviks was their avowed hatred of Germany - though Germany, ironically, played a hand in their success.

Preparata analyses the "the Allied betrayal of the Russian Whites" in the second chapter of his book.

He reiterates the proposed thesis, namely that the whole Allied intervention was a scam designed to 1) allow the Bolsheviks to win power through much bloodshed, 2) fool the public opinion in the West, and 3) if necessary, prevent a German take-over of additional parts of Russia.

Also of interest are the statistics provided in Chapter 45 of Volume 1 of Herbert Hoover's autobiography.¹⁹ At the time, Hoover (1874-1964, President 1929-1933) was in charge of the American Relief Administration. He was against recognition of the Soviets, against intervention, but for a relief programs with strings attached - or, if necessary, for purely humanitarian purposes. The relief did take place in the spring of 1919. Millions of starving Russians were saved from a gruesome doom. Further relief took place in 1921, when the Bolsheviks in their incompetence and savagery had managed to destroy the corn-producing capacity of the grain-basket of Europe.

The Americans gave White Russia: 20 thousand tons of food, and 8 thousand tons of clothing and medicine.

They gave Red Russia: 730 thousand tons of food, and 11.5 thousand tons of clothing and medicine. In monetary terms, the financing of the White relief was largely in the form of loans from US banks (Preparata points out that Kolchak's "gold chest exceeded by 52.7 percent the entire gold reserve of the Bank of England." Much of the gold ended up in various Western/ Japanese bank-vaults as security for loans. Kolchak was betrayed, and shot by the Reds.), while a good two-thirds of the Red relief, out of a total worth \$83 million, is listed as "Charity from United States."

Hoover was a sincere anti-Communist as well a human being decent enough to aid those whom he could aid. Woodrow Wilson's role in the affair, however, was, in all likelihood, less than genuine.

This should be enough. In short, the Bolsheviks would never have attained - or held to - power without the help of the Anglophile bankers, who sought to demolish and exploit Russia - just like in the 1990s.

Prior to the war, industrialization had proceeded at a spectacular pace in Russia. Remember that real "democracy" needs prosperity as a prerequisite. Tragically, the combined calamity of the Great War and the Civil War brought Russia to its knees. The Russians had only slightly recovered under Stalin, when they were hit by the Second World War, which inflicted unimaginable devastation on the Russians for the second time in thirty years. The Russians recovered again, to suffer another Wall Street raid in the 1990s, thanks in part to the treachery of such specimens as Yeltsin and Chubais. Today, Russia has managed to pick itself up from the ground again, though it faces considerable demographic, economic, and geo-strategic challenges.

Some Americans, properly brainwashed during the Cold War, harbour latent and utterly irrational antagonism toward Russia. Such blind hatred is unnecessary! Russia has been America's friend for most of America's history. Take the three largest wars that America waged - the Civil War and the World Wars. In all three, Russia was America's dedicated ally. In extending his support to Lincoln, the Tsar Liberator famously said that he would see the freedom he had extended to his serfs awarded to the black slaves of the United States.²⁰ In both the World Wars the Russians suffered terrific casualties while the Americans emerged with an unscathed infrastructure and comparatively minor losses. What more proof can one ask for? The Americans were, in turn, the friends of the Russians. The American food relief in the early 1920s saved millions of Russian lives. The Lend-Lease of World War II was instrumental to the Red Army's success.

Some may complain about the Russian support to North Korea and North Vietnam. Two points: first, the Soviet government, which aided the communist Asian regimes, was the same government that the Wall Street financiers and their City pals had installed; and second, except for a few pilots in Korea, no Russians fought in Korea and Vietnam. On the other hand, the Americans were murdering millions an ocean away from home. But, of course, the blame for this travesty, too, lies

¹⁹Thanks to Stanley Monteith for providing the reference; in his *Brotherhood of Darkness*, Monteith reaches conclusions similar to mine.

²⁰That the Civil War was not really about the slaves does not diminish the point.

squarely at the feet of the Oligarchy.

One more important point in regard to the Bolshevik Revolution is that it was a coup more than a revolution. In effect, the communists superseded the Tsarist machinery of nobility and democracy, and Lenin took over Nicholas II's capacities. The new system was more repressive than the old system and introduced the classic Roman Empire problem of the succession of the autocrat. Succession under the Tsar followed primogeniture with the odd aberration like Catherine the Great. Under the Soviets, behind-the-scenes orgies of backstabbing threatened the integrity of the entire Soviet edifice, especially between the reigns of Lenin and Stalin.

People often imagine that the magical Revolution would suddenly fix everything and change the whole world overnight. This is not the case. A revolution can not instantly change the worldview of an entire population. Changing the culture of a nation takes a concerted effort over at least a generation, because people generally do not dramatically alter the outlook that they adopt in their formative years (before the age of 25). One²¹ paramount characteristic of the historical Russian outlook is the need of the Russian people for a strong leader. This existed under Peter the Great, under Alexander I and Alexander II, under Stalin, and today the need exists under Putin. When Russia's leader is strong, Russia prospers; and when he is weak, Russia suffers. The Revolution had nothing to do with liberty or equality. It was conducted by a gang of dangerously insane highly murderous criminals who should have been thrown out in the Galapagos to build their wonderful social order among the turtles and Darwin's ghost. The Revolution tried to supplant Orthodox Christianity with the creed of Marxism, the mildly-Tolstoyan and heavily-Oblomovian nobility with the thuggish narrow-minded Nomenklatura, and the patriarchal Tsar with the messianic Great Revolutionary. The exercise was destructive, unnecessary, and by no means Russian in nature.

5.10.3 1920-1990

Wall Street and the City supported the Communist regime for its duration, before engineering its collapse in the 1980s.

The classic reference on the subject is Sutton's *The Best Enemy Money Can Buy* (1986).

From Chapter 2 of that work: "Almost all - possibly 95 percent - of Soviet military vehicles are produced in very large plants designed by American engineers in the 1930s through the 1970s."

Vehicle production - and that includes both civilian and military vehicles - tended to take place in vast industrial plants such as those Detroit used to be famous for. How were Russia's auto-plants built? They were built with Western know-how, often by Western engineers.

The vast Gorkovsky Avtomobilny Zavod - GAZ - was built largely with the help of Ford in 1932. The Zavod imeni Likhachova - ZIL - was built with the aid of U.S. A.J. Brandt Co. in 1929. The Brandt intervention was a one-off affair, and ZIL produced about 30,000 trucks annually in 1930. GAZ was "designed from scratch" by Ford (who remained interested in Russia) and produced 140,000 vehicles per year.

The Ford-Gorki group of assembly plants includes the plants at Ulyanovsk (model designation UAZ), Odessa (model designation OAZ), and Pavlovo (model designation PAZ). The BBH-ZIL group includes the truck plants at Mytischiy (MMZ model designation), Miass (or URAL Zis), Dnepropetrovsk (model designation DAZ), Kutaisi (KAZ model), and Lvov (LAZ model). Besides these main groups there are also five independent plants. The Minsk truck plant (MAZ) was built with German assistance. The Hercules-Yaroslavl truck plant (YaAz) was built by the Hercules Motor Company. The MZMA plant in Moscow, which manufactures small automobiles, was also built by Ford Motor Company.

In the late 1960s, Fiat of our friend the Bilderberger Agnelli, participated in the construction of the "so-called Fiat-Togliatti" plant. "Three-quarters of this equipment came from the United States."

²¹The other one is propensity toward extremism.

In 1972 - during the Vietnam War - the US government "issued \$1 billion in licenses to export equipment and technical assistance for the Kama truck plant. Planned as the largest truck plant in the world, it covers 36 square miles and produces more heavy trucks, including military trucks, than the output of all U.S. heavy truck manufacturers combined."

(emphasis Sutton's) This comprises the complete Soviet vehicle manufacturing industry **all built with Western, primarily American, technical assistance and technology**. Military models are produced in these plants utilizing the same components as the civilian models. The two main vehicle production centers, Gorki and ZIL, manufacture more than two-thirds of all Soviet civilian vehicles (excluding the new Togliatti and Kama plants) and almost all current military vehicles.

GAZ was built with the assistance of Ford and allied companies between 1929 and 1933 at a price of \$13 million in Soviet purchases of "automobiles and parts." The plant produced Fords - the early models even bore a Ford sign.

ZIL was an upgrade of the 1916 Tsarist AMO plant, which had also been built with American materials.

Both massive plants provided equipment used in the Korea and Vietnam wars.

But it gets better! Chapter 3:

Under intense political pressure from the deaf mute blindmen, U.S. politicians, particularly in the Johnson and Nixon administrations under the prodding of Henry Kissinger (a long-time employee of the Rockefeller family), allowed the Togliatti (Volgograd) and Kama River plants to be built.

The Volgograd automobile plant, built between 1968 and 1971, has a capacity of 600,000 vehicles per year, three times more than the Ford-built Gorki plant, which up to 1968 had been the largest auto plant in the USSR.

Although Volgograd is described in Western literature as the "Togliatti plant" or the "Fiat-Soviet auto plant," and does indeed produce a version of the Fiat-124 sedan, the core of the technology is American. Three-quarters of the equipment, including the key transfer lines and automatics, came from the United States. It is truly extraordinary that a plant with known military potential could have been equipped from the United States in the middle of the Vietnamese War, a war in which the North Vietnamese received 80 percent of their supplies from the Soviet Union.

The construction contract, awarded to [Agnelli's] Fiat S.p.A., a firm closely associated with [Rockefeller's] Chase Manhattan Bank, included an engineering fee of \$65 million.

Three-quarters of the stuff came from America, and the other quarter from Italy and the rest of Europe, including U.S. subsidiary companies.

This was not enough, and in 1972 the US-A helped the US-SR built the Kama Plant, with an annual production capacity of 100,000 trucks. Kissinger was behind this project as well. Another culprit is George P. Shultz (1920-), a Bechtel cadre, a Chicago boy, and the Secretary of State under Reagan. The financing went through the Import-Export Bank, which at the time floated under the sage guidance of Bill Casey (1913-1987), who was the CIA chief under Reagan. David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan was also involved.

(Chapters 4, 5, 6) The Americans also gave the Soviets various high-tech blueprints - fuses for bombs, semi-conductors, PCs, serial production know-how, precision guidance for missiles, rocketry components, and so on.

(Ch.6) Even though the Tsar had had a decent air fleet, by 1930 the Soviet airforce consisted almost solely of foreign airplanes. In the 1930s, the Soviets borrowed a significant amount of blueprints from the West, and particularly from America. For example, "in 1937-38, the Vultee Aircraft Division

of Aviation Manufacturing Corporation of Downey, California built a fighter aircraft plant for the Soviets in Moscow.” The US (including Standard Oil) also helped the Soviets with the process for the production of aviation fuel.

The massive Stupino aluminum-works near Moscow was built in 1939 with the help of United Engineering and Foundry. The Lend-Lease helped establish a number of other plants. The Soviet aviation industry would not have been possible without this help. All Soviet aircraft engines were of foreign models under license.

After the war, it was Britain’s turn to help the Soviet aviation industry. Rolls-Royce jet technology combined with captive German materiel and personnel provided the Soviet with the MiGs that they used in Korea.

Note that the Germans had effectively invented the jet-fighter, and had even employed a working model during the war - the Me-262. Also note that after the war the Soviets literally transplanted Germany’s industry from Prussia to Russia.

The Americans got their share of German engineers via the infamous OSS (proto-CIA) ”Operation Paperclip.” Werner von Braun would later be instrumental in the development of the American space program.

(Chapter 7) A proper bogeyman in the nuclear era had to have nukes and the capability to deliver them. That is why the United States gave the Soviets accelerometers and ball bearings (for missile guidance) for ICBMs.

What about the Soviet Navy?

(Chapter 8) All told, in 1941 the Soviet fleet comprised 3 battleships, 8 cruisers, 85 destroyers and torpedo boats, 24 minelayers, 75 minesweepers, 300 motor torpedo boats and gunboats, and 250 submarines. Most were built in the West or to Western designs. U.S. Lend-Lease added 491 ships to this total: 46 110-foot submarine chasers and 59 65-foot submarine chasers, 221 torpedo boats (24 of them from the United Kingdom), 77 minesweepers, 28 frigates, 52 small landing craft, 2 large landing craft from the United Kingdom, and 6 cargo barges. In addition to combat vessels, Lend-Lease transferred merchant ships and marine engines.

In terms of tonnage, Lend-Lease probably doubled the size of the Soviet Navy. Only a small number of these naval ships have been returned, although the Lend-Lease master agreement required the return of all vessels.

What about the Red merchant marine?

(emphasis Sutton’s) There are two extraordinary facts about the gigantic strategic Soviet merchant marine:

First: over two-thirds of its ship tonnage has been built outside the Soviet Union. The remaining one-third was built in Soviet yards and to a great extent with shipbuilding equipment from the West, particularly Finland and NATO allies, Great Britain and Germany.

Second: four-fifths of the main marine diesel engines used to propel the vessels of the Soviet merchant marine were actually built in the West. In other words, only one-fifth of the main diesel engines were built in the USSR. Moreover, even this startling statistic does not reflect the full nature of Soviet dependence on foreign marine diesel technology because **all of the main engines manufactured in the USSR are built to foreign designs.**

(Chapter 10) The US also financed the building of Soviet oil and gas pipelines.

(Chapter 13) Then we have tanks. Those are produced at tractor plants. Who built the Soviet tractor plants?

The tractor plants at Stalingrad, Kharkov, and Chelyabinsk, erected with almost complete American assistance and equipment, and the Kirov plant in Leningrad, reconstructed by Ford, were used from the start to produce Soviet tanks, armored cars, and self-propelled guns. The enthusiasm with which this tank and armored-vehicle program was pursued, and the diversion of the best Russian engineers and material priorities to military purposes, have been responsible for at least part of the current Soviet problem of lagging tractor production and periodic famines.

—
Soviet tractor plants were established in the early 1930s with major U.S. technical and equipment assistance. The Stalingrad tractor plant was completely built in the United States, shipped to Stalingrad, and then installed in prefabricated steel buildings also purchased in the United States. This unit, together with the Kharkov and Chelyabinsk plants and the rebuilt Kirov plant in Leningrad, comprised the Soviet tractor industry at that time, and a considerable part of the Soviet tank industry as well. During the war, equipment from Kharkov was evacuated and installed behind the Urals to form the Altai tractor plant, which opened in 1943.

Three postwar tractor plants were in operation by 1950: the Valdimir plant opened in 1944, the Lipetsk plant in 1947, the Minsk plant and the Kharkov assembly plant in 1950. This was the basic structure of the Soviet tractor industry in the 1960s and 1970s.

Moreover, Soviet tank designs drew heavily on Western models and technology. The famous T-34 was based on the American Christie design. The model won the Second World War, and saw heavy use in Korea.

The Stalingrad Tractor Plant, the largest in Europe, was a packaged factory built in the United States, dismantled, shipped to the USSR, and re-erected at Stalingrad under the supervision of American engineers. All its equipment was manufactured in the United States by some eight firms; it went into production with the Harvester 15/30 model and the T-37 3-ton tank.

...

The Kharkov "tractor" plant was identical to the Stalingrad plant. The original intention was to build Kharkov as an all-Soviet undertaking, but American engineers were called in at a very early point.

...

The Chelyabinsk "tractor" plant was started in 1930, without foreign technical assistance, as another duplicate of the Stalingrad Tractor Plant. One year later, in March 1931, a letter to the Soviet press, signed by thirty-five Chelyabinsk Tractor Plant engineers and economists, charged that the project was "on the verge of total collapse."

American engineers, including John Calder, the expert troubleshooter, were then called in to take over construction of the plant and initial operating responsibility.

In short, practically the entire Soviet military-industrial capacity of World War II was Western - largely American - built.

The same, though to a lesser degree, holds for the Nazi war machine, as we will see later.

And yes, the Americans also aided the Soviets with the development of the A-bomb. Look up George Racey Jordan's *From Major Jordan's Diaries* (1952).

We have already met Averell Harriman of Skull & Bones. Let us browse through the biographies of a few more personages invested in the Soviet con game.

David Rockefeller dedicates Chapter 17 of his *Memoirs* (2002) to the history of his contact with the Soviet Union. As a good banker, David believed in putting business before politics - and so he

met with Houari Boumedienne of Algeria, Mobutu Sese Soko of Zaire, Augusto Pinochet of Chile, Saddam Hussein, Marshal Tito, Ceausescu, Wojciech Jaruzelski, Alfredo Stroessner of Paraguay, "all the modern leaders of racist South Africa," Zhou Enlai, and "virtually every leader of the Soviet Union from Nikita Khrushchev through Mikhail Gorbachev," and also Fidel during the latter's 1996 visit to New York. David first met with the Russians in 1962 at the Dartmouth post-Cuban-Crisis conference. In 1964, he travelled to Leningrad, which gave him the opportunity to go to Moscow to meet Nikita. The two men talked for two hours. David's daughter, Neva, took notes. Rockefeller broached the topic of trade, and was left with the impression that the Soviets would be receptive. Curiously, Khrushchev fell from grace a few weeks after David's visit.

Unofficial "private" contact between Western and Soviet interests took place at the shadowy Dartmouth Conferences, which were funded by the usual foundations, including Rockefeller's. Seventeen such conferences took place between 1960 and 1990. Notable attendees included David, Zbig, James Billington, John Kenneth Galbraith on the American side, and Evgeni Primakov, Georgi Arbatov, and Andrei Kozyrev on the Soviet side. Primakov (1929-) was a potent figure in the Gorbachev-Yeltsin era. Arbatov (1923 - 2010) was an insider think-tank technocrat who served as an intermediary between the Politburo and the KGB, and contributed to the development of the Perestroika. The Western-oriented Arbatov was no fan of either Yeltsin or Putin. Kozyrev (1951-) was the foreign minister of Russia between 1991 and 1996. He was pals with Gaidar and Chubais. David was also "impressed" with Vladimir Petrovsky (1933-), who became a UN top honcho in the 1990s. In Rockefeller's opinion, "Dartmouth broke down barriers and made change possible."

David promoted East-West trade because of its "political implications." He was instrumental in the attempt of securing the most-favoured-nation trading-partner status of the USSR. As mentioned before, in 1972 Chase became the first American bank to receive permission to establish a representative office in Moscow. Curiously, Billington, then an advisor to Chase - and hence evidently a Rockefeller cadre - was groomed as the head of the branch.

The sinister personage of Armand Hammer (1898-1990) looms large in the unwritten history of the 20th century. That the Arm (holding a sickle) and Hammer was the symbol of the Soviet Union is a fact so bizarre it beggars belief. Hammer was the man in charge of the powerful Occidental Petroleum, the largest oil producer in Texas, and the second largest oil&gas producer in California. To get an idea of what Hammer was, note that the man bragged about being the only man in history who was friends with both Lenin and Reagan. He was the son of Russian Jews who had immigrated to New York. Throughout his life, Hammer maintained close ties with the leaders of the USSR. His father, Julius Hammer was a leader in what would become the CPUSA. Julius also spent some time in Sing Sing after a botched abortion. Armand made a good buck peddling alcohol-laden "drugs" during the Prohibition. In 1921, Hammer went to the USSR; the trip lasted until the late '30s. In his passport application, he had stated that he intended to go only to Western Europe. In the USSR, Hammer conducted business deals with Lenin. The profits were good.

Back in the States, Hammer backed the Republicans. He gave a hefty donation to Richard Nixon's presidential campaign. Writes Wikipedia, "By the time of his death, Hammer had won the Soviet Union's Order of Friendship of People, the U.S. National Medal of Arts (1987), France's Legion of Honor, Italy's Grand Order of Merit, Sweden's Royal Order of the Polar Star, Austria's Knight Commander's Cross, Pakistan's Hilal-i-Quaid-Azam Peace Award, Israel's Leadership Award, Venezuela's Order of Andrés Bello, Mexico's National Recognition Award, Bulgaria's Jubilee Medal, and Belgium's Order of the Crown."

Hammer also wanted a Noble Peace Prize, and though, as the reader surely agrees, he eminently deserved one, Hammer's repeated nominations never lead to the real thing.

Another curious specimen was the publishing magnate Robert Maxwell (1923-1991). Born Ján Ludvík Hoch, Maxwell was another Eastern European (Slovakian) Jew who made good. Hoch became Maxwell during the war, when he saw action in the service of the British. After the war, Maxwell served as a censor in Berlin for the British military command. He used his contacts to

go into business, and eventually became the distributor of Springer Verlag (scientific literature) for Britain and America. He expanded into the publishing business. In the 1960s, Maxwell served as a Member of Parliament. As the 1980s rolled by, Maxwell managed to obtain the *Daily Mirror* and the American branch of the elite publisher McMillan (who, apropos, defrauded Quigley over the publication of *Tragedy & Hope*). The man's media empire extended in all corners of the West - and beyond.

In terms of personality, Maxwell was a glutton and a narcissist of gargantuan proportions. This Maxwell was on intimate terms with the various Eastern European dictators, including the men in charge of Romania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Hungary. In a notorious incident, Maxwell once entered Varna Harbour in his private yacht, clad in a T-shirt emblazoned with the words "King of Bulgaria." The confused coast guards contacted Sofia, where the dictator Zhivkov rejoiced at the news of the arrival of his good pal Bob, who had taken upon himself the thankless task of publishing the English-language version of Zhivkov's biography. Ceausescu's biography was also published by Maxwell's interests, and so were those of the Polish and East German communist chieftains. Various post-1989 Bulgarian businessmen, politicians, and gangsters had had connections with Maxwell. From Wikipedia's page on Maxwell:

Shortly before Maxwell's death, a former Mossad officer named Ari Ben-Menashe had approached a number of news organisations in Britain and the United States with the allegation that Maxwell and the *Daily Mirror's* foreign editor, Nick Davies, were both long time agents for the Israel intelligence service, Mossad. Ben-Menashe also claimed that in 1986 Maxwell had tipped off the Israeli Embassy in London that Mordechai Vanunu had given information about Israel's nuclear capability to the *Sunday Times*, then to the *Daily Mirror*. Vanunu was subsequently lured from London to Rome where he was kidnapped and returned to Israel, convicted of treason and imprisoned for 18 years.

There are whole books written on the subject, connecting Maxwell with: the British Oligarchy, Zionist interests, communist dictators, high-level international criminals, and other such individuals and organizations.

It should therefore be no surprise that Maxwell died "in mysterious circumstances" - murdered, without a doubt. Perhaps he had outlived his usefulness in 1991; perhaps he had implicated himself in one scandal too many; perhaps he had angered the Mossad - whatever the case, his drowned body was found in the Atlantic, floating like a miniature dead whale.

Following Maxwell's death, it turned out that his empire was a house of cards. His sons declared bankruptcy in 1992. The interested reader can find plenty of examples of the corrupt and fraudulent nature of Bob Maxwell's business dealings.

This should suffice. Back to the issue of the Western propping up of the Soviet "threat."

Two questions arise: why were the Soviets so "inept" at producing their own stuff, and why did the West build the Soviet stuff for the Soviets?

In regard to the first question, Sutton, who suffered from free-market fundamentalism, simply said that the Soviet system - meaning, as Lenin put it, "state capitalism" - was inherently incapable of invention and organization. The reality is subtler. The Great War and the Civil War had all but destroyed Russia. Though I have not investigated the matter, I suspect that the majority of the Tsar's engineers turned White and either fled the country or perished in the Civil War. Worse, Stalin's rise in the 1920s led to further internal instability and genocide. The USSR did not get to business until the late 1920s, and by then it was woefully behind the West in all matters of technology. Problems such as doctrinaire thinking at the top, widespread corruption, and internal repression certainly did not aid the process of Soviet industrialization. World War II administered another crippling blow to Russia. The US, on the other hand, emerged from the war as the world leviathan, home to half the planet's GDP. Despite Russia's enormous industrial potential, and the

emergence of a competent Soviet scientific establishment, the USSR could never conceivably have caught the US in either the arms race or the technological race. Moreover, Britain, France, Western Germany (with the highly-industrialized Ruhr and Rhine regions), Italy, and Japan were all in the American sphere of influence, while the Soviets were the pariah of the world. There never was a contest.

Sutton is wrong in claiming that state intervention can not lead to technological advancement. As Noam Chomsky never tires of pointing out, vast portions of America's post-war technology came from government funded projects and institutions. Chomsky had seen this personally from his perch at M.I.T. In a May 1998 London lecture entitled *Power in The Global Arena*, Chomsky lambasted the free-market guru Alan Greenspan for attempting to claim that the Internet, computers, information processing, lasers, satellites, transistors were invented by "private enterprise." The Internet was developed primarily in the Pentagon, at the public's expense. Transistors were developed at AT&T's Bell Labs - but, points out Chomsky, AT&T is a "government supported monopoly," meaning that in effect the public also financed Bell Labs. To prove his point, Chomsky observes that after the telephone industry was deregulated, Bell Labs blinked out of existence. Moreover, in the 1950s the sole buyer of transistors was the government, largely for the purposes of the Pentagon. The laser was developed at Bell Labs and the Hughes Research Labs of the Hughes Aircraft Company. The American aviation industry has been tight with the Pentagon since the war. What happens is that the taxpayers pay taxes, the government channels money to the Pentagon, the Pentagon places orders on "private contractors," and you get "free enterprise." Computing received a huge boost in development during the Second World War, when the various powers used computers for the purposes of cryptography. Transistored computers were first demonstrated in 1953 at the (public) University of Manchester.

In short, the major technological breakthroughs since World War II were public funded.

This is not to denigrate the achievements of individualistic inventors. The appearance of those inventions depends mostly on the level of prosperity and the outlook of a society. Richer, less static societies will have more people who have the time and the will to tinker with gadgets. The existence of a "free-market" does not particularly concern such people. The "free-market" argument is that the promise of riches would produce more inventors. That is not how things work. Getting rich has to do not with innovation but with marketing. Apple did not invent the mp3-player - they merely made it shiny and sold it as a sexy accessory. One of the ultimate triumphs of the free-market must be the billion dollar plastic-bottle tap-water industry. The only remaining free-market frontier is the air we breathe.

But back to the topic at hand. Why did the American Oligarchs quietly build the Soviet Union's industrial capacity? Prior to the Second World War, the ultimate goal clearly was the creation of a second, bigger, better, even more destructive Russo-German war. One of the two players would be knocked out for good, and the other would be contained by the Atlantic Powers. That is exactly what happened.

After the war, the old nationalistic ideological model of legitimacy was dropped in favour of the new and improved false dichotomy of Communism VS Capitalism. The Soviet bogeyman provided the Anglo-Americans with an excuse for conquering what remained of the world. Moreover, the communist doctrine covered the inadequacies and the insanities of the pseudo-free-market monopoly industry economic system of the West.

Another worthwhile point to make is that, as the *Report from Iron Mountain* explains, war is good for business - and to fight a war, you need two sides. America's military might at the end of World War II was hegemonic. Nothing could stand in its way. And yet, to have a war, someone had to provide for the opposing side! The Oligarchs thought about this and decided to let the Soviet Union do the job. So they took the USSR's oil money and built the Soviet war machine, which then they proceeded to fight in Vietnam and elsewhere. Meanwhile, the American sovereign debt kept rising. It was the ultimate scam, nothing could go wrong.

Due to their desire to enter the 21st century with a running start, the Oligarchs decided to end the

ideological polar split of the Cold War era by the late 1980s. The time had come for the final push. The new enemy would be invisible, pervasive, and ubiquitous - and so they came up with terrorism and man-made global warming. If necessary, we will hear about Peak Oil and about asteroids. Should Russia or China, both of which do not seem to be entirely under the control of the Oligarchs, get any ideas, we may even have World War III. To be fair, I suspect that, unless they find their backs against the wall, the Oligarchs will not destroy the world, which they want to conquer. At the most, they may provoke an incident like the one pictured in the 1964 Jimmy Stewart movie *Fail-Safe*. Stewart plays a US President who oversees the accidental drop of a nuclear warhead on Moscow. To defuse the situation and to prevent a nuclear holocaust, Jimmy nukes New York. Should such a farce take place in reality, the Oligarchs will use the scare to promote universal disarmament and the creation of an international "peace enforcing" army.

Speaking of China, the Chinese economic boom of the last three decades has been as much a production of the West as was the industrial build-up of the Soviet Union. One can trivially check that the US and Japan have been pouring billions into China since Hank Kissinger and Zbig lifted what David Rockefeller calls "the Bamboo Curtain" in the 1970s. From the point of view of the corporations, 1) China was an untapped market, and 2) Chinese labour was attractively cheap. And so the corporate owners of America and the other Western countries offshored millions upon millions of jobs to China.

The development of China has been a grand and overwhelmingly positive achievement, but it should not have been conducted at the detriment of the Western nations.

The conclusion is elementary - the Anglo-American oligarchical crowd has indirectly controlled communism for a century for its nefarious purposes.

Finally, Quigley:

Tragedy and Hope, p.936-

Behind this unfortunate situation [the IPR's communist ties] lies another, more profound, relationship, which influences matters much broader than Far Eastern policy. It involves the organization of tax-exempt fortunes of international financiers into foundations to be used for educational, scientific, "and other public purposes." Sixty or more years ago, public life in the West was dominated by the influence of "Wall Street." This term has nothing to do with its use by the Communists to mean monopolistic industrialism, but, on the contrary, refers to international financial capitalism deeply involved in the gold standard, foreign-exchange fluctuations, floating of fixed-interest securities and, to a lesser extent, flotation of industrial shares for stock-exchange markets. The group, which in the United States, was completely dominated by J.P. Morgan and Company from the 1880's to the 1930's was cosmopolitan, Anglophile, internationalist, Ivy League, eastern seaboard, high Episcopalian, and European-culture conscious. Their connection with the Ivy League colleges rested on the fact that the large endowments of these institutions require constant consultation with the financiers of Wall Street (or its lesser branches on State Street, Boston, and elsewhere) and was reflected in the fact that these endowments, even in 1930, were largely in bonds rather than in real estate or common stocks. As a consequence of these influences, as late as the 1930's, J.P. Morgan and his associates were the most significant figures in policy making at Harvard, Columbia, and to a lesser extent Yale, while the Whitneys were significant at Yale, and the Prudential Insurance Company (through Edward D. Duffield) dominated Princeton.

... Because of its dominant position in Wall Street, the Morgan firm came also to dominate other Wall Street powers, such as Carnegie, Whitney, Vanderbilt, Brown-Harriman, or Dillon-Reed. Close alliances were made with Rockefeller, Mellon, and Duke interests but not nearly so intimate ones with the great industrial powers like du Point and Ford.

In spite of the great influence of this "Wall Street" alignment, an influence great enough to merit the name of the "American Establishment," this group could not control the Federal government and, in consequence, had to adjust to a good many government actions thoroughly distasteful to the group. The chief of these were in taxation law, beginning with the graduated income tax in 1913, but culminating, above all else, in the inheritance tax. These tax laws drove the great private fortunes dominated by Wall Street into tax-exempt foundations, which became a major link in the Establishment network between Wall Street, the Ivy League, and the Federal government.

...More than fifty years ago [as of 1966] the Morgan firm decided to infiltrate the Left-wing political movements in the United States. This was relatively easy to do, since these groups were starved for funds and eager for a voice to reach the people. Wall Street supplied both. The purpose was not to destroy, dominate, or take over but was really threefold: (1) to keep informed about the thinking of Left-wing or liberal groups; (2) to provide them with a mouthpiece so that they could "blow off steam," and (3) to have a final veto in their publicity and possibly on their actions, if they ever went "radical."

...

(p.950) This myth [radical-Right's views], like all fables, does in fact have a modicum of truth. There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international Anglophile network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Groups, has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other groups, and frequently does so.

(p.954) It must be recognized that the power that those energetic Left-wingers [in the U.S.] exercised was never their own power or Communist power but was ultimately the power of the international financial coterie, and, once the anger and suspicions of the American people were aroused, as they were by 1950, it was a fairly simple matter to get rid of the Red sympathizers.

5.11 Jews

As one researches the way the world actually works, individuals of the Jewish persuasion repeatedly appear on the grand scene. So, in the interest of acquiring a comprehensive overview of the world canvas, we must examine the Jews, Jewishness, Israel, Zionism, and all the related issues.

Let me stress that a priori I feel about the Jews in about the same way I feel about the Eskimos. I had heard about both groups of people, but had never had close contact with their representatives. In retrospect, however, I must say that I did not know that while the Eskimos own, to my knowledge, boats and igloos, certain purported Jews happen to own large banks, Hollywood, and a bizarre theocracy armed with nuclear weapons - all of which things concern me directly. Moreover, I have come to realize certain uncomplimentary but true things about Jewish culture.

Let me be clear on two points: first, I do not hate the Jews; and second, nor do I see them as the unfortunates of history who have always been persecuted by evil and irrational madmen. The Jews have been persecuted, yes - but for a reason, as we will see. This is not to excuse the persecution, but to explain its origins.

Due to the sensitivity of the subject, I will rely as much as possible on Jewish sources. Three of the most important ones are: Israel Shahak, the author of *Jewish History, Jewish Religion* (1994); Yuri Slezkine, the author of *The Jewish Century* (2004); and Norman Finkelstein, the author of *This Time We Went Too Far* (2010) and *The Holocaust Industry* (2000).

Here are some other useful references penned by Jews: Sammuell Oppenheim's *Jews and Masonry* (1910); Maurice Samuel's *You Gentiles* (1924); Ariel Toaff's *Blood Passover* (c. 2005); Marcus Eli Ravage's (biographer of Rothschild) two articles *Comissary to the Gentiles* and *A Real Case Against the Jews*; Michael Higger's *The Jewish Utopia* (1932); Samuel Roth's *Jews Must Live* (1934); Robert

Friedman's *Red Mafiya* (2000); Marvin Tokayer and Mary Swartz's *The Fugu Plan* (1979); Victor Ostrovsky's *By Way of Deception* (1990) and *The Other Side of Deception* (1994); and Benjamin Freedman's *Hidden Tyranny* (1946-1965).²²

Also of interest are the following books written by "Gentiles"²³: Wilhelm Marr's 19th century article *Victory of Judaism Over Germanism* (1879); Reverend Dennis Fahey's *Rulers Of Russia* (1940); Z. Ragozin's *Russian Jews and Gentiles* (1881); Elizabeth Dilling's *The Jewish Religion* (1984 4th ed.); Robert Williams's *The Ultimate World Order as Pictured in The Jewish Utopia* (1957); Dr Tony Martin's relevant lectures, papers, and books; David Irving's relevant works; Douglas Reed's works; and Professor Kevin B. MacDonald's trilogy *A People That Shall Dwell Alone* (1994), *Separation and Its Discontents* (1998), and *The Culture of Critique* (2002).

Some of the "Gentile" authors above have been characterized as "anti-Semites." I contend that most - in some cases all - of what they say can be backed by the Jewish sources provided. Let the reader not fall victim to prejudice, narrow-mindedness, and intellectual dishonesty.

Israel Shahak (1933-2001) was a professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He was a survivor of the Second World War.

Yuri Slezkine (1956-) is a professor at Berkeley. His *Jewish Century* was very well-received.

Norman Finkelstein (1953-) is a writer and an activist. He was an assistant professor at De Paul between 2001 and 2007.

I apologize for the excessive quotation; unfortunately, the topic demands it.

Jews and Israel

To begin with, let us understand what "being Jewish" means and what "Judaism" really is.

The problem is that Jewishness is not a well-defined ethnic identity. Two large Jewish "sub-races" exist - the Ashkenazi and the Sephardic Jews. In rough terms, the Ashkenazi, who today constitute the dominant group, were the Eastern-European Jews, and the Sephardic Jews were the Mediterranean Jews. But there also exists a tiny group of recognized African - black - Jews. So, even though many Jews exhibit certain recognizable ethnic characteristics, the Jews are not exactly a race. By the way, this plain fact renders the concept of "anti-Semitism" utterly meaningless. In truth, the Arabs qualify as Semites, and it is a matter of common knowledge that many Jews in Israel and at large are virulently anti-Arabic.

Neither are the Jews a well-defined religious conglomeration. There are many "secular" Jews who do not observe the various idiosyncrasies of orthodox Judaism, but who nevertheless strongly identify themselves with Judaism as a culture and with Israel; moreover, they exhibit, in varying degrees, the cultural characteristics of the Judaic outlook. Another worthwhile point is that in the course of history, some Jews, to avoid persecution, converted to Christianity in public, but continued to practice their Jewish religion in private. The Marrano Jews of the Iberian peninsula were one such group. Jews of this type are usually called "hidden-Jews" or "crypto-Jews."

In effect, "Jewishness" is something between a culture, a worldview, and a code of behaviour.

To set the note and highlight the sensitive nature of the problem under consideration, let me quote Shahak's justification for writing his book:

(Chapter 1) This book, although written in English and addressed to people living outside the State of Israel, is, in a way, a continuation of my political activities as an Israeli Jew. Those activities began in 1965-6 with a protest which caused a considerable scandal at the time: I had personally witnessed an ultra-religious Jew refuse to allow his phone to be used on the Sabbath in order to call an ambulance for a non-Jew who happened to

²²Thanks to <http://iamthewitness.com/> for providing many of the references.

²³I dislike the word "Gentiles," but non-Jews sounds too awkward an alternative.

have collapsed in his Jerusalem neighbourhood. Instead of simply publishing the incident in the press, I asked for a meeting which is composed of rabbis nominated by the State of Israel. I asked them whether such behavior was consistent with their interpretation of the Jewish religion. They answered that the Jew in question had behaved correctly, indeed piously, and backed their statement by referring me to a passage in an authoritative compendium of Talmudic laws, written in this century. I reported the incident to the main Hebrew daily, *Ha'aretz*, whose publication of the story caused a media scandal.

The results of the scandal were, for me, rather negative. Neither the Israeli, nor the diaspora, rabbinical authorities ever reversed their ruling that a Jew should not violate the Sabbath in order to save the life of a Gentile. They added much sanctimonious twaddle to the effect that if the consequence of such an act puts Jews in danger, the violation of the Sabbath is permitted, for their sake. It became apparent to me, as drawing on Talmudic laws governing the relations between Jews and non-Jews, that neither Zionism, including its seemingly secular part, nor Israeli politics since the inception of the State of Israel, nor particularly the policies of the Jewish supporters of Israel in the diaspora, could be understood unless the deeper influence of those laws, and the worldview which they both create and express is taken into account. The actual policies Israel pursued after the Six Day War, and in particular the apartheid character of the Israeli regime in the Occupied Territories and the attitude of the majority of Jews to the issue of the rights of the Palestinians, even in the abstract, have merely strengthened this conviction.

Israel insists on defining itself as a "Jewish State." In 1985, the Knesset passed a law, which forbids any party which opposes the principle of the Jewish State from participating in elections. So Israel is **not** a democracy, but is a theocracy: "Even this example shows that the State of Israel is not a democracy due to the application of a Jewish ideology directed against all non-Jews and those Jews who oppose this ideology."

What does this mean?

By this official definition, Israel 'belongs' to persons who are defined by the Israeli authorities as 'Jewish', irrespective of where they live, and to them alone. On the other hand, Israel doesn't officially 'belong' to its non-Jewish citizens, whose status is considered even officially as inferior. This means in practice that if members of a Peruvian tribe are converted to Judaism, and thus regarded as Jewish, they are entitled at once to become Israeli citizens and benefit from the approximately 70 per cent of the West Bank land (and the 92 per cent of the area of Israel proper), officially designated only for the benefit of Jews. All non-Jews (not only all Palestinians) are prohibited from benefiting from those lands. (The prohibition applies even to Israeli Arabs who served in the Israeli army and reached a high rank.) The case involving Peruvian converts to Judaism actually occurred a few years ago.

This official policy is blatant apartheid, and a ridiculously close parallel to what the Nazis did back in their heyday. Besieged Gaza bears all the characteristics of a closed ghetto, if not an outright concentration camp.

The Israeli State defines "Jew" as follows:

According to Israeli law a person is considered 'Jewish' if either their mother, grandmother, great-grandmother and great-great-grandmother were Jewesses by religion; or if the person was converted to Judaism in a way satisfactory to the Israeli authorities, and on condition that the person has not converted from Judaism to another religion, in which case Israel ceases to regard them as 'Jewish'. Of the three conditions, the first represents the Talmudic definition of 'who is a Jew', a definition followed by Jewish Orthodoxy. The Talmud and post-Talmudic rabbinic law also recognise the conversion of a non-Jew to Judaism (as well as the purchase of a non-Jewish slave by a Jew followed by a different

kind of conversion) as a method of becoming Jewish, provided that the conversion is performed by authorised rabbis in a proper manner. This 'proper manner' entails for females, their inspection by three rabbis while naked in a 'bath of purification', a ritual which, although notorious to all readers of the Hebrew press, is not often mentioned by the English media in spite of its undoubted interest for certain readers.

More apartheid, just to drive the point home again and again:

Discrimination in residency is based on the fact that about 92 per cent of Israel's land is the property of the state and is administered by the Israel Land Authority according to regulations issued by the Jewish National Fund (JNF), and affiliate of the World Zionist Organization. In its regulations the JNF denies the right to reside, to open a business, and often to work, to anyone who is not Jewish, only because he is not Jewish. At the same time, Jews are not prohibited from taking residence or opening businesses anywhere in Israel. If applied in another state against the Jews, such discriminatory practice would instantly and justifiably be labelled antisemitism and would no doubt spark massive public protests. When applied by Israel as a part of its 'Jewish ideology', they are usually studiously ignored or excused when rarely mentioned.

The above arrangement also smacks of Communism. The relevance of the association will be made clear shortly.

In a certain sense, Israel does not even see itself as a nation:

The routine means for enforcing discrimination in everyday life is the ID card, which everyone is obliged to carry at all times. ID cards list the official 'nationality' of a person, which can be 'Jewish', 'Arab', 'Druze' and the like, with the significant exception of 'Israeli'.

This, combined with the Law of Return, means that, in effect, every Jew outside of Israel who passes the grandmother test is a citizen of Israel - whether he has bothered to get a passport or not. If, furthermore, a Jew harbours fraternal feelings toward his fellow Jews, as many Jews do, then he faces the problem of dual allegiances. (Observe that a Dutch-American dual passport holder does not have to deal with the issue of supporting apartheid.) This becomes a serious problem when masses of Jews who strongly identify with Israel attain positions of influence in foreign countries. To put it plainly, such people put the interests of Israel before the interests of their host country. This is a cause for concern, and, in certain cases, leads to treasonous behaviour punishable - but rarely punished because of quasi-post-Dreyfusian reasons - by law.

Shahak provides various other examples of discrimination. Though some of the motivation behind the apartheid is racist in nature, there is a method to the madness - the ultimate goal is the purification of the population via the removal of the Gentile population of Israel by any means which would not arouse too indignant an international outcry.

Israel also propagates among its Jewish citizens an exclusivist ideology of the Redemption of Land. Its official aim of minimizing the number of non-Jews can be well perceived in this ideology, which is inculcated to Jewish schoolchildren in Israel. They are taught that it is applicable to the entire extent of either the State of Israel or, after 1967, to what is referred to as the Land of Israel. According to this ideology, the land which has been 'redeemed' is the land which has passed from non-Jewish ownership to Jewish ownership. The ownership can be either private, or belong to either the JNF or the Jewish state. The land which belongs to non-Jews is, on the contrary, considered to be 'unredeemed'. ... The logical conclusion of such an ideology is the expulsion, called 'transfer', of all non-Jews from the area of land which has to be 'redeemed'. Therefore the Utopia of the 'Jewish ideology' adopted by the State of Israel is a land which is wholly 'redeemed' and none of it is owned or worked by non-Jews. The leaders of the Zionist labour movement expressed this utterly repellent idea with the greatest clarity.

In regard to the goals of the Israeli proto-Utopia:

My own early political conversion from admirer of Ben-Gurion to his dedicated opponent began exactly with such an issue. In 1956 I eagerly swallowed all of Ben-Gurion's political and military reasons for Israel initiating the Suez War, until he (in spite of being an atheist, proud of his disregard of the commandments of Jewish religion) pronounced in the Knesset on the third day of that war, that the real reason for it is 'the restoration of the kingdom of David and Solomon' to its Biblical borders. At this point in his speech, almost every Knesset member spontaneously rose and sang the Israeli national anthem. To my knowledge, no Zionist politician has ever repudiated Ben-Gurion's idea that Israeli policies must be based (within the limits of pragmatic considerations) on the restoration of the Biblical borders as the borders of the Jewish state. Indeed, close analysis of Israeli grand strategies and actual principles of foreign policy, as they are expressed in Hebrew, makes it clear that it is 'Jewish ideology', more than any other factor, which determines actual Israeli policies. The disregard of Judaism as it really is and of 'Jewish ideology' makes those policies incomprehensible to foreign observers who usually know nothing about Judaism except crude apologetics.

Some eminent Rabbis (Shahak mentions one Dov Lior) regarded the return of the Sinai to Egypt as a crime against God, which was justly punished by Israel's failure to conquer Lebanon in the 1980s. Moreover, explains Shahak, the ambitions of the ruling circles of Israel are often not merely *imperialistic*, but *ideological* - and therefore much less susceptible to reason and compromise. To illustrate the point, Shahak points out that the closed Utopian Israel is a dream along the lines of Plato's Republic. Moreover, the advent of this Utopia would, in a certain sense, merely be a reversion to an earlier Golden Age. The specifics of the Golden Age we will examine shortly.

Jewish History

(Chapter 2) The first difficulty in writing about this subject is that the term 'Jew' has been used during the last 150 years with two rather different meanings. To understand this, let us imagine ourselves in the year 1780. Then the universally accepted meaning of the term 'Jew' basically coincided with what the Jews themselves understood as constituting their own identity. This identity was primarily religious, but the precepts of religion governed the details of daily behavior in all aspects of life, both social and private, among the Jews themselves as well as in their relation to non-Jews. It was then literally true that a Jew could not even drink a glass of water in the home of a non-Jew. And the same basic laws of behavior towards non-Jews were equally valid from Yemen to New York. Whatever the term by which the Jews of 1780 may be described ... it is clear that all Jewish communities at that time were separate from the non-Jewish societies in the midst of which they were living. However, all this was changed by two parallel processes - beginning in Holland and England, continuing in revolutionary France and in countries which followed the example of the French Revolution, and then in the modern monarchies of the 19th century: the Jews gained a significant level of individual rights (in some cases full legal equality), and the legal power of the Jewish community over its members was destroyed. It should be noted that both developments were simultaneous, and that the latter is even more important, albeit less widely known, than the former.

In short, before the 19th century, and in many places during the 19th century, Jewish society was a closed, theocratic society which functioned under a highly elaborate and strictly enforced code of laws. The rabbis were in charge.

Herein comes a crucial point - though this undermined their own authority, the Muslim and Christian rulers who presided over Jewish populations tended to allow and even welcome this arrangement of

intra-Jewish rabbinical supremacy, because, simply, the rabbis paid the Christian rulers a cut of the loot - "in Spanish archives dating from the 13th and 14th centuries there are records of many detailed orders issued by those most devout Catholic Kings of Castile and Aragon, instructing their no less devout officials to co-operate with the rabbis in enforcing observance of the Sabbath by the Jews. Why? Because whenever a Jew was fined by a rabbinical court for violating the Sabbath, the rabbis had to hand nine tenths of the fine over to the king." In terms of power-play, both sides won - the rabbis enforced their laws with the backing of the Gentile rulers, who profited handsomely for a mere word of sanction. Shahak gives a further example to show that the arrangement was still alive and well in 1832 in Pressburg (now Bratislava), then in the Hapsburg Empire.

The only way out of the extreme oppression of Jewish society was the method Spinoza adopted - conversion.

When the modern state came about after the French Revolution, the concept of the citizen as a person bound by laws rather than by oaths and religious affiliation significantly disrupted the structure of Jewish society, to the infinite chagrin of many a rabbi. Indeed,

one will not find in Hannah Arendt's voluminous writings, whether on totalitarianism or on Jews, or on both, the smallest hint as to what Jewish society in Germany was really like in the 18th century: burning of books, persecution of writers, disputes about the magic powers of amulets, bans on the most elementary 'non-Jewish' education such as the teaching of correct German or indeed German written in the Latin alphabet. Nor can one find in the numerous English-language 'Jewish histories' the elementary facts about the attitude of Jewish mysticism (so fashionable at present in certain quarters) to non-Jews: that they are considered to be, literally, limbs of Satan, and that the few non-satanic individuals among them (that is, those who convert to Judaism) are in reality 'Jewish souls' who got lost when Satan violated the Holy Lady (Shekhinah or Matronit, one of the female components of the Godhead, sister and wife of the younger male God according to the cabbala) in her heavenly abode.

To illustrate the extreme reactionary convictions of the orthodox rabbis, Shahak points out how in 1848, as the rule of law in Vienna disintegrated, the orthodox rabbis of what is now Lvov *poisoned* a liberal colleague of theirs. One of the culprit's crimes had been "the advocacy and actual performance of the Bar Mitzvah ceremony, which had recently been invented."

Thus,

the word 'Jewry' and its cognates describe two different and even contrasting social groups, and because of current Israeli politics the continuum between the two is disappearing fast. On the one hand there is the traditional totalitarian meaning discussed above; on the other hand there are Jews by descent who have internalized the complex of ideas which Karl Popper has called 'the open society'. (There are also some, particularly in the USA, who have not internalized these ideas, but try to make a show of acceptance.)

Shahak points out that some modern "Jewish characteristics," such as the "Jewish humor," did not exist before the 19th century - in fact, "humor and jokes are strictly forbidden by the Jewish religion - except, significantly, jokes against other religions." The other famous stereotypical "Jewish characteristic" is the Jewish "love of learning." Except Religious learning, "which was itself in a debased and degenerate state," the Ashkenazis, and to a lesser extent the Sephardis, bore "a supreme contempt and hate for all learning (excluding the Talmud and Jewish mysticism)."

Large parts of the Old Testament, all nonliturgical Hebrew poetry, most books on Jewish philosophy were not read and their very names were often anathematized. Study of all languages was strictly forbidden, as was the study of mathematics and science. Geography, history - even Jewish history - were completely unknown. The critical sense, which is supposedly so characteristic of Jews, was totally absent, and nothing was so forbidden, feared and therefore persecuted as the most modest innovation or the most innocent criticism.

In Shahak's opinion, "A large part of the Zionist movement always wanted to restore [this beautiful Utopia] - and this part has gained the upper hand."

We will examine the wonderful Talmud shortly. As to the modern "Jewish love for learning," it stems to a large degree from the Jewish historic abhorrence of manual labour, which motivated the liberated Jews to enter the professions in droves. Apart from absenting one from physical labour, Jewish participation in the professions improves the standing and the influence of the larger Jewish community. Samuel Roth's book discusses this subject, and the general attitude of the Jews toward their professional obligations, in great detail.

It is not my intention to insult the Jewish readers. I am well aware that many Jews who have integrated into the larger society do harbour a genuine love for learning, and that they haven't the faintest idea of the realities of Jewish history. Good for them and all the best of luck! But that is not the point.

To get another inkling of how bad things were, consider the following:

The rabbinical authorities of east Europe furthermore decreed that all non-talmudic studies are to be forbidden, even when nothing specific could be found in them which merits anathema, because they encroach on the time that should be employed either in studying the Talmud or in making money - which should be used to subsidize talmudic scholars.

The reader may want to take a look at our section on the Talmud before continuing, in order the better understand the origins of European "anti-Semitism." Apart from the Talmud, the general Christian population tended to regard the Jews with loathing, because most Christians were peasant labourers, and the Jews kept themselves to the cities are regarded the peasants and their occupation with boundless contempt - Slezkine elaborates on this point in his work. Instead of toiling over the soil, the Jews engaged in shop-keeping, banking, and other mercantile activities. Moreover, the Jews were under the obligation to: 1) make money for the rabbis; 2) defraud non-Jews by any means possible; 3) extend the influence of the Jewish community in order to "reclaim" the world. Understandably, this type of behaviour failed to ingratiate the Jews in the eyes of the masses of peasants.

How did the rabbis protect their racket? One of their favourite tricks was bribery, which worked often and well. Shahak defines another mechanism as follows, emphasis his: "**surreptitious defiance, combined with outward compliance.**"

Follows a diatribe of Shahak's, which raises a few critical points:

In 1944, during the actual struggle against Hitler, the British Labor Party approved a plan for the expulsion of Palestinians from Palestine, which was similar to Hitler's early plans (up to about 1941) for the Jews. This plan was approved under the pressure of Jewish members of the party's leadership, many of whom have displayed a stronger 'kith and kin' attitude to every Israeli policy than the Conservative 'kith and kin' supporters of Ian Smith ever did. But stalinistic taboos on the left are stronger in Britain than on the right, and there is virtually no discussion even when the Labor Party supports Begin's government.

In the USA a similar situation prevails, and again the American liberals are the worst. This is not the place to explore all the political consequences of this situation, but we must face reality: in our struggle against the racism and fanaticism of the Jewish religion, our greatest enemies will be not only the Jewish racists (and users of racism) but also those non-Jews who in other areas are known - falsely in my opinion - as 'progressives'.

We highlight two points: first, as we well know, the British Oligarchs have always been the most consummate of hypocrites; and second, the American so-called "liberal-progressive" class of today is

itself hypocritical, pathetic, and despicable. In this regard, also read (Pulitzer Prize winner) Chris Hedge's 2010 work *Death of the Liberal Class*.

Classical / Orthodox Judaism

To begin with - and this is why I expressly avoid using the specious term "Judeo-Christian" - the Jewish religion is not monotheistic. In Biblical terms,

(Ch.3) as many biblical scholars know, and as a careful reading of the Old Testament easily reveals, this ahistorical view is quite wrong. In many, if not most, books of the Old Testament the existence and power of 'other gods' are clearly acknowledged, but Yahweh (Jehovah), who is the most powerful god, is also very jealous of his rivals and forbids his people to worship them. It is only very late in the Bible, in some of the later prophets, that the existence of all gods other than Yahweh is denied.

To complicate matters further, classical Judaism **does not** truly subscribe to the Bible (meaning the Old Testament). Writes Shahak, "it is quite clear, though much less widely realized, that [Classical Judaism], during its last few hundred years, was for the most part far from pure monotheism. The same can be said about the real doctrines dominant in present-day Orthodox Judaism, which is a direct continuation of classical Judaism."

The decay of monotheism came about through the spread of Jewish mysticism (the cabbala) which developed in the 12th and 13th centuries, and by the late 16th century had won an almost complete victory in virtually all the centers of Judaism. The Jewish Enlightenment, which arose out of the crisis of classical Judaism, had to fight against this mysticism and its influence more than against anything else, but in latter-day Jewish Orthodoxy, especially among the rabbis, the influence of the cabbala has remained predominant.

This is important, because the related beliefs "form part of the explicit system of beliefs of many religious politicians, including most leaders of Gush Emunim, and have an indirect influence on many Zionist leaders of all parties, including the Zionist left."

I leave the inquiry into the bizarre, perverse, and quite hilarious details of the doctrines of classical Judaism to the reader. To give you an idea, with my emphasis: "Other prayers or religious acts, as interpreted by the cabbalists, are designed to deceive various angels (imagined as minor deities with a measure of independence) **or to propitiate Satan.**"

Another point that must be made is that some prayers are designed as "a means for tricking the angels who operate the gates through which prayers enter heaven and who have the power to block the prayers of the pious." By the end of this section, the reader will have seen that the orthodox Jew has the absolute duty to defraud the Gentiles by any means possible. This is bad enough - but what can be expected of someone who dares to swindle even his own God? And do not think this is an isolated example - Shahak provides a number of additional cases of this type. One illustration involving the milking of cows is so hilarious that I can not reprint it here for fear of disturbing the reader's concentration and solemnity.

Furthermore,

Faith and beliefs (except nationalistic beliefs) play an extremely small part in classical Judaism. What is of prime importance is the ritual act, rather than the significance which that act is supposed to have or the belief attached to it. Therefore in times when a minority of religious Jews refused to accept the cabbala (as is the case today), one could see some few Jews performing a given religious ritual believing it to be an act of worship of God, while others do exactly the same thing with the intention of propitiating Satan - but so long as the act is the same they would pray together and remain members of the same congregation, however much they might dislike each other. But if instead of

the intention attached to the ritual washing of hands anyone would dare to introduce an innovation in the manner of washing, a real schism would certainly ensue.

It must be understood that "all this is of considerable importance in Israel (and in other Jewish centers) even at present." At the same time, many of the saner Israeli leaders act from merely imperialistic concerns.

To understand Judaism, one must also realize that it is **not** a Biblical religion.

...this is connected with the question of interpretation. We have seen that in matters of belief there is great latitude. Exactly the opposite holds with respect to the legal interpretation of sacred texts. Here the interpretation is rigidly fixed - but by the Talmud rather than by the Bible itself. Many, perhaps most, biblical verses prescribing religious acts and obligations are 'understood' by classical Judaism, and by present lay-Orthodoxy, in a sense which is quite distinct from, or even contrary to, their literal meaning as understood by Christian or other readers of the Old Testament, who only see the plain text. The same division exists at present in Israel between those educated in Jewish religious schools and those educated in 'secular' Hebrew schools, where on the whole the plain meaning of the Old Testament is taught.

Thus, **the Talmud** rather than the Bible is the supreme Jewish law, and, as the reader can see for himself in the section for the Talmud, that holiest of books sometimes directly contradicts the literal interpretation of even the Ten Commandments.

This is why protestations on Biblical grounds against Israeli crimes fall on deaf ears.

As pointed out above, classical Judaism advocated for total, unchecked mendacity. In fact,

...the Kol Nidrey prayer on the eve of Yom Kippur - a chanting of a particularly absurd and deceptive dispensation, by which all private vows made to God in the following year are declared in advance to be null and void.

In other words, religious Jews can swindle you and their fellow Jews with absolute impunity. The Kol Nidrey is not just some forgotten ancient custom, but an integral part of modern orthodox Judaism. Note that together with swindling the Gentiles, and "Together with the deception of God goes the deception of other Jews, mainly in the interest of the Jewish ruling class." Thus, it is important to realize that most Jews are victims as much as anyone else; at the same time, those strongly patriotic Jews who place their people and Israel above criticism compose - and I hate to say this - one of the most dangerous castes of true believers and useful idiots in today's world.

Moreover, "The second dominant feature of the dispensations is that they are in large part obviously motivated by the spirit of profit. And it is this combination of hypocrisy and the profit motive which increasingly dominated classical Judaism."

In plain terms, the medieval stereotype of the greedy Jew is and always has been largely accurate. Again, let us not argue over implicitly obvious trifles - clearly, the statement "all Jews are greedy" is false. At the same time, the statement "avarice is a typical characteristic of Jewish culture in general" is correct. Again, remember that even secular Jews can not help but be affected by the overall current of Jewish culture - which, ultimately, stems from the Talmud. The problem is as ghastly and horrifying as it is important - and it is the same problem of brainwashing that we have stumbled over again and again in this work.

At the same time, "the profit motive is not characteristic of Judaism in all periods of its history." The ancient agricultural based Jewish societies were the exception. However, the medieval and post-medieval Jewish societies, in which we are interested, were vehemently enamoured with profits.

Back to Jewish History

(Chapter 4) Shahak defines four periods of Jewish history. The first two are in the ancient period, and consequently of no interest to this analysis. The third period, which followed after 200A.D., is the era of classical Judaism. The fourth era is that of the modern age - roughly since the French Revolution - in which the totalitarian Jewish society collapsed from the pressure of the modern state - and the Jews, in the long run, embarked on their modern diasporas to the United States and Israel. The major characteristics of the classical (medieval to enlightenment age) Jewish society were, emphasis Shahak's:

- "Classical Jewish society has no peasants."
- "Classical Jewish society was particularly dependent on kings or on nobles with royal powers."
- "The society of classical Judaism is in total opposition to the surrounding non-Jewish society, except the king (or the nobles, when they take over the state)."

In brief, here is how the system worked: the Jews stuck to the towns, where they were in charge of the shops, the mills, and so on, and they defrauded, swindled, and robbed the Christian peasants by any means which did not bring immediate repercussion upon the Jewish commune. The lower level Jews were, in turn, robbed blind by their rabbis and wealthy brethren. The top Jews, for their part, bribed the Christian aristocrats and kings, who, moreover - and this includes many Popes - liked to use the Jews to bypass the Biblical bans on usury.

Thus, the Jews, for all the misfortune that they suffered at the hands of their more powerful fellows, comprised - and this is Shahak's accurate term - **a privileged caste** within medieval society - "the poorest Jewish craftsman, peddler, land-lord's steward or petty cleric was immeasurably better off than a serf."

The situation was particularly awful in Poland, where the Jews had a major colony, and where the feudal Szlachta²⁴ held on until the 20th century despite Alexander II's efforts at ruining them. Indeed, during World War II many Poles, themselves under almost incomprehensible oppression, were not entirely averse to the fate, which befell their Jewish neighbours. The animosity caused by this ugly development in what surely already was the most heinous epoch of modern history has persisted to this day.²⁵ The situation in Russia was also bad. Ragozin's lengthy article plainly explains how things stood - in short, the Jews oppressed the peasantry and bribed the nobility. The nobles and often the Tsar tended to be for law and order and against pogroms. The reality was - and this is a crucial point, which should dispel some of the reader's misconceptions - that the cause of the pogroms in Russia and Poland in the 19th and early 20th centuries was the **justified popular fury** of the peasantry.

Moreover, in general, the Jewish buffer tended to redirect popular anger from the nobility to the Jews. At the same time, the Tsar and the nobility sometimes tried to alleviate the plight of their subjects; while the Jews of the classical Jewish society always depredated on their less fortunate Gentile neighbours.

To highlight another tragedy of history, note that the Jewish "socialists," who were immensely influential in Eastern Europe, as well shall see, retained their hatred for the peasantry. Thus, relates Shahak, "A typical example is their opposition to the formation of peasant co-operatives promoted by the Catholic clergy, on the ground that this was 'an act of antisemitism.' This attitude is by no means dead even now; it could be seen very clearly in the racist views held by many Jewish 'dissidents' in the USSR regarding the Russian people..."

²⁴To understand the mentality of Brzezinski, who is Szlachta, realize that the notorious Polish nobility was degenerate and incompetent enough to cause the dismemberment of Poland rather than to relinquish some of its feudal power over the most maltreated peasants of Europe.

²⁵See, for example, <http://www.jewishpost.com/viewpoints/My-Trip-to-Poland-The-Reality-of-Being-Jewish.html>, accessed by the author on November 29, 2011.

Now, just as the Jews were commanded to rob the peasants, so were they admonished to obey the nobles and the kings in the most subservient manner possible.

The various rulers granted the rabbis charters, which rendered the Jewish communities independent, and, crucially, exempted the Jewish mini-states from paying taxes. This explains, to a certain degree, the recurring historical archetype of the opulent Jew. What happened was that the larger Jewish community scoured the peasants, and was in turn robbed by its most powerful members, who paid a share of the loot to the nobility. One can be sure that the share always was as small as possible. This pernicious caste structure has been a recurrent theme in history. The British found a similar system in India - and, boy, did they love it! They even transplanted some Indians to East Africa to fulfil the function of the Jews of Europe. Some Chinese minorities play the same role in certain South-East Asian countries. The scam goes back to Babylon; but that is another topic. Suffice to say that, clearly, the Talmud was invented by some highly intelligent and spectacularly evil mind (or minds), which had a clear idea of what would happen when the ship of Jewry embarked upon the ocean of history powered by a set of Talmudic sails.

Because of all of this, "throughout the classical period (as well as in modern times) the rabbis were the most loyal, not to say zealous, supporters of the powers that be; and the more reactionary the regime, the more rabbinical support it had."

The system described above functioned less splendidly in societies, which: 1) had a sufficiently developed domestic middle / mercantile class, which assumed the traditional role of the Jews; 2) had a sufficiently developed modern state, which protected the sanctity of law at the expense of rabbinical rule; 3) had a 'good' king, who cared for his subjects sufficiently to relieve them of their Jewish oppressors.

For an example to the third point, Philip IV the Fair whom we saw smash the Templars, also banished France's Jews.

In contrast, the combined oppression of Jewry and nobility was particularly malignant in strongly feudal societies, such as, to use Shahak's adequate examples, pre-Ferdinand&Isabella (1492) Iberia, and pre-partition (1795) Poland.

Shahak provides a few more interesting illustrations. Take medieval England. William the Conqueror brought the Jews there after 1066 along with his entourage of French nobility. The rudimentary constitution that was the Magna Carta marked the decline of the Jewish influence in the Albion. Edward I (1239-1307, Ling 1272-1307) formed the Parliament and simultaneously banished the Jews in 1290. To pacify the populace, Edward had prohibited the Jews from practising usury in 1275, and had encouraged them to engage in productive trades (i.e. the hateful manual labor). The Jews refused that opportunity to integrate with their host society, and in the end Edward found himself forced to banish them. No Jews would settle in England until the 17th century, when Cromwell, financed by Dutch Jewish interests, overturned Edward's edict.

In Italy, the Jews did well in the backward regions in the South and in the feudal areas in Piedmont, but were unimportant in Florence. Venice, of course, had plenty of wheeling and dealing with the Jews.

Similar developments took place in the Muslim world. The Ottoman Empire was heavily penetrated by Jewish influence.

...perhaps the best Islamic example is the state where the Jews' position was better than anywhere else in the East since the fall of the ancient Persian empire - the Ottoman empire, particularly during its heyday in the 16th century. As is well known, the Ottoman regime was based initially on the almost complete exclusion of the Turks themselves (not to mention other Muslims by birth) from positions of political power and from the most important part of the army, the Janissary corps, both of which were manned by the sultan's Christian-born slaves, abducted in childhood and educated in special schools.

Until the end of the 16th century no freeborn Turk could become a Janissary or hold any important government office. In such a regime, the role of the Jews in their sphere was quite analogous to that of the Janissaries in theirs. Thus the position of the Jews was best under a regime which was politically most dissociated from the peoples it ruled. With the admission of the Turks themselves (as well as some other Muslim peoples, such as the Albanians) to the ruling class of the Ottoman empire, the position of the Jews declines. However, this decline was not very sharp, because of the continuing arbitrariness and nonnational character of the Ottoman regime.

At the same time, "in a pre-modern state, a 'better' position of the Jewish community normally entailed a greater degree of tyranny exercised within this community by the rabbis against other Jews."

A few more quotes in support of the points made above, emphasis in the original:

In short, in eastern Poland, under the rule of the nobles (and of the feudalized church, formed exclusively from the nobility) the Jews were both **the immediate exploiters of the peasantry** and virtually the only town-dwellers.

...

Internal conditions within the Jewish community moved in a similar course. In the period 1500-1795, one of the most superstition-ridden in the history of Judaism, Polish Jewry was the most superstitious and fanatic of all Jewish communities.

...

...the descendants of the Jews of pre-1795 Poland (often called 'east-European Jews' - as opposed to Jews from the German cultural domain of the early 19th century, including the present Austria, Bohemia and Moravia) now wield predominant political power in Israel as well as in the Jewish communities in the USA and other English-speaking countries; and, because of their particular past history, this mode of thinking [i.e. perennial victim mentality] is especially entrenched among them, much more than among other Jews.

...

It must be pointed out that in all the worst anti-Jewish persecutions, that is, where Jews were killed, the ruling elite - the emperor and the pope, the kings, the higher aristocracy and the upper clergy, as well as the rich bourgeoisie in the autonomous cities - were always on the side of the Jews.

...

...all the massacres of Jews during the classical period were part of a peasant rebellion or other popular movements at times when the government was for some reason especially weak. This is true even in the partly exceptional case of Tsarist Russia. The Tsarist government, acting surreptitiously through its secret police, did promote pogroms; but it did so only when it was particularly weak (after the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, and in the period immediately before and after the 1905 revolution) and even then took care to contain the break down of 'law and order'.

...

The general rule can be observed in all the major massacres of Jews in Christian Europe.

In regard to modern (late 19th / early 20th century) anti-Semitism, some of it stemmed from the nationalist cult, which demanded national ethnic homogeneity, some from the machinations of the Christian Churches (though it is true that the Jews were anti-Christian), some from the conservatives' identification of the Jews with communism (which was also largely accurate), and some, frankly, stemmed from the role that the Jews, either wittingly or in spite of themselves, played in society. This is not to justify any pogroms, but merely to explain them.

Today, there lingers a segment of anti-Semites who loathe Jews for irrational, often xenophobic, reasons. But there also exists - and I say this with a concern for the Jews - an increasing circle of well-informed people who abominate Zionism, and dislike Jewry, on perfectly rational grounds.

Let the reader not be presumptuous in subscribing me to the latter set of people. The truth is that Israel's lunacies have grown so obscene that even the stunning barrage of propaganda from the heavily-Jewish owned and staffed Western media can not fully curb the growing tide of anti-Zionism.

That Israel and certain morally corrupt Jews use the cloak of "anti-Semitism" to cover their wrongdoings is too obvious to discuss in detail.

Moreover,

In fact, close relations have always existed between Zionists and antisemites: exactly like some of the European conservatives, the Zionists thought they could ignore the 'demonic' character of antisemitism and use the antisemites for their own purposes. Many examples of such alliances are well known. Herzl allied himself with the notorious Count von Plehve, the antisemitic minister of Tsar Nicholas II; Jabotinsky made a pact with Petlyura, the reactionary Ukrainian leader whose forces massacred some 100,000 Jews in 1918-21; Ben-Gurion's allies among the French extreme right during the Algerian war included some notorious antisemites who were, however, careful to explain that they were only against the Jews in France, not in Israel.

Shahak also provides examples of influential rabbis applauding the Nazi segregationist policies - because the rabbis wanted segregation, in order to lord over their brethren.

Israel

It must be understood that the precepts of Orthodox Judaism are fundamental to the policies of modern Israel. Here is one among many quotes to that effect.

(Ch.2) ...the Hassidic movement towards non-Jews. Hassidism - a continuation (and debasement!) of Jewish mysticism - is still a living movement, with hundreds of thousands of active adherents who are fanatically devoted to their 'holy rabbis', some of whom have acquired a very considerable political influence in Israel, among the leaders of most parties and even more so in the higher echelons of the army.

What, then, are the views of this movement concerning non-Jews? As an example, let us take the famous Hatanya, fundamental book of the Habad movement, one of the most important branches of Hassidism. According to this book, all non-Jews are totally satanic creatures 'in whom there is absolutely nothing good'. Even a non-Jewish embryo is qualitatively different from a Jewish one. The very existence of a non-Jew is essential', whereas all of creation was created solely for the sake of the Jews.

This book is circulated in countless editions, and its ideas are further propagated in the numerous 'discourses' of the present hereditary Führer of Habad, the so-called Lubavitcher rabbi, M.M. Schneersohn, who leads this powerful worldwide organization from his New York headquarters. In Israel these ideas are widely disseminated among the public at large, in the schools and in the army. (According to the testimony of Shulamit Aloni, Member of the Knesset, this Habad propaganda was particularly stepped up before Israel's invasion of Lebanon in March 1978, in order to induce military doctors and nurses to withhold medical help from 'Gentile wounded'. This Nazi-like advice did not refer specifically to Arabs or Palestinians, but simply to 'Gentiles', goyim.) A former Israeli President, Shazar, was an ardent adherent of Habad, and many top Israeli and American politicians - headed by Prime Minister Begin - publicly courted and supported it.

Or take a more recent tidbit, from the *Economist*:

The religious right in Israel - It's on the rise too

As if to match the Islamist surge, religious Jews are gaining in politics too

The Economist, Dec 10th 2011

WHEN revolutionary Zionist pioneers first pitched up in Palestine, they tended to look askance at the existing Orthodox Jews as dusty museum pieces. A century or so on, Orthodox Jews often have a similar attitude to secular Jews. Once a small minority in Israel's state-building project, Orthodox Jews are now at its forefront. They comprise 40% of the ruling coalition's members, and over 40% of new army officers and combat soldiers. As their birth rate is more than double that of secular Jews, their power is set to mount.

The spectrum of political Judaism is as wide as political Islam's. A bit like the split between Muslim Brothers and Salafists, religious Jews loosely divide into religious Zionists, who want Jews to control biblical land, and the ultra-Orthodox, who seek to enforce literal rabbinical dictates.

...

Though intense ideological rivals, they have forged working relations under Binyamin Netanyahu's coalition. Both defend their assets, be it settlements in the West Bank, where they form at least 70% of the Jewish population, or the separate Torah education systems they have created, both with state backing. Both argue that Israel's Jewish character is more vital than its democratic one.

...

In ultra-Orthodox suburbs of Tel Aviv, women, like their Saudi counterparts, do not drive. The American secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, recently said she was worried that women's rights in Israel were being eroded. In the ultra-Orthodox press her photograph was airbrushed out.

Religious Jews tend to be more dismissive of Arabs than their secular compatriots are. Politicians aligned with them promote laws allowing Jews to ban Arabs from living among them. Polls suggest that a high percentage of religious Jews would deny non-Jews the vote.

A few more quick notes on Israel.

First, as Quigley notes, the "Balfour" declaration was really Milner's declaration; moreover, Rothschild, who was a Zionist, was a member of the innermost circle of the Rhodes's secret society. Israel was created by the British Oligarchy, specifically by Milner's secret society.

The reason for the creation of Israel, seems to me, is dual: first, powerful Jewish members of the British Oligarchy, such as Rothschild and Ernest Cassel, pushed for the creation of a "Jewish State" in Palestine; and second, by the early 20th century it was clear that oil would play a crucial geopolitical role in the decades to come, and that the Middle East held huge depositories of the precious black gold - and, therefore, the British decided to establish a beachhead state beholden to them for its very existence smack in the middle of the Orient.

These two parallel developments also explain the bizarre Anglo-American support for the Israel - first, powerful Jewish interests in both countries demand that support; and second, Israel is an Anglo-American beachhead in one of the most geopolitically important regions of the planet.

Note that some strong interests in the United States are not particularly enamoured with Israel. For example, the Rockefeller faction is not Israel's greatest friend. Aaron Russo mentions this; but the clearest indication of Rockefeller's distaste for Israel can be found in Zbig's repeated and pointed criticisms of Israel. Zbig - and therefore the Rockefeller gang - wants a resolution of the Israel-Palestine conflict, which he sees as detrimental to the stability of the Middle East, and to the larger goals of America and the Rockefeller faction.

Speaking of which, let us briefly examine the Israel-Palestine conflagration. The top expert on this issue is Norman Finkelstein.

Let us be clear - Israel is a xenophobic theocracy that was founded in a bout of terrorism and ethnic

cleansing. This is elementary history, and a topic too disgusting to cover in details. Go back to the founding of Israel and you will find Jewish terrorism against the British benefactors of Israel, Jewish massacres against the Palestinians, and other such horrors.

The 1967 Six-Day war was a "pre-emptive" war of aggression. Again, let us be perfectly clear - a "pre-emptive" war is what the Nazis waged against Poland, and, later, the USSR. A "pre-emptive" war is a Nuremberg-level crime. During this "pre-emptive" war, the Israelis occupied what was left of Palestine. Since 1967, the Israelis have slowly but surely been, literally, colonizing Palestine. Their end-goal is simply the gradual removal of the Palestinian population of "greater" Israel.

The Western media tries to portray Israel as the victim in the Israel-Palestine conflict. In the fairy tale fed to the (perhaps not so) gullible Westerners, the Palestinians are recalcitrant terrorists, and the Israelis are merely defending themselves. By the same logic, the French Resistance of World War II was just a gang of evil terrorists attacking the innocent Nazis, who had the duty to defend themselves. In reality, Israel is *occupying* Palestine following a Nuremberg-level war of conquest.

What should be done? Now, I am not the biggest fan of Zbigniew Brzezinski, but I can not help but admire the man's eloquence, realistic grasp of international politics, and general sanity in comparison to the utterly bankrupt Neocon gang that stood behind the Bushes.

Zbig's views have been clearly stated again and again. Take, for example, Zbig's appearance on his daughter's TV show (*Good Morning Joe*) on the 19th of September 2011. Says Zbig: "We talk peace, but we do not promote peace." He characterizes the (then incoming) US veto on Palestinian nationhood as "not only a serious strategic error," but also "a tragic historical error." Zbig argues (elsewhere, for example at his RIIA speech cited above) for the two-State solution with no Palestinian right of return - because Israel would never accept this "right." The Palestinians and their Western friends should ally themselves with Brzezinski and the forces behind him to pursue peace.

In the same interview, Zbig describes Netanyahu's behaviour as "self-destructive." For him - and I completely agree - the current Israeli strategy will lead to isolation, and threatens Israel's long-term prospects of survival.

In political terms, Israel certainly is not a pluralistic democracy, since its Arab denizens are not full citizens. As should be abundantly clear to the non-partisan observer, Israel is something worse than an apartheid state. Indeed, Israel is almost a full-blown Nazi state - and the only reason that it maintains at least a facade of sanity, is the fact that Israeli power is not great enough to permit the masters of Israel to show their true colours.

Moreover, the creeds of Nazism and Zionism stem from roughly the same 19th century sources. For lack of space, I will not pursue this tangential topic.

Lest anyone accuses me for being "anti-Semitic," let me be clear - I would like to see an Israel which peacefully co-exists with its Arabian fellow-nations. The policy of Israeli imperial expansion can only lead to the total isolation of Israel on the world stage. Already, after decades of Israeli affronts to civilization and humanity, the world opinion is degenerating toward an utter hatred of Israel and everything related to Israel. This hatred is *the same hatred exhibited 70 years ago against the Nazis*. Talmudic Israel threatens itself, the Jews both in Israel and at large, and - because Israel is a nuclear power with a thoroughly insane nuclear doctrine - the entire world. The Talmudic mentality *must be criticized for the good of Israel, the Middle East, and indeed the entire world*.

The Wonderful Talmud

The majestic Talmud consists of two parts - the Babylonian and the Palestinian Talmuds. Of the two, the former is the one that carries authority.

(Shahak, Ch.3) The legal system of the Talmud can be described as totally comprehen-

sive, rigidly authoritarian, and yet capable of infinite development, without however any change in its dogmatic base. Every aspect of Jewish life, both individual and social, is covered, usually in considerable detail, with sanctions and punishments provided for every conceivable sin or infringement of the rules. The basic rules for every problem are stated dogmatically and cannot be questioned. What can be and is discussed at very great length is the elaboration and practical definition of these rules.

(Ch.5) ...the Halakhah, that is the legal system of classical Judaism - as practiced by virtually all Jews from the 9th century to the end of the 18th and as maintained to this very day in the form of Orthodox Judaism - is based primarily on the Babylonian Talmud.

The Halakhah is a guide to the Talmud.

(Chapter 2) ...in addition to a series of scurrilous sexual allegations against Jesus, the Talmud states that his punishment in hell is to be immersed in boiling excrement - a statement not exactly calculated to endear the Talmud to devout Christians.

Or one can quote the precept according to which Jews are instructed to burn, publicly if possible, any copy of the New Testament that comes into their hands. (This is not only still in force but actually practiced today; thus on 23 March 1980 hundreds of copies of the New Testament were publicly and ceremonially burnt in Jerusalem under the auspices of Yad Le'akhim, a Jewish religious organization subsidized by the Israeli Ministry of Religions.)

...now one can read quite freely - and Jewish children are actually taught - passages such as that which commands every Jew, whenever passing near a cemetery, to utter a blessing if the cemetery is Jewish, but to curse the mothers of the dead if it is non-Jewish.

(regarding a 1962 publication of a part of the Maimonidean Code) ...the command to exterminate Jewish infidels appears in it in full: 'It is a duty to exterminate them with one's own hands.' In the English translation this is somewhat softened to: 'It is a duty to take active measures to destroy them.' But then the Hebrew text goes on to specify the prime examples of 'infidels' who must be exterminated: 'Such as Jesus of Nazareth and his pupils, and Tzadoq and Baitos and their pupils, may the name of the wicked rot'. Not one word of this appears in the English text on the facing page. And, even more significant, in spite of the wide circulation of this book among scholars in the English-speaking countries, not one of them has, as far as I know, protested against this glaring deception.

... The Megiddo Modern Hebrew-English Dictionary, published in Israel, correctly defines *shegetz* as follows: 'unclean animal; loathsome creature, abomination (colloquial - pronounced shaygets) wretch, unruly youngster; Gentile youngster'.

(Ch.3) ... The Eighth Commandment, 'Thou shalt not steal' (Exodus, 20:15), is taken to be a prohibition against 'stealing' (that is, kidnapping) a Jewish person. The reason is that according to the Talmud all acts forbidden by the Decalogue are capital offenses. Stealing property is not a capital offense (while kidnapping of Gentiles by Jews is allowed by talmudic law) - hence the interpretation.

... Here is a notorious case of turning the literal meaning into its exact opposite. The biblical text plainly warns against following the bandwagon in an unjust cause: 'thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil; neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment' (Exodus, 23:2). The last words of this sentence - 'Decline after many to wrest judgment' - are torn out of their context and interpreted as an injunction to follow the majority.

... The famous verse 'thou shalt love thy fellow as thyself' (Leviticus, 19:18) is understood by classical (and present-day Orthodox) Judaism as an injunction to love one's fellow Jew, not any fellow human. Similarly, the verse 'neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy fellow' (ibid., 16) is supposed to mean that one must not stand idly by

when the life ('blood') of a fellow Jew is in danger; but ... a Jew is in general forbidden to save the life of a Gentile, because 'he is not thy fellow'.

(Ch.5) ... When the victim [of a murder] is a Gentile, the position is quite different. A Jew who murders a Gentile is guilty only of a sin against the laws of Heaven, not punishable by a court. To cause indirectly the death of a Gentile is no sin at all.

...A Gentile murderer who happens to be under Jewish jurisdiction must be executed whether the victim was Jewish or not. However, if the victim was Gentile and the murderer converts to Judaism, he is not punished.

All this has a direct and practical relevance to the realities of the State of Israel. Although the state's criminal laws make no distinction between Jew and Gentile, such distinction is certainly made by Orthodox rabbis, who in guiding their flock follow the Halakhah. Of special importance is the advice they give to religious soldiers.

...Rabbi Shim'on used to say: "The best of Gentiles - kill him; the best of snakes dash out its brains."

...there can be little doubt that in practice this doctrine does exert an influence on the administration of justice, especially by military authorities. The fact is that in all cases where Jews have, in a military or paramilitary context, murdered Arab non-combatants - including cases of mass murder such as that in Kafr Qasim in 1956 - the murderers, if not let off altogether, received extremely light sentences or won far-reaching remissions, reducing their punishment to next to nothing.

...As for Gentiles, the basic talmudic principle is that their lives must not be saved, although it is also forbidden to murder them outright [except in war; the motivation for the prohibition is fear of reprisal].

...Sexual Intercourse between a married Jewish woman and any man other than her husband is a capital offense for both parties, and one of the three most heinous sins. The status of Gentile women is very different. The Halakhah presumes all Gentiles to be utterly promiscuous and the verse 'whose flesh is as the flesh of asses, and whose issue [of semen; Shahak's comment] is like the issue of horses' is applied to them. Whether a Gentile woman is married or not makes no difference, since as far as Jews are concerned the very concept of matrimony does not apply to Gentiles ('There is no matrimony for a heathen'). Therefore, the concept of adultery also does not apply to intercourse between a Jewish man and a Gentile woman; rather, the Talmud equates such intercourse to the sin of bestiality. (For the same reason, Gentiles are generally presumed not to have certain paternity.)

...This does not imply that sexual intercourse between a Jewish man and a Gentile woman is permitted - quite the contrary. But the main punishment is inflicted on the Gentile woman; she must be executed, even if she was raped by the Jew: 'If a Jew has coitus with a Gentile woman, whether she be a child of three or an adult, whether married or unmarried, and even if he is a minor aged only nine years and one day - because he had willful coitus with her, she must be killed, as is the case with a beast, because through her a Jew got into trouble.' The Jew, however, must be flogged, and if he is a Kohen (member of the priestly tribe) he must receive double the number of lashes, because he has committed a double offense: a Kohen must not have intercourse with a prostitute, and all Gentile women are presumed to be prostitutes.

...According to the Halakhah, Jews must not (if they can help it) allow a Gentile to be appointed to any position of authority, however small, over Jews.

...Gentiles are presumed to be congenital liars, and are disqualified from testifying in a rabbinical court.

...The Talmud bluntly forbids giving a gift to a Gentile. However, classical rabbinical authorities bent this rule because it is customary among businessmen to give gifts to business contacts. It was therefore laid down that a Jew may give a gift to a Gentile acquaintance, since this is regarded not as a true gift but as a sort of investment, for

which some return is expected.

...Anti-Gentile discrimination in this matter has become largely theoretical, in view of the dispensation which in effect allows interest to be exacted even from a Jewish borrower. However, it is still the case that granting an interest-free loan to a Jew is recommended as an act of charity, but from a Gentile borrower it is mandatory to exact interest. In fact, many - though not all - rabbinical authorities, including Maimonides, consider it mandatory to exact as much usury as possible on a loan to a Gentile.

...If a Jew finds property whose probable owner is Jewish, the finder is strictly enjoined to make a positive effort to return his find by advertising it publicly. In contrast, the Talmud and all the early rabbinical authorities not only allow a Jewish finder to appropriate an article lost by a Gentile, but actually forbid him or her to return it.

...It is a grave sin to practice any kind of deception whatsoever against a Jew. Against a Gentile it is only forbidden to practice direct deception. Indirect deception is allowed, unless it is likely to cause hostility towards Jews or insult to the Jewish religion.

...It is forbidden to defraud a Jew by selling or buying at an unreasonable price. However, 'Fraud does not apply to Gentiles'...

...It is therefore clear that - exactly as the leaders and sympathizers of Gush Emunim say - the whole question to how the Palestinians ought to be treated is, according to the Halakhah, simply a question of Jewish power: if Jews have sufficient power, then it is their religious duty to expel the Palestinians.

Judaism is imbued with a very deep hatred towards Christianity, combined with ignorance about it. This attitude was clearly aggravated by the Christian persecutions of Jews, but is largely independent of them. In fact, it dates from the time when Christianity was still weak and persecuted (not least by Jews), and it was shared by Jews who had never been persecuted by Christians or who were even helped by them. Thus, Maimonides was subjected to Muslim persecutions by the regime of the Almohads and escaped from them first to the crusaders' Kingdom of Jerusalem, but this did not change his views in the least.

...According to the Talmud, Jesus was executed by a proper rabbinical court for idolatry, inciting other Jews to idolatry, and contempt of rabbinical authority. All classical Jewish sources which mention his execution are quite happy to take responsibility for it; in the talmudic account the Romans are not even mentioned. The more popular accounts - which were nevertheless taken quite seriously - such as the notorious Toldot Yeshu are even worse, for in addition to the above crimes they accuse him of witchcraft. The very name 'Jesus' was for Jews a symbol of all that is abominable, and this popular tradition still persists.

Much more can be added to this putrid list - by I think we have had enough. For a further discussion on the subject, replete with stunning examples of the perversity and rabid xenophobia of the Talmud, consult Elizabeth Dilling's *The Jewish Religion*, and Carol A. Valentine's website *Come and Hear*.²⁶

In Chapter 6 of his work, Shahak gives examples of the political consequences of the Talmudic precepts of Orthodox Judaism.

First, do not succumb to the delusion that the teachings of the Talmud are a long-forgotten phenomenon of a bygone age of barbarism. On the contrary,

(Ch.6) The persistent attitudes of classical Judaism toward non-Jews strongly influence its followers, Orthodox Jews and those who can be regarded as its continuators, Zionists. Through the latter it also influences the policies of the State of Israel. Since 1967, as

²⁶<http://www.come-and-hear.com/index-2.html>

Israel becomes more and more 'Jewish', so its policies are influenced more by Jewish ideological considerations than by those of a coldly conceived imperial interest. This ideological influence is not usually perceived by foreign experts, who tend to ignore or downplay the influence of the Jewish religion on Israeli policies. This explains why many of their predictions are incorrect.

In addition to Israeli policies it may be surmised that the 'Jewish ideology' influences also a significant part, maybe a majority, of the diaspora Jews. While the actual implementation of Jewish ideology depends on Israel being strong, this in turn depends to a considerable extent on the support which diaspora Jews, particularly US Jews, give to Israel. The image of the diaspora Jews and their attitudes to non-Jews, is quite different from the attitudes of classical Judaism, as described above. This discrepancy is most obvious in English-speaking countries, where the greatest falsifications of Judaism regularly occur. The situation is worst in the USA and Canada, the two states whose support for Israeli policies, including policies which most glaringly contradict the basic human rights of non-Jews, is strongest.

Russia and the Jews

I chose to follow Shahak's book in order to provide a Jewish source for my claims, and in order to give a basic framework to this section. Naturally, many pious Jews have criticized Shahak on various accounts - some have even accused him for being "anti-Semitic"!

In reality, Shahak's claims can be easily verified with the other Jewish and non-Jewish sources that I mentioned. Let us, for our part, leave Shahak, and delve into other sources and issues related to the Jews and to Judaism.

For example, let us see what the Jews (meaning, of course, certain relevant groups of Jews rather than every single Jew the world has ever seen or will see) have done to Russia over the last two centuries.

Take Ragozin's 1881 paper *Russian Jews and Gentiles*. Ragozin looks at a pogrom that took place in Ielizavetgrad, a town of 45,000, where about a third of the population was Jewish. The riot 1) began spontaneously; 2) was condemned and suppressed, as much as possible, by the authorities; 3) marked Jewish property not for theft, but for destruction - i.e. the rioters were motivated not by greed or envy, but by sheer fury; some looting did occur, but much of the loot was voluntarily returned at the behest of the authorities; 4) died down when "scarcely anything was left to destroy."; 5) spared Jews of honorable reputation; 6) spared Jewish lawyers and doctors, and other Jews regarded as "useful to society."

Similar, unrelated, riots broke out in other places in Russia at about the same time.

Now, what caused these riots? The typical mindless answer is that the evil ignorant religiously bigoted Russians attacked the innocent good Jews. This view is racist (against the Russians), anti-Christian, and utterly nonsensical.

The reality is that the Russians (and Poles and Ukrainians) justifiably felt that the Jews were oppressing them. Explains Ragozin,

It is a fact so well known in Russia as to need no repetition or argument, that it is in part the merciless and systematic "exploitation," or, as the people so graphically describe it, the sucking out of the country's blood by the Jews which has brought the peasantry of the West to the depths of destitution.

This statement coincides with what Shahak, MacDonald, and Slezkine wrote in their works. Moreover, points out Ragozin, the Russians never instituted pogroms against their fellow Muslim

subjects of the Tsarist Empire. So the riots were not really religiously motivated, though, as we have seen, Judaism is hysterically anti-Christian.

To explain the antagonism of the Russian peasantry toward their Jewish overlords, Ragozin provides the following illustrative examples and observations. She references to the works of one Jacob Brafmann, a Jewish rabbi who converted to Christianity.

Brafmann possessed a number of documents, showing

(Part II) ...as clearly as possible in what way and by what means the Jews, notwithstanding their limited rights, have always succeeded in driving alien elements from the towns and boroughs where they have settled, to get into their hands the capital and immovable property in those places, and to get rid of all competition in commerce and trades, as has been the case in the western provinces of Russia, in Poland, Galicia, Romania; by what miracle it could come to pass that whole departments of France were found to be mortgaged to the Jews in 1806, as Napoleon tells Champagny in his letter of November 9th of that year, although they formed only an insignificant minority in the empire, in all sixty thousand.

The Jews in Eastern Europe lived in *Kahals*, which were, in effect, states-within-the-state, complete with Talmudic courts of justice, called *Beth-din*.

Now, the Talmud says that "the property of Gentiles is even as a waste, free unto all [Jews]." This was taken literally by the pious Eastern European Jews, who energetically tried to defraud and rob their Christian neighbours.

For example, and here Ragozin is quoting Brafmann - so the words below are those of a Jewish scholar - :

(Pt. III, Brafmann) Considering, then, the Gentile population of its district as 'its lake' to fish in, the Kahal proceeds to sell portions of this strange property to individuals on principles as strange. To one uninitiated in Kahal mysteries, such a sale must be unintelligible. Let us take an instance. The Kahal, in accordance with its own rights, sells to the Jew N. a house, which, according to the state laws of the country, is the inalienable property of the Gentile M., without the latter's knowledge or consent. Of what use, it will be asked, is such a transaction to the purchaser? The deed of sale delivered to him by the Kahal cannot invest him with the position which every owner assumes toward his property. M. will not give up his house on account of its having been sold by the Kahal, and the latter has not the power to make him give it up. What, then, has the purchaser N. acquired for the money paid by him to the Kahal? Simply this: he has acquired *khazaka* - i.e., right of ownership over the house of the Gentile M., in force whereof he is given the exclusive right, guaranteed from interference or competition from other Jews, to get possession of the said house, as expressly said in the deed of sale, 'by any means whatever.'

This means that: 1) the mission in life for many Jews was the despoliation of their Gentile neighbours; 2) but the Jews got screwed, too, because to buy a Christian's house, they had to pay twice - once to the "Gentiles," and once to the rabbis.

The usual way of obtaining Gentile houses was Bentham's beloved usury.

(Ragozin) The proposed victim is tempted into borrowing, and enticed on and on by proffered facilities so long as it is supposed he still has a chance of rescue. When he has become entangled in the meshes of renewed bills and compound interest wholly beyond the range of his resources, the blow descends, and the fortunate purchaser enters into open possession of his secretly long-cherished property.

This is also the IMF *modus operandi*.

Another favourite avenue of approach was the peddling of vodka to the long-suffering Russians who

often had little more than vodka to live for - "It is warmth in the inhuman winter cold; mirth in his rare hours of rest; strength - fictitious, it is true, yet upholding him for the time - when he sinks under the day's task; medicine in sickness; above all, it is forgetfulness."

(Ragozin) Well do the Jews know all this, and so the public - houses in the villages are all kept by Jews - a plenteous and never-failing source of replenishment to the exchequer of the kahal. In every village are one or two public-houses, or more, according to its size and the number of its inhabitants; for there must not be more fishers than the lake can support, nor must it be fished out all at once. How complete the success let any village of our western provinces witness, with its wretched, weather-beaten cabins, hingeless doors and shutters, crooked and thatchless roofs, and rotting door-steps; its tottering, yawning barns, scantily propped by poles; empty stables, solitary plows and wagons under ruinous sheds; finally, the long trains of Amoor emigrants mentioned in our first chapter. And if figures are wanted, let this suffice: in 1869, seventy-three per cent of all the immovable property of the western provinces had passed into the hands of the Jews.

On account of their obsession with "Kosher," the Jews controlled the butchering industry in Russia:

So little is this suspected that no sort of objection is raised against their building slaughter-houses, and getting the entire butcher's trade into their own hands; indeed, the fact is mentioned with perfect innocence in the Russian Code of Laws: "In most of the towns of the western provinces there are no butchers but Jews, and only that meat is sold to Christians which is not found kosher."

As the reader undoubtedly suspects, this mean that the Jewish butchers sold tainted meat to their Gentile customers. No need to take my word for it! Here is what a Jewish scholar had to say:

"We cannot wonder," remarks Brafmann, "at the profound loathing with which Jews regard the food of Christians, knowing as they do that much of the meat which is sold them is actually no better than carrion."

To maintain this system, the rabbis frequently bribed the authorities.

Ragozin also mentions the notorious *kol-nidreh* oath. Brafmann also justly complained of the totalitarian nature of the kahals.

That is how things stood in Russia in the 19th century.

We have already seen that in 1905, a gang of Jewish financiers financed the Russo-Japanese war, and sponsored the 1905 Revolution.

Fast-track to 1917. Now, it is a widespread belief that people who allege that the Bolshevik Revolution was a "Jewish conspiracy" are evil lying anti-Semites. Except that both Slezkine and MacDonald, apart from a great many writers of the first half the 20th century, show in great detail that the extreme Jewish involvement in the Bolshevik Revolution was a reality.

In plain terms, it is a trivially verifiable fact that the majority of the key communist revolutionaries of the early 20th century were Jews. Moreover, contrary to various specious claims, the Jews were *the* dominant class in the Soviet Union during the latter's 70 year history.

Marx himself was the descendant of a long line of rabbis.

Trotsky - born Lev Davidovich Bronshtein - was a Jew. But let us read what Slezkine wrote in Chapter 3 of his book - *The Jews and the Russian Revolution*:

In 1900, 5.2 of Europe's 8.7 million Jews resided in Russia, where they comprised 4% of the population. These Jews dominated the professions and the mercantile trades. They spoke Yiddish and lived apart from the rest of the population.

Writers Slezkine, "... there is clearly good reason to argue that the Jews were, in some sense, first among nonequals." They were the most urbanized group in Russia - 49% urban in 1897.

The development of the Russian State was a trouble for the Jews, because, as Shahak pointed out, Classical Judaism operates best when the surrounding State is weak (or ruthlessly authoritarian and caste-based, which is a form of weakness) - thus the Jews are always by definition in opposition to the State, which explains their love for Bolshevism in Tsarist Russia, and the hatred for 'Communism,' meaning the Soviet State, among certain segments of the Soviet Jewish population.

To defend itself, the Tsarist government had banned the Jews from positions in the bureaucracy. Inasmuch as Judaism was a sworn enemy of the state, this was not "anti-Semitism," but good sense. Another problem was that "The state that had used the Jews to extract revenue from the peasants was trying to protect the peasants it still depended on from the Jews it no longer needed. ... The imperial government did not instigate Jewish pogroms; it did, however, help bring them about by concentrating the Jewish population in selected places and occupations and by insisting on separation even as it fostered industrial growth." Note that the rabbis themselves insisted on separation, and commanded their subjects to enter particular professions! The point remains, though - the Russian imperial government "did not instigate pogroms."

In response, many Jews emigrated to the United States, there to do what they do. "More than 70 percent of all Jewish immigrants to the United States came from the Russian Empire." Meanwhile, the Russian Jews continued to urbanize, until just before the war they held a dominant position in Russia's cities. This is critical, because, obviously, cities serve as the political nerve centres of a country.

In adherence with their loathing for productive labour, the Jews were "much more successful at being capitalists, professionals, myth keepers, and revolutionary intellectuals than most people around them." 19th century "capitalists" were notorious basket cases. I can not tell what a "myth keeper" is supposed to be. The "revolutionary intellectuals" were in fact zealous psychopathic mass murderers, as the whole world saw after 1917.

The Jews had dominated the commercial life of the Pale for most of the nineteenth century. Jewish banks based in Warsaw, Vilna, and Odessa had been among the first commercial lending institutions in the Russian Empire (in the 1850s, Berdichev had eight active and well-connected banking houses). In 1851, Jews had accounted for 70% of all merchants in Kurland, 75% in Kovno, 76% in Mogilev, 81% in Chernigov, 86% in Kiev, 87% in Minsk, and 96% each in Volynia, Grodno, and Podolia. Their representation in the wealthiest commercial elite was particularly strong: in Minsk and Chernigov provinces and in Podolia... already in 1828-32, 93.3% of the nonnoble industrial enterprises in Volynia were owned by Jews...

... In 1915-16, when the imperial capital was still formally closed to all but specially licensed Jews, at least 7 of the 17 members of the St. Petersburg Stock Exchange Council and 28 of the 70 joint-stock bank managers were Jews or Jewish converts to Christianity [i.e. crypto-Jews].

And so on. Now, what could possibly go wrong when a community dedicated to the defrauding, despoliation and eventual enslavement - and we have provided repeated testaments to this reality from Jewish sources - of the surrounding population slowly but surely begins to take over a country through the use of usury, bribery, and other underhanded tactics?

Just one more example of the pervasive Jewish influence in Russia's society:

In 1887 in Odessa, Jews owned 35% of factories, which accounted for 57% of all factory output; in 1900, half of the city's guild merchants were Jews; and in 1910, 90% of all grain exports were handled by Jewish firms (compared to 70% in the 1880s.) Most Odessa banks were run by Jews, as was much of Russia's timber export industry. On the eve of World War I, Jewish entrepreneurs owned about one-third of all Ukranian sugar mills

(which accounted for 52 % of all refined sugar), and constituted 42.7% of the corporate board members and 36.5% of board chairmen. ... in 1881 in St. Petersburg, Jews made up 2% of the total population and 43% of all brokers, 41% of all pawn-brokers, 16% of all brothel owners, and 12% of all trading house employees. Between 1869 and 1890, the proportion of business owners among St. Petersburg Jews grew from 17% to 37%.

The Jews also sought to take control of the professions. To that end, they swarmed into the universities - "in 1886, more than 40% of the law and medical students at the universities of Kharkov and Odessa were Jewish. In the empire as a whole, in 1889 Jews accounted for 14% of certified lawyers and 43% of all apprentice lawyers (the next generation of professionals)." And so on and so on - to understand what this meant, read Roth's *Jews Must Live*.

In short, prior to the Great War, the Jews, aided by immensely powerful German and Anglo-American Jewish financiers such as Rothschild, Warburg, and Schiff, were taking over Russia. The inevitable happened, and in 1917 the Jews reached for total control of Russia. The process of take-over was more complicated than a simple conspiracy along the lines of a few powerful Jewish bankers meeting and deciding to conquer Russia - though there demonstrably was some of that, too; but the reality revolved around a multi-faceted historical process, which featured certain curious psychological developments.

As Shahak explained, throughout the 19th century many Jews emancipated themselves from the Kahal. Writes Slezkine, "in the 1870s and 1880s, the revolution of young Jews against their parents reached Russia - eventually in the form of Marxism..." Thus, while many "secular" Jews adopted communism as a rebellion against the Kahal, in one of the great ironies of history, they had merely adopted the philosophy of the Kahal under a new guise. Classical Jewry and Communism are both international, totalitarian, antagonistic to the legitimacy of the outside state, virulently anti-Christian, and rigidly ideological - the similarities between the two creeds are too strong to ignore. And so, at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, thousands of Jews in Russia, Germany, and the United States fell in love with communism.

The end result was a system of the "as above, so below" type, where Jewish capitalist and Jewish communists - like Armand Hammer and Leon Trotsky - gleefully co-operated to tear Russia apart. Writes Slezkine,

In the 1880s, Jews made up about 17% of all male and 27.3% of all female activists of the People's Will party [i.e. the Narodnaya Volya terrorist organization, which had assassinated Alexander II], and about 15.5% and 33.3% of all male and female defendants at political trials. In the peak years of 1886-1889, the Jews accounted for between 25 and 30% of all activists, and between 35 and 40% of those in southern Russia. The influential Orzhikh-Bogoraz-Shternerg group, centered in Ekaterinoslav and known for its uncompromising commitment to political terror, was more than 50% Jewish... of the 4,526 political deportees in January 1905, ..., 37% were Jews.

And then,

(emphasis mine) With the rise of Marxism, the role of Jews in the Russian revolutionary movement became still more prominent.

...

According to the Provisional Government's commissar for the liquidation of the tsarist political police abroad, S.G. Svatikov, **at least 99 (62.3%)** of the 159 political émigrés **who returned to Russia in 1917 in "sealed trains" were Jews**. The first group of 29 that arrived with Lenin included 17 Jews (58.6%).

...

Only in German-dominated Latvia, where nationalist resentment, workers' strikes, and a peasant war coalesced into a single movement under the aegis of the Bolsheviks, **did**

the proportion of revolutionaries in the total population sometimes exceed the Jewish mark.

Now, Slezkine explains that the Jewish revolutionaries were rebelling against their Jewish heritage, i.e. they were not really Jews, etc, etc - but that is naive. Simply put, one does not easily shed the heritage of his cultural tradition. The Jewish revolutionaries were heavily influenced by the Orthodox Jewish tradition described above. In attempting to escape that tradition, they fell right back into its clutches - though under a new paradigm.

Writes Slezkine, unbelievably,

The Jews, as a group, were the only true Marxists because they were the only ones who truly believed that their nationality was "chimerical"; the only ones who - like Marx's proletarians but unlike the real ones - had no motherland.

...

But the Jews were not just the most revolutionary national group in the Russian Empire. They were also the best at being revolutionaries. As Leonard Shapiro put it, "It was the Jews, with their long experience of exploiting conditions on Russia's western frontier which adjoined the pale for smuggling and the like, who organized the illegal transport of literature, planned escapes and illegal crossings, and generally kept the wheels of whole organization running."

Remember - Jacob Schiff was funding the communists from New York; the wealthy Parvus was a Jew; the Rothschilds were in close contact with Milner; Armand Hammer and Robert Maxwell were both Jews - and so on and on and on.

On to the Revolution:

For those [Jews] who wished to fight, there was but one army to join. The Red Army was the only force that stood earnestly and consistently against the Jewish pogroms and the only one led by a Jew. Trotsky was... the living embodiment of redemptive violence... The other Bolshevik leaders standing closest to Lenin during the civil war were G.E. Zinoviev (Ovsei-Gersh Aronovich Radomylsky), L.B. Kamenev (Rosenfeld), and Ya.M. Sverdlov [**all three Jews**].

Slezkine points out that most members of the Bolshevik party were Russians - but that is beside the point. The question is - who controls the contraption? And we have already had our answer.

Let us, for example, look at the infamous Cheka. Its head in the crucial period of 1917-26 was one Felix Dzerzhinsky (1877-1926). He was Polish szlachta. Some claim he was a Jew (through his father's line), but I have not found satisfactory proof to that effect. Dzerzhinsky's second in command was one Yakov Peters (1886-1936), a Latvian. The first head of the Petrograd Cheka, Moisei Uritsky (1873-1918), was a Jew. He was assassinated on August 17, 1918, by a Russian aristocrat Jew. The head of the Kiev Cheka was Martin Latsis (1888-1938), another Latvian. The man who ordered the August 1918 Red Terror was Sverdlov (1885-1919), a Jew. The Hungarian revolutionary Bela Kun (1886-1938?), a half Jew (by line of father), was in charge of the massacres in the Crimea. Yan Berzin (1889-1938) was another Latvian prominent in the Terror.

Genrikh Yagoda (1891-1938), Stalin's NKVD enforcer between 1934 and 1936, was also Jewish. His successor was Nikolai Yezhov (1895-1940), the husband to the Jewess Yevgenia Feigenberg. The details of Yezhov's birth are shrouded in mystery. The next head of the NKVD was Beria (1899-1953), who was an Orthodox Georgian.

Two of Stalin's intimates were Molotov (1890-1986), husband to the Jewess Polina Zhemchuzhina, and Lazar Kaganovich (1893-1991), a Jew. Molotov and Kaganovich bear great responsibility for the Ukrainian Famine.

But back to Slezkine's analysis. Emphasis mine;

[The Jews'] overall share of Bolshevik party membership during the civil war was relatively modest (5.2% in 1922), but their visibility in city squares was striking. After the February Revolution, all army officers had become suspect as possible "counterrevolutionaries"; the new soldiers' committees required literate delegates; many of the literate soldiers were Jews. Victor Shklovsky, the literary scholar, estimated that **Jews had made up about 40% of all top elected officials in the army.** ... In April 1917, 10 out of 24 members of the governing bureau of the Petrograd Soviet were Jews.

At the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets in June 1917, at least 31 % of Bolshevik delegates were Jews. At the Bolshevik Central Committee meeting of October 23, 1917, which voted to launch an armed insurrection, **5 out of the 12 members present were Jews.** Three out of seven Politburo members charged with leading the October uprising were Jews. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee elected at the Second Congress of Soviets (which ratified the Bolshevik takeover...) included 62 Bolsheviks (out of 101) members. Among them were 23 Jews, 20 Russians, 5 Ukrainians, 5 Poles, 4 "Balts," 3 Georgians, and 2 Armenians. According to Nahum Rafalkes-Nir, who represented Palei-Zion, **all 15 speakers who debated the takeover as their parties' official representatives were Jews (in fact, probably 14).**

...

The first Bolshevik commandants of the Winter Palace and the Moscow Kremlin were Grigorii Isakovich Chudnovsky and Emelian Yaroslavsky (Minei Izraelevich Gubelman). Yaroslavsky was also the chairman of the League of the Militant Godless. The heads of the Soviet delegation at the Brest-Litovsk negotiations were Adolf Ioffe and Trotsky. Trotsky was the face of the Red Army.

And so on:

In 1918, about 54% of all Petrograd Party officials described as "leading" were Jews, as were 45% of city and provincial Party officials and 36% of Northern District commissars. Three out of five members of the presidium of the Petrograd trade union council in 1919, and 13 out of 36 members of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet in 1920 were Jews. In 1923 in Moscow, Jews made up 29 % of the Party's "leading cadres" and 45% of the provincial social security administration.

In regard to the Cheka and its offshoots, the Jews held on to the commanding positions and let Latvians do the dirty work: (emphasis mine)

... even in the Cheka, Bolsheviks of Jewish origin combined ideological commitment with literacy in ways that set them apart and propelled them upward. ... Jews made up 19.1% of all central apparatus investigators and 50% (6 out of 12) of the investigators employed in the department for combating counter-revolution. In 1923, at the time of the creation of the OGPU (the Cheka's successor), Jews made up 15.5% of all "leading" officials and **50% of the top brass (4 out of 8 members of the Collegium's Secretariat).** ... Leonard Schapiro is probably justified in generalizing (especially about the territory of the former Pale) that "anyone who had the misfortune to fall into the hands of the Cheka stood a very good chance of finding himself confronted with and possibly shot by a Jewish investigator."

In regard to the Red Terror:

Specifically, and very publicly, Jewish names were associated with two of the most dramatic and symbolically significant acts of the Red Terror. ... in June 1918, Lenin ordered the killing of Nicholas II and his family. Among the men entrusted with carrying out the order were Sverdlov, Shaia Goloshchekin, and Yakov Yurovsky. It was meant to be a secret operation, but after the Whites reoccupied Ekaterinburg, they ordered an official

investigation, the results of which, including the Jewish identities of the main perpetrators, were published in Berlin in 1925 (and eventually confirmed). At the end of the civil war, in late 1920-early 1921, Bela Kun and R.S. Zemliachka (Razaliia Zalkind, the head of the Crimean Party Committee and the daughter of a well-off Kiev merchant) presided over the massacre of thousands of refugees and prisoners of war who had stayed behind after the evacuation of the White Army.

And so on.

I think this will suffice.

Also see Kevin MacDonald's trilogy. Additional sources can be provided, but I feel that both Slezkine and MacDonald have the advantage of being simultaneously thorough and credible.

In short, the Bolshevik Revolution 1) came in the wake of the Russo-Japanese war and the 1905 revolution, both of which were financed by Jewish interest; 2) was led by a group of predominantly Jewish revolutionaries.

Moreover, the 1917 Revolution was financed by Wall Street and City factions, who had ties with powerful Jewish interests such as Rothschild, Cassel, Kuhn & Loeb, and so on.

Nor was the Bolshevik Revolution the only red insurrection inspired by Jewish revolutionaries - quite the contrary. Communism and Jewry went hand in hand across the world.

This is not to say that the Bolshevik Revolution was a carefully pre-meditated plan of a global Jewish conspiracy. The big picture is larger than that. The fact remains that the 1917 genocidal revolution in Russia was, to an uncomfortably large degree, a Jewish affair.

But it gets worse, as we will see briefly. But first, a quick note on the legends of the anti-Semitism of the USSR. In fact, the Soviets declared anti-Semitism a capital offence soon after gaining power. Many Russian, particularly among the Whites, harboured anti-Jewish sentiments for reasons, which should by now be apparent. Stalin, after he took power, and especially during and after the war, made the Soviet Union far more nationalistic in character. The Jews of the USSR, who were doing quite well, naturally reacted against this recreation of a strong Russo-centric state. Thus, in the late Soviet era many anti-Soviet dissenters were Jews. Moreover, many of those dissenters used their ethnicity to move to the U.S. or to Israel. Friedman in his *Red Mafiya* repeatedly quotes the members of the Russian Jewish Mob to the effect that: 1) the Jews were doing great in the USSR, and 2) the mobsters used their Jewishness to gain access to the US.

To give you an idea of the Jewish situation in the post-revolutionary USSR, let me again quote Slezkine, now from Chapter 4:

By 1939, 86.9% of all Soviet Jews lived in urban areas, about half of them in the eleven largest cities of the USSR.

...

In 1926, Jews constituted 1.8% of the Soviet population and 20% of all private traders (66% in Ukraine and 90% in Belorussia). In Petrograd (in 1923), the share of private entrepreneurs employing hired labor was 5.8 times higher among Jews than in the rest of the population. In 1924 in Moscow, Jewish "Nepmen" owned 75.4% of all drugstores, 54.6% of all fabric stores, 48.6% of all jewelry stores, 39.4% of all dry goods stores, [etc]... The new "Soviet bourgeoisie" was Jewish to a very considerable extent. At the bottom of the "Nepman" category, Jews made up 40% of all Soviet artisans; at the top, they constituted 33% of the wealthiest Moscow entrepreneurs.

...

Ultimately, however, the Soviet "bourgeois" never became identified with the Jew. The class enemies of the NEP-era demonology were primarily Russian peasants, Russian shop-

keepers, and Russian Orthodox priests, as well as the largely cosmopolitan pusillanimous "philistines" and foreign capitalists.

...

When NEP came to an end all remaining private entrepreneurs - with Jewish "fathers" prominent among them - were being hounded, robbed, arrested, and kicked out of their home, most of the OGPU officials in charge of the operation were Jews themselves. By 1934, when the OGPU was transformed into the NKVD, Jews "by nationality" constituted the largest single group among the "leading cadres" of the Soviet secret police (37 Jews, 30 Russians, 7 Latvians, 5 Ukrainians, 4 Poles, 3 Georgians, 3 Belorussians, 2 Germans, and 5 assorted others). Twelve key NKVD departments and directorates, including those in charge of the police, labor camps, counterintelligence, surveillance, and economic wrecking were headed by Jews... The people's commissar of internal affairs was Genrikh Grigorevich (Enokh Gershenovich) Yagoda.

And more:

From the inception of the Soviet regime, the unique combination of exceptionally high literacy rates [due to urbanization] and a remarkable degree of political loyalty [to the murderous Soviet regime] had made Jews the backbone of the new Soviet bureaucracy.

...

In 1939 in Leningrad, Jews made up 69.4% of all dentists; 58.6% of all pharmacists; 45% of all defense lawyers; 38.6% of all doctors; [etc.]

...

The higher one looks in the status hierarchy, the greater the Jewish share.

...

Most members of the new Soviet elite were not Jews, and most Jews were not members of the new Soviet elite. But there is no doubt that the Jews had a much higher proportion of elite members than any other ethnic group in the USSR. ... it seems certain that Jews would have constituted the largest single component of the new Soviet elite, especially (or rather, most visibly) its cultural contingent. They tended to be the poets, the prophets, and the propagandists. [i.e. the brainwashers]

This really should suffice. Let us move on to the 1990s.

Follows an excerpt from Mark Ames's *The Exile* May 18, 2007 article, *The Jews: Where Are They Now?*. Ames is a Californian Jew, and one of the best-informed Americans on the subject of post-Communist Russia.

When the Tsar's secret police wrote and distributed *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* around the turn of the 20th-century, they essentially invented modern anti-Semitism. The infamous forged pamphlet alleged to be the minutes of a Jewish cabal plotting to control the Christian world by monopolizing international finance and media. The Protocols served its purpose, provoking fresh waves of anti-Jewish pogroms across Russia, which temporarily took the heat off the besieged Tsar.

Ninety years later, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, a funny thing happened: Russia's media and finance was overwhelmingly controlled by Jews. Paranoia and fiction became reality. Of the seven oligarchs who controlled more than 50% of Russia's economy during the 1990s, six were Jews: Boris Berezovsky, Vladimir Gusinsky, Alexander Smolensky, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Mikhail Friedman, and Vitaly Malkin. Berezovsky also controlled the state television station and several newspapers, while Gusinsky's media empire controlled NTV, Russia's only national independent TV station, as well as major radio and print outlets.

While these largely Jewish figures appeared to dominate the nation, Russia suffered through a decade of unprecedented industrial decline, mass poverty, and a soaring death

rate unheard of in an industrialized country not at war. It was a nightmare come true for a country where anti-Semitism is as common as birch trees.

... That meant that while ethnic Slavs dominated all the best career slots in the highly bureaucratized Soviet society, Jews dominated the black market economy. After the collapse of communism, the black market became legalized as free-market capitalism. And so a disproportionate number of Jews went from being black marketers to robber barons to oligarchs.

On top of that, Anatoly Chubais, the notorious economic czar of Yeltsin's, was another Jew. Putin cracked down on the Russian Oligarchs - but a new crop emerged!

Of the eight OJs [Original Jewigarchs], six are out (not to mention the now-quiet Vitaly Malkin). But while six out of eight Jews permanently crossed from the list may seem like a lot, don't let your Christian children out during Passover just yet. If you look at the list of the top ten richest Russians, no less than four are definitely of the Hebrew persuasion and the fifth is a question mark.

Indeed, plenty of Jews are doing just fine under Putin, so long as they play by the new rules. Take for example Mikhail Fradkov, Putin's half-Jewish prime minister. He'll tell you.

Ames proceeds to list Mikhail Friedman, Anatoly Chubais, Roman Abramovich, Oleg Deripaska, Vladimir Lisin, and Victor Vekselberg.

The neo-Oligarchy and the immensely powerful mobs which demolished Russia in the 1990s were overwhelmingly Jewish. And, again, it gets worse.

Journalist (and Jew) Robert Friedman, in his *Red Mafiya*, analyses the Russian mob in the United States. It turns out that: 1) the "Russian" mob is in reality a Russian Jewish mob - Friedman makes the point repeatedly; 2) that mob is international with strong ties with Israel, the Jewish Oligarchs of Russia, and the Wall Street and City of London nexuses of financial power.

In summary, largely Jewish-driven movements managed to destroy Russia twice in a century - once in the decade after 1917, and again in the decade after 1990. Is there a conspiracy? It is absurd to argue, in the face of the overwhelming evidence, that there is not; though perhaps one could examine the phenomenon as a historical process, in which the Jews, in conjunction with the Anglo-American and other incidentally allied interests, act like a highly organized Mafia.

Germany and Austria

The 1918 Spartacist communist revolt in Germany was spearheaded by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. The latter was a Jew, and the former was reputed to be a Jew. Both died in the reprisals that followed the unsuccessful coup. Kurt Eisner, the Jewish Bavarian socialist who argued for the admission of German guilt for the instigation of World War I, was killed in Munich in February 1919. His death led to the brief creation of the Bavarian Soviet Republic.

Some data provided in Chapter 2 of Slezkine's book:

In the early nineteenth century, thirty of the fifty-two private banks in Berlin were owned by Jewish families; a hundred years later many of these banks became shareholding companies with Jewish managers, some of them directly related to the original owners as well as to each other. The greatest German joint stock banks, including the Deutsche Bank and the Dresdner Bank, were founded with the participation of Jewish financiers, as were the Rothschilds' Creditanstalt in Austria [which started the 1931 pan-European bank run] and the Pereires' Crédit Mobilier in France. (Of the remaining private - i.e.,

non-joint stock - banks in Weimar Germany, almost half were owned by Jewish families). In fin de siècle Vienna, 40% of the directors of public banks were Jews or of Jewish descent, and all banks but one were administered by Jews (some of them members of old banking clans) under the protection of duly titled and landed *Paradegoyim*²⁷. Between 1873 and 1910, at the height of political liberalism, the Jewish share of the Vienna stock exchange council remained steady at about 70%, and in 1921 Budapest, 87.8 % of the members of the stock exchange and 91% of the currency brokers association were Jews, many of them ennobled. In industry there were some spectacularly successful Jewish magnates, some areas with high proportions of Jewish industrial ownership (such as Hungary), and some strongly "Jewish" industries (such as textiles, food, and publishing), but the principal contribution of Jews to industrial development appears to have consisted in the financing and managerial control by banks. In Austria, of the 112 industrial directors who held more than seven simultaneous directorships in 1917, half were Jews associated with the great banks, and in interwar Hungary, more than half and perhaps as much as 90% of all industry was controlled by a few closely related Jewish banking families. In 1912, 20% of all millionaires in Britain and Prussia were Jews. In 1908-11, in Germany as a whole, Jews made up 0.95% of the population and 31% of the richest families. In 1930, about 71% of the richest Hungarian taxpayers were Jews. And of course the Rothschilds, "the world's bankers" as well as the "Kings of the Jews," were, by a large margin, the wealthiest family of the nineteenth century.

...

In turn-of-the-century Vienna, 62% of the lawyers, half the doctors and dentists, 45% of the medical faculty, and one fourth of the total faculty were Jews, as were between 51.5% and 63.2% of professional journalists. In 1920, 59.9% of Hungarian doctors, 50.6% of lawyers, 39.25% of all privately employed engineers and chemists, 34.3% of editors and journalists, and 28.6% of musicians identified themselves as Jews by religion. (If one were to add converts to Christianity, the numbers would presumably be much higher.) In Prussia, 16% of physicians, 15% of dentists, and one-fourth of all lawyers in 1925 were Jews; and in interwar Poland, Jews were about 56% of all doctors in private practice, 43.3% of all private teachers and educators, 33.5% of all lawyers and notaries, and 22% of all journalists, publishers, and librarians.

...

As Steven Beller put it, "in an age when the press was the only mass medium, cultural or otherwise, the liberal press was largely a Jewish press."

The same was true, to a lesser degree, of publishing houses...

And so on and on.

This gives us a general idea of where Hitler came from. Again, let us be clear - this is not to justify the Nazis, but to get an idea of their motivation.

Once more one has to ask - what could possibly go wrong, when a strongly self-identified group, whose outlook, if not necessarily fully Talmudic, is - perhaps unconsciously - overwhelmingly self-serving and antagonistic to the surrounding society, slowly penetrates the nodes of power of the larger society? Obviously enough, the Jewish bankers would lift up Jewish industrialists, the Jewish journalists would eulogize the prominent Jewish citizens, the Jewish lawyers would protect their fellow Jews from clink-time - and so on. By and large, the first allegiance of the Jews is not to the German, or Austrian, or Polish state - but to their fellow Jews. Note that in the period examined by Slezkine, Zionism was gaining immense popularity in Jewish circles. On top of everything, many of the most visible communist agitators were Jews. What could go wrong? We all know.

²⁷The word seems to be the corresponding equivalent of the expression "house Jew."

Influence and Embarrassments

This section contains various ad-hoc facts pertaining to our subject.

Henry Makow, PhD, is a Jew and a self-identified former Zionist, as well as a researcher into the Illuminati situation. From his May 30, 2004 article *The "Jewish" Conspiracy is British Imperialism:*

According to L.G. Pine, the Editor of *Burke's Peerage*, Jews "have made themselves so closely connected with the British peerage that the two classes are unlikely to suffer loss which is not mutual. So closely linked are the Jews and the lords that a blow against the Jews in this country would not be possible without injuring the aristocracy also." (*Tales of the British Aristocracy*, 1957, p.219.)

Published in the *L.A. Times* on December 19, 2008:

How Jewish is Hollywood?

By Joel Stein

I have never been so upset by a poll in my life. Only 22% of Americans now believe "the movie and television industries are pretty much run by Jews," down from nearly 50% in 1964. The Anti-Defamation League, which released the poll results last month, sees in these numbers a victory against stereotyping. Actually, it just shows how dumb America has gotten. Jews totally run Hollywood.

How deeply Jewish is Hollywood? When the studio chiefs took out a full-page ad in the Los Angeles Times a few weeks ago to demand that the Screen Actors Guild settle its contract, the open letter was signed by: News Corp. President Peter Chernin (Jewish), Paramount Pictures Chairman Brad Grey (Jewish), Walt Disney Co. Chief Executive Robert Iger (Jewish), Sony Pictures Chairman Michael Lynton (surprise, Dutch Jew), Warner Bros. Chairman Barry Meyer (Jewish), CBS Corp. Chief Executive Leslie Moonves (so Jewish his great uncle was the first prime minister of Israel), MGM Chairman Harry Sloan (Jewish) and NBC Universal Chief Executive Jeff Zucker (mega-Jewish). If either of the Weinstein brothers had signed, this group would have not only the power to shut down all film production but to form a *minyan* with enough Fiji water on hand to fill a *mikvah*.

The person they were yelling at in that ad was SAG President Alan Rosenberg (take a guess). The scathing rebuttal to the ad was written by entertainment super-agent Ari Emanuel (Jew with Israeli parents) on the *Huffington Post*, which is owned by Arianna Huffington (not Jewish and has never worked in Hollywood.)

The Jews are so dominant, I had to scour the trades to come up with six Gentiles in high positions at entertainment companies. When I called them to talk about their incredible advancement, five of them refused to talk to me, apparently out of fear of insulting Jews. The sixth, AMC President Charlie Collier, turned out to be Jewish.

As a proud Jew, I want America to know about our accomplishment. Yes, we control Hollywood. Without us, you'd be flipping between "The 700 Club" and "Davey and Goliath" on TV all day.

So I've taken it upon myself to re-convince America that Jews run Hollywood by launching a public relations campaign, because that's what we do best. I'm weighing several slogans, including: "Hollywood: More Jewish than ever!"; "Hollywood: From the people who brought you the Bible"; and "Hollywood: If you enjoy TV and movies, then you probably like Jews after all."

In fact, Hollywood was founded by Jews and has been ran by Jews throughout its history. The influence of Hollywood in the shaping of American 20th century "culture" can not be overstated. Also see Neal Gabler's *An Empire of Their Own* (1988).

Jon Stewart (1962-), in charge of the immensely popular *Daily Show*, is regarded as America's top

journalist. He is a Jew, and his brother Larry Leibowitz is a big-time banker and the chief operating officer of the New York Stock Exchange. Bill Maher (1956-) is a Jew and a devoted Zionist. Jay Leno (1950-) and Larry King (1933-) are also Jewish.

Or let us look at the *New York Times*, America's "most prestigious" newspaper.

Their editor is Jill Abramson, of whom, apparently, the *Jewish Journal* has it "from reliable sources that Jill Abramson is Jewish."²⁸ Opinion editor - Andrew Rosenthal.

Of the main *NYT* columnists, David Brooks the token conservative is a Jew. The Globaloney pusher Thomas Friedman - whose paean of the free-markets, *The World Is Flat* is, as Ralph Nader once mentioned somewhere, as accurate as its title - is a Jew and a great lover of Israel. Paul Krugman is a Jew. Nicholas D. Kristof, however, is not Jewish.

August 8, 2011, CBS News:

Report: 81 congressmen going to Israel on break

Perhaps seeking a salty dip in the Dead Sea to end a stressful debt debate, nearly one in five members of the House in Representatives will use their summer recess period to visit Israel, The Jerusalem Post reports.

Of the 81 heading over, 55 are Republicans and 26 are Democrats, The Post reports. Half of the freshmen Republican reps - 47 of them - make up that group, and many of them will be visiting Israel for the first time.

The political influence of AIPAC and America's Jewry is too notorious to bother with. Note that many of the other members of Congress have gone to Israel at other times. As the reader can trivially check for himself, one can not become a US President without frequent and pathetic protestations of fealty toward Israel.

Imagine a fifth of Congress suddenly descended upon, say, Nicaragua. What would people say and think? But Tel Aviv appears to be some kind of a second Washington.

The banks: the Rothschilds had a great banking financial empire in the 19th century. The Jew Ernest Cassel was the court banker of the British Monarchy at the eve of World War I. Max Warburg, in turn, was the Kaiser's court banker. On the other side of the ocean, Kuhn, Loeb & Co of Jacob Schiff was the most prestigious bank after J.P. Morgan's institution. It is well established that at his death, J.P. Morgan held only about a fifth of his net worth. I have heard that Rothschild interests held the balance, but I have not seen a good source verifying the claim.

The four largest modern (non-secret) US investment banks before the crash were: Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, Lehman Brothers and Merrill Lynch. Goldman Sachs was clearly founded by Jews. The bank's head honchos Lloyd Blankfein and Gary Cohn are Jews. Morgan Stanley was founded by a grandson of J.P.'s and Harold Stanley of the Skull and Bones. Head honchos: John J. Mack, of Lebanese/Greek/? origins, and James P. Gorman, apparently a Jew. The Lehman brothers were Jews. The head of LB in 2008 was Richard S. Fuld, Jr., a Jew. Merrill & Lynch were East Coast Establishment, but were not Jews. Their bank folded into the Bank of America in 2009. The CEOs of the largest US banks - BoA, JP Morgan Chase, and Citigroup are not Jewish.

Federal Reserve: Ben S. Bernanke, the current chairman, is a Jew. His predecessor, Alan Greenspan, in charge 1987-2006, is a Jew. Eugene I. Meyer, head of the Fed in the crucial years between 1930 and 1933, was a Jew. He was trained at the Jewish powerful Lazard bank. Arthur F. Burns, head of the Fed between 1970 and 1978, when the emasculation of America started, was a Jew. Marriner Stoddard Eccles, chairman between 1934 and 1948, was a Mormon. Charles Sumner Hamlin, the first chairman of the Fed (1914-1916), was another Jew.

People of the Jewish persuasion hold great influence in global banking, but it is wrong to claim that banking is all Jewish. The Anglo-Americans have their share of banks.

²⁸http://www.jewishjournal.com/bloggish/item/new_york_times_new_editor_jill_abramson_worlds_most_powerful_jewish_woman_2/

The notorious and very powerful ADL was founded from the B'nai B'rith, which is a Jewish Masonic organization. For a good expose on the ADL, look up Bill Cooper's three talks on the subject (the first one is *Hour of the Time* for June 23, 1994). Cooper quotes a LaRouche expose on the subject, the details of which he has verified.

Not only is the Russian mob Jewish; there have been many notable American Jewish gangsters, notably Meyer Lansky (1902-1983) and Bugsy Siegel (1906-1947).

The Neocon movement, which governed the Bush White House, is largely Jewish. Just look at the Neocon roster on Wikipedia:

Public intellectuals: Irving Kristol (Jew), William Kristol (Jew), Norman Podhoretz (Jew), John Podhoretz (Jew), Irwin Stelzer (Jew), Charles Krauthammer (Jew), David Brooks (Jew), David Frum (Jew), Max Boot (Jew), Andrew Sullivan (HIV bearing Irish Catholic Oxbord/ Harvard paradegoy).

Academics: Robert Kagan (Skull and Bones, Jew), Francis Fukuyama (paradegoy Chicago boy), Victor Davis Hanson (columnist at the *Jewish World Review*), Michael Ledeen (Jew), Sidney Hook (Jew), Nathan Glazer (Jew), Harvey Mansfield (Jew?), Bernard Lewis (Jew).

Government officials: Paul Wolfowitz (Jew), R. James Woolsey, Jr. (heh²⁹), Richard Perle (Jew), Jeane Kirkpatrick ("staunch supporter of the State of Israel"), Scooter Libby (Jew), Condoleezza Rice (token woman, token black), Richard Armitage, Zalmay Khalilzad (Afghan sell-out), Elliot Abrams (Jew), William G. Boykin (fundamentalist evangelical Christian), Frank Gaffney (columnist for *Jewish World Review*), John R. Bolton (prominent in the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs), Eliot A. Cohen (self-hating Jew, apparently).

Politicians: George W. Bush (Skull and Bones), Dick Cheney (JINSA), Henry M. Jackson (JINSA), Joe Lieberman (Orthodox Jew), John McCain, Daniel Patrick Moynihan (pro-Israel), Donald Rumsfeld.

The founder of the movement was the Jew Leo Strauss. He was the recipient of a Rockefeller Fellowship in 1932. One of Strauss's intellectual influences was Carl Schmitt, who later became the Nazis' chief jurist. Strauss was also Zionist.

Kevin MacDonald discusses the Jewish influence in the psycho-analysis movement and the Frankfurt School, both of which he views as malignant to Western society. Psycho-analysis was Jewish through and through - Freud himself was a Jew. It is of interest that the modern Public Relations industry was invented in great part by Freud's nephew, the Jew Edward Bernays.

Jewish people have held a plethora of influential posts in the U.S. government, especially in the last 20 years. The list is too long to bother with.

The Jewish professor Ariel Toaff's in his *Blood Passover* argues that the notorious blood libel was not really a libel, i.e. certain Cabala-loving Jews did massacre Christian children for occult purposes in the medieval era.

Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Vietnam, Serbia, Panama, and Granada committed zero unprovoked acts of war against NATO in the last half-century. Nil.

Israel has committed at least two such acts of war in the last fifty years. The first was the attack on the USS Liberty on June 8, 1967. Thirty-four Americans died in the incident, and 170 were wounded. Tel Aviv had hoped to blame the attack on the Arabs in order to obtain American assistance in the

²⁹<http://info.jpost.com/C003/Supplements/FSB/030926/art.04.html>: "I sometimes get asked these days if I'm Jewish it's my neoconish views on defense and foreign affairs, I suppose. For a while I would just say, 'No, Presbyterian,' but I've started saying instead, 'Well, I anchor the Presbyterian wing of JINSA (the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs).'" "

Six-Day War.

The second overt act of war on the part of Israel came on 30 May 2010, when Israeli commandos boarded the Mavi Marmara in international waters and proceeded to slaughter nine of the unarmed passengers, one of them an American.

These two incidents in themselves prove that NATO is nothing but a bashing club for the Anglo-American establishment and their allies.

From Wikipedia's page on Baruch Goldstein (1956-1994). This Goldstein was an American born Jewish physician, who, on February 25, 1994, decided to celebrate the Jewish holiday of Purim in the traditional manner: Mr. Baruch went to the holy Islamic Cave of the Patriarchs in full uniform, and opened fire on the congregation. Twenty-nine died and more than a hundred were wounded before Baruch was beaten to death. In the Palestinian riots that followed the incident, the IDF murdered 25 more Palestinians.

Baruch's grave-site has become a holy shrine. "At least 10,000 people have visited the grave since the massacre."

At Goldstein's funeral, Rabbi Yaacov Perrin claimed that even one million Arabs are "not worth a Jewish fingernail". Samuel Hacoheh, a teacher at a Jerusalem college, declared Goldstein the "greatest Jew alive, not in one way but in every way" and said that he was "the only one who could do it, the only one who was 100 percent perfect." In contrast, mainstream Jewish religious leaders "rejected the suggestion that killing Palestinians with an automatic rifle" was authorized by the Torah.

Whenever the reader hears of "Palestinian extremists," let him think of Baruch.

After the latest Israeli massacre of Palestinians in 2009, the Jew Goldstone wrote a report, which accused Israel of war crimes and possible crimes against humanity. Naturally, the report inspired a desperate howl of protestation from various concerned quarters. On April 1, 2011, in what was perhaps a joke, Goldstone retracted a part of his report.

The *Protocols* may or may not have been a forgery; but Michael Higger's *The Jewish Utopia* is a genuine example of Jewish supremacist literature. Dr. Michael Higger was a respected rabbinical scholar of the Talmud, in whose name the Jewish Theological Seminary awards a scholarship.

The total conservative estimate for the non-inflation adjusted American aid to Israel is of the order of \$114 billion.³⁰ America coughs out something like \$4 billion annually.

After the war, starting in the early 1950s, the Germans paid 3 billion Marks as reparations to Israel. Israel's current GDP is around \$230 billion, with a budget around \$60 billion. The American and German "aid" was absolutely instrumental during the early existence of Israel. Today, one wonders how people would react if the U.S. were to wire billions to the government of, say, Croatia, which, along with the other former Yugoslavian states, conducted ethnic cleansing in the 1990s. The Croatian GDP is \$60 billion. Suppose the US had awarded the Croats \$5 billion per annum, plus military equipment, in the early 1990s.

Besides, why should the US give money to Israel, when Israel is a strong industrial nation, and the US suffers from serious debt problems?

In his 1991 book *The Samson Option*, the Jewish Pulitzer-prize winning journalist Seymour Hersh explained that Israel's nuclear policy - the Samson Option, a.k.a. Mad Dog policy - dictates that should Israel ever risk obliteration, the Israeli nuclear arsenal will fly in the direction of the major world cities. Pure blackmail.

³⁰<http://wrmea.org/component/content/article/245-2008-november/3845-congress-watch-a-conservative-estimate-of->html, 2nd December 2011.

Historically, the greatest European (and by the Age of Discovery, world) trade powers were, roughly: Venice in the Middle Ages; the Iberians in the 16th century; the Dutch in the 17th century; the British until 1918; the United States since 1918. The Jews have had a strong presence in all of these powers exactly at their times of pre-eminence.

Speaking of which, Cromwell's Revolution (circa 1650) brought the Jews to England; the French Revolution (1789) emancipated (perhaps to the chagrin of the rabbis) the French Jews; and the Bolshevik Revolution (1917) emancipated the Russian Jews. All three events involved civil war, endemic religious strife, and major societal disruptions. Perhaps Jewish money-masters financed the first two revolutions - but that implies no blame on Jewry in general. The situation in Russia we have already examined.

Norman Finkelstein, the son of two Holocaust survivors, penned the book *The Holocaust Industry* (2000). From the man's website:³¹

Ten years ago this past month my book *The Holocaust Industry* was published. It evoked outrage from the Jewish-Holocaust-Israel establishment and marked the beginning of the end of my academic career. I lost my job at Hunter College right after its publication and Depaul University cited it as grounds for denying me tenure in 2007. Much of the outrage was directed at the chapter entitled The Double Shakedown, in which I documented the Holocaust industry's blackmail of European governments in the name of "needy Holocaust victims" and then the shakedown of Holocaust victims by the Jewish organizations that pocketed the "Holocaust compensation" monies. Although controversial then, it has now become a commonplace how corrupt this racket was. Nearly all the principals in the Holocaust shakedown racket - Rabbi Israel Singer, Alan Hevesi, Burt Neuborne, Neal Sher, Melyvn Weiss, Edward Fagan, Avraham Herschson - have been exposed as crooks. A central role in this racket has been played by the Claims' Conference. ... I would enter one caveat however: the biggest crooks are not those who embezzled money from the Crooks' Conference but those who run it, in particular the filthy Greg Schneider. Out of deference to the memory of my late parents, I categorically oppose the death penalty (both my parents vehemently opposed it), but out of respect for their memory I also certainly wouldn't mind if all these characters were hoisted on the nearest lamppost by ropes around their necks.

Finkelstein also had much to say in regard to Elie Wiesel.

Also of interest are Victor Ostrovsky's books on the Mossad. Ostrovsky was a Mossad operative himself. During his stint with the Israeli intelligence, Ostrovsky noticed that the Mossad deals drugs and engages in other contraband. The Mossad agents were utterly arrogant and ruthless. The Mossad considered the whole world - including the United States - Israel's enemy, and took whatever information it could from its allied intelligence service, without necessarily providing information in return. The Mossad has an extensive spy network in the United States.

One interesting and crucial aspect of the Mossad is its use of non-Israeli Jews. Those are called *Sayanim*. Whenever necessary, the Mossad approaches patriotic non-Israeli Jews, and asks them for help under the pretext of "saving Israeli lives." Sometimes, the Sayanim betray state secrets, or aid the Mossad in terrorist operations. This once more shows the double-allegiance of all Zionist minded Jews worldwide. No one who professes Zionist sympathies should ever be given influential posts in the governments of the Western nations.

Dr. Tony Martin of Wellesley College has shown that Jewish mercantile interest commanded a good deal of the Negro slave trade of the colonization era.

³¹<http://www.normanfinkelstein.com/category/the-holocaust-industry/>, 2nd December 2011.

Millions of fundamentalist "Christians" (in reality they are heretics) in America have been brain-washed into believing that the Jews really are God's chosen people and that therefore America should unreservedly back Israel.

From Chapter 1 of Oppenheim's *Jews and Masonry*:

That the connection of Jews with Masonry in the early history of the United States was of benefit to them, as well as that it was to the advancement of the Order, is probably true, though little has been written on the subject by Jewish historians.

Various rabbis have claimed that Freemasonry is almost entirely Jewish.

Much more can be said, but this will have to suffice.

Conclusions

Jewry adheres to the general precepts of a secret society. A gang of rabbis and financiers dominate the top of Jewish society. Below them rest the less wealthy, but still influential Jews, who understand the principle of "scratch my back." The outer circle of Jewish society comprises all Jews who possess any significant Jewish identity, and the most pro-Jewish segments of the Gentile population. Jewry implicitly adheres to secrecy and self-promotion.

Moreover, the top levels of Jewish society integrate almost seamlessly with the top levels of the Anglo-American Oligarchy, which we have been examining. So is there an international Jewish conspiracy? Not exactly; something clearly is going on, but it inter-meshes with certain ancient historical processes, and the plans of the Anglo-American mob.

Two critical points stand out: 1) The world Jewry continues to fulfil its historical role as the enforcer for the ruling oligarchy; and 2) historically, the Jews were simultaneously also the victims of both their totalitarian society, and the popular fury of the surrounding oppressed Gentile masses.

Should things continue to develop along their present trajectory, the world opinion will increasingly polarize against the Jews. In the long run, this can only be detrimental both to the Jews and to the world at large. Moreover, the traditional Jewish culture tends to run against the grain of practically all non-Jewish societies and cultures; and the Jews as a group (excepting the thoroughly integrated Jewish elements), perhaps in spite of themselves, tend to develop what can fairly be called a parasitic relationship to the larger community that they inhabit.

The role of the Jews and of Israel in the 21st century world is a vital problem, which merits serious and sober consideration. The fact that Zbigniew Brzezinski takes the same view should be enough reason to avoid name-calling and other vulgar trivialities.

On my part, I have avoided Jew-baiting and other such practices. I had to include this chapter, because the Jews play a role in the larger picture. Now let us move on.

5.12 Mormons

The Mormons are largely irrelevant to our overall discussion. Still, their cult offers a useful glimpse at the insanity of humanity, and at the power of secret societies. My main source is former Mormon Ed Decker, the author of *The God Makers I & II* (1984, 1993).

Mormonism, or The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, as it likes to be called, is a strange religion dominant in the American south-west. The Mormon Church owns Utah, and exerts influence

in Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, and California. Following decades of dedicated proselytizing, the Mormons have managed to extend their creed across the world. Today, there are about 14 million Mormons, most of them members of the main LDS Church.

Now, the creed was founded in the 19th century by one Joseph Smith (1804-1844), a Freemason and a notorious swindler. (*GMI*, Ch. 7) Mr Smith claimed to have discovered golden plates with strange markings, which he proceeded to decipher with his "seer stone." In reality, Smith simply propagated the popular 19th century scam of the magic seeing stone. Con men like Joe and his father would go from place to place and offer their services as seer stone-guided treasure hunters. That was, perhaps, not the most profitable way of making a living, but it likely beat farmwork, of which Joe had had a taste.

(*GMI*, Ch.8) The Mormon "Bible" was an obvious fraud concocted by a sub-par plagiarist. Most of the various other Mormon myths and legends are too silly to recount, except apropos, for their value of hilarity.

What do the Mormons believe in? (*GMI*, Ch.3, elaborated in Ch.4) They believe that adherence to Mormonism will turn one into a god. This, of course, means that the Mormons are **not** Christians, but are pagans at best and heretics at worst.

(*GMI*, Ch.3; *GMII*, Ch.3) Until 1978, Mormonism preached that blacks are damned by default and can never be Mormons; but in 1978 a volte-face occurred, and now blacks are welcome as members of the LDS Church. This can happen, because (*GMI*, Ch.4) the Mormon doctrine says that the Bible is good, but Joseph Smith's ramblings are better, and the pronouncements of the current crop of LDS "brethren" are the best, i.e. the Church leadership reserves not only the right to *interpret* scripture, but also the right to *manufacture* scripture. A better scam I have hardly ever heard of.

(*GMI*, Ch.3) The LDS Church explains that - oh, yes! - Jesus and Lucifer were brothers. (Ch.6) A classic Mormon scriptural play narrates how Lucifer told Eve that the only way to become a god is to disobey God. The Fall, in the opinion of the LDS, was really a "blessing in disguise." This is the same doctrine that keeps reappearing in our research.

(*GMI*, Ch.5; *GMII*, Ch.1) The folks behind the LDS are smooth operators, and they spend millions in public relations campaigns in order to cultivate the super-Patriotic, super-Christian image of American Mormonism. The reality is far bleaker.

(*GMI*, Ch.6) Mormonism is a proto-Masonic cult replete with Masonic rituals of initiation and oaths of allegiance. This is why Mormonism is a classic secret society - the inner circle consists of the Church top honchos, the "brethren," who are a thoroughly mercenary psychopathic bunch. Below them lies the LDS clergy, a gang of Masonically brainwashed lunatics and mercenaries (and, perhaps, a few well-meaning naifs). The outer circle comprises the masses of deluded faithful Mormons. (*GMI*, Ch.14) About 70% of the Mormons have not been initiated into the inner secrets of their Temples. Only about 10% of Mormons are regularly involved in Temple work.³²

(*GMI*, Ch.6) Curiously, the Mormons are obsessed with genealogies, and possess one of the best genealogical libraries in the world. This stems from the Mormon belief that prayer can bring one's ancestors into the loving grasp of the Mormon Church.

Strangely enough, (*GMI*, Ch.6) Anton LaVey's *Satanic Bible* tells of a god of the ghouls called Mormo.

The Mormon priests wear elaborate aprons (*GMI*, Ch.6), which of course are the aprons of Freema-

³²These figures apply to most secret societies and hierarchical organizations. The outer circle usually consists of about 90% of the population, the inner circle of about 9%, and the innermost circle of 1%. Larger societies sometimes include yet another circle, which comprises of up to 0.1% of the population.

sonry.

(*GMI*, Ch. 7) Joseph Smith taught that when "Gentiles" were baptized into the Mormon Church, their Gentile blood was literally taken out of their veins by "the Holy Ghost" and replaced with Jewish blood. This is why Jews are called "Gentiles" in Mormonism and Latter-Day Saints of whatever nationality are considered to be the real "Jews."

Old Joe also said that "the moon was inhabited by people about six feet tall who dressed like Quakers and lived to be a thousand years old." His successor, Brigham Young, the namesake of the Mormon-owned university in Utah, added that the Sun is also inhabited.

That these and other Mormon prophecies have been proven absurd does not particularly bother the masses of the Mormon faithful.

(*GMI*, Ch. 13) Hardcore Mormons wear a holy pajama (or, rather, underwear), which they never take off. Never, ever, even when showering.

Granny Geer explained how seriously this is taken by devour Mormons:

After I had helped my grandmother to bathe and helped her out of the tub, we would dry the left leg and put the clean garment on it... and *only then* [emphasis in original] would she take the old garment off the right leg.

Modern Mormons sometimes wear two-piece holy pajamas.

(*GMI*, Ch.14) The ultimate goal of the Mormons is, naturally, the conquest of the world and the realization of a wonderful LDS worldwide theocracy. This will never happen, but with a scam like this one, the dedicated swindler might as well reach for the sky. (*GMI*, Ch.16) Decker identifies the LDS "global goal" as "one-world government." This is hardly surprising, since in all likelihood the Mormon brass are high-level Freemasons.

(*GMI*, Ch. 15) One curious fact about Mormonism is that, because of Joe's pathetic demise (he was lynched after being jailed by the authorities of Illinois), the Mormons instituted an oath to the destruction of the United States, which was only revoked some time after 1930. This means that our friend Marriner Stoddard Eccles, the Fed chairman under the Masons FDR and Truman, a graduate of the Mormon Brigham Young College, and a Mormon missionary, had perhaps sworn to destroy the United States government. Of course, this particular datum does not mean much - but it does make one wonder.

(*GMI*, Ch.16) Investigative reporter Jeffrey Kaye concluded, "The Mormon Church, this American Zion, wields more economic power more effectively than the state of Israel or the Pope in Rome."

This is an obvious exaggeration (the Vatican has a billion plus adherents, and Israel has nukes), but it does suggest that the LDS Church's business is more prosaic than the mere salvation of the souls of the faithful. In reality, the Mormon Church is an unincorporated association without assets. "All wealth and power is owned and controlled by the closely held *Corporation of the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, Inc.*" This mighty corporation, which owns a variety of businesses and chains, swallows the tithes and contributions of the devout Mormon believers across the world.

(*GMII*, Ch.12) In the 1980s, one low estimate of the Church's wealth put LDS Inc. in the top 100 of the largest American corporations.

(*GMI*, Ch. 16) The Mormons also preach "blood atonement," which is why Utah practices capital punishment by firing squad.

(*GMI*, Ch. 10) For a large part of the early history of the LDS Church, the Mormons preached and practised polygamy. The Church was forced to ban the practice in 1904 in order to avoid antagonizing the Federal Government, but certain fundamentalist Mormon sects continue to adhere to the precept of polygamy. One elementary problem of polygamy is that in a polygamous society, there are not enough women for all the men.

The CIA likes to recruit Mormons (and Freemasons), because of their adherence to rules of secrecy. Thus, Mormonism is highly represented in the security agencies - at least at the lower levels. Bill Cooper has talked about this.

Decker concludes Chapter 16 of his first volume with an astute observation:

There is another scenario, however, which is equally disturbing and much more likely. It arises from the fact that Mormonism is actually part of something larger. We have already noted that the "revelations" that Joseph Smith received, far from being unique, were in fact very similar to the basic philosophy underlying many occult groups and secret revolutionary societies. Thus far in history, these numerous occult/ revolutionary organizations have remained largely separate and in competition with one another. If something should happen to unite them, and at the same time their beliefs should gain worldwide acceptance, a new and unimaginably powerful force for world revolution would have come into existence. There is increasing evidence of a new and growing secular/ religious ecumenism persuasive enough to accomplish this unprecedented and incalculably powerful coalition. It could be the means of creating the one-world government that has not only been the long-standing hope and plan of The Brethren and many other occult/ revolutionary leaders, but is increasingly gaining a wide acceptance through New Age networks as the only viable option to a nuclear holocaust and/ or ecological collapse. Improbable? Perhaps. But certainly it can no longer be summarily dismissed as impossible.

Not only is it possible and probable - it is actually happening.

Religious tolerance is admirable and necessary; but where do we draw the line? Do we just ignore a scam as blatant as that of Mormonism? The issue is a sensitive one - some will say that Christianity is as absurd as Mormonism - never mind that Christianity has a two-thousand year history and constitutes the foundation of Western civilization, while the LDS is a minor cult in a dusty corner of the United States.

Of course, most Mormons are largely unaware of the realities listed above, and live their lives as decent citizens.

It is disheartening that an insanity of this scale can take place in the most advanced nation of our oh-so modern world. Weishaupt and Russell were right - people can be made to believe anything.

5.13 Knights of Malta

5.13.1 History

The Knights of Malta are the heirs of the old Knights Hospitaller, founded in Jerusalem in 1023 before the First Crusade. The Hospitallers were one of two major Knightly Orders of the era, the other one being that of the Templars. After Saladin's successors booted out the crusaders in the late

13th century, the Hospitallers relocated to Rhodes and Cyprus. Like their Templar fellows, though likely to a lesser degree, the Hospitallers had become rich and powerful.

After the Turks conquered Rhodes (1522), the Hospitallers moved to Malta, where they withstood a savage siege in 1565. Cyprus fell in 1570.

When Philip IV and the Pope dissolved the Templars in 1312, much of their property passed to the Hospitallers. John Robinson argues in *Born in Blood* that Wat Tyler's 1381 Peasant Revolt in England was in fact a carefully planned retaliation against the Hospitallers on the part of the underground Templars. Whatever the case, the Hospitallers continued to exist, though their power diminished as the modern state developed. One of the main duties of the Hospitallers was the containment of the Berber pirates, who were a thorn in the side of Europe until the early 19th century. The exercise proved enjoyable, and the Hospitallers began to prey on Muslim civilian ships. Awash in loot, the Knights - now of Malta - enjoyed a life of luxury and martial glory - or should we say a life of license and plunder?

Knights of the Order of the Hospitallers fight under a white cross on a black background.

Henry VIII understandably (given his anti-Catholicism) banned the Hospitallers from England in the early 16th century. After the Reformation, the Knights of Malta - holders of a Papal charter - aligned with the French and the forces of the Counter-Reformation. The status quo broke in 1798, when Napoleon captured Malta on his way to Egypt. The British claimed the island at the end of the Napoleonic Wars. Since 1814, Malta has been the crucible of the British domination of the Mediterranean. One of the Third Reich's worst strategic mistakes was the failure to invade and capture Malta during the Wehrmacht's heyday in 1941-42. The British presence in Malta disrupted Rommel's supply lines and ultimately doomed the Afrika Korps.

Curiously, the Knights of Malta had strong ties with the Russian Empire. When Peter the Great (1672-1725, Emperor 1682-1725) decided to modernize Russia around 1700, he built the city on the shore of the Neva - St. Petersburg - as a naval base for his expanding empire. Peter sent envoys to the Hospitallers to study their naval practices, and to examine the possibility of the establishment of a Russian base on Malta. The relationship developed in the 18th century. Catherine the Great (1729-1796, Empress 1762-1796) sent her top officers to Malta for training. After Napoleon busted the Knights in 1798, Catherine's son Pavel (1754-1801, Emperor 1796-1801) offered them an asylum. In gratitude, the Knights made Pavel their Grand Master. This caused a problem, since Pavel was the head of the Orthodox Church, and the Hospitallers were a Catholic outfit.

During the 19th century, the Knights existed as an elite naval academy in St. Petersburg. The Bolshevik Revolution ended that arrangement. The exiled Russians reconstituted the Order in Paris. The Russian Hospitallers still exist in a fractured form.

Meanwhile, the Pope resurrected the Catholic branch of the Hospitallers in 1834 in Rome. The new order was called the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. Its sigil was a white cross on a red background (the Templars had a red cross on a white background). The Knights of Malta went back to administering hospitals.

Today, the Order holds a bizarre quasi-sovereign status. It has a representative at the U.N., and can issue diplomatic passports, which are recognized by a number of nations. The Order has about 13,000 members and an additional 80,000 volunteers and 20,000 medical personnel. Amazingly, until the 1990s only bearers of noble titles could enter the Order.

Minor splinter Hospitaller Orders exist in the various protestant nations. One more interesting branch is that of the Venerable Order of Saint John, inaugurated in 1831 and head-quartered in London. The continuation of the medieval British branch of the Hospitallers, this group boasts 25,000 members, 4,000 employees, and 300,000 volunteers. In 1888, Victoria awarded the Order of Saint John a Royal Charter. The British monarch is the official head of the outfit. The top grade of the Order can include only the members of its Grand Council, plus up to 21 others. These British Hos-

pitallers have presence in the English-speaking countries and in France. Initiates "solemnly declare that I will be faithful and obedient to The Order of St John and its Sovereign Head as far as it is consistent with my duty to my [head of state] and to my country." Since 1999, membership has been extended to non-Christians.

The French have a somewhat similar Order of Saint Lazarus (green cross on white background).

A semi-secret organization with ties to the top echelons of world power and the ability to issue diplomatic passports must also have strong ties to the shadowy world inhabited by the intelligence communities. Unfortunately, as far as I know, no extensive membership list of the Knights of Malta exists in the public domain.

One interesting datum on the Roman (main) Branch of the Order of Malta, is that though its Grand Masters for the most of the 19th and 20th centuries were Italians, the two most recent Grand Masters have been British - Andrew Bertie (1988-2008), and Matthew Festing (2008-). Bertie (1929-2008) is a cousin to Elizabeth II. Festing (1949-) is the youngest son of Field Marshal Francis Festing, Chief of the Imperial General Staff.

Naturally, one suspects that our Anglo-American friends have managed to penetrate yet another secret organization for their nefarious purposes. A recent scandal gives support to this thesis.

5.13.2 January 2011 Seymour Hersh Findings

In a January 17, 2011 speech in Qatar, dinosaur investigative journalist Seymour Hersh said the following:

So, but in the Cheney shop - I can write about it in ways I could not then, because I didn't want expose anybody who was there - in the Cheney shop the attitude was, "What's this? What? What are they all worried about, the politicians and the press, they're all worried about some looting? And wait a second, Sunnis don't like Shia? And there's no WMD? And there's no democracy? Don't they get it? We're going to change mosques into cathedrals. And when we get hold of all the oil, nobody's going to give a damn." That's the attitude: "We're going to change mosques into cathedrals."

That's an attitude that pervades, I'm here to say, a large percentage of the Special Operations Command, the Joint Special Operations Command and Stanley McChrystal, the one who got in trouble because of the article in Rolling Stone, and his follow-on, a Navy admiral named McRaven, Bill McRaven - all are members or at least supporters of Knights of Malta. McRaven attended, so I understand, the recent annual convention of the Knights of Malta they had in Cyprus a few months back in November. They're all believers - many of them are members of Opus Dei. They do see what they are doing - and this is not an atypical attitude among some military - it's a crusade, literally. They see themselves as the protectors of the Christians. They're protecting them from the Muslims in the 13th century. And this is their function. They have little insignias, they have coins they pass among each other, which are crusader coins, and they have insignia that reflect that, the whole notion that this is a war, it's culture war.

Look, Knights of Malta does great stuff. They do a lot of charity work; so does Opus Dei. It's a very extreme, extremely religious, Roman Catholic sect, if you will. But for me, it's always, when I think of them, I always think of the line we used about Werner von Braun. Werner Von Braun was the German rocket scientist who invented the V-2. ... And one of [Mort Sahl's] ditties about Werner von Braun was, oh yes, "Werner von Braun, he aimed for the moon but often hit London." With his rockets. So the trouble with some of these religious groups is they may have good things, but right now there is a tremendous, tremendous amount of anti-Muslim feeling in the military community.

How fanatically Christian the Order of Malta members are is difficult to say. What we do know is that the U.S. high command is, indeed, utterly mad. From *Harpers'*, May 2009:

Jesus killed Mohammed: The crusade for a Christian military by Jeff Sharlet

...

When Barack Obama moved into the Oval Office in January, he inherited a military not just drained by a two-front war overseas but fighting a third battle on the home front, a subtle civil war over its own soul. On one side are the majority of military personnel, professionals who regardless of their faith or lack thereof simply want to get their jobs done; on the other is a small but powerful movement of Christian soldiers concentrated in the officer corps. There's Major General Johnny A. Weida, who as commandant at the Air Force Academy made its National Day of Prayer services exclusively Christian, and also created a code for evangelical cadets: whenever Weida said, "Airpower," they were to respond "Rock Sir!" a reference to Matthew 7:25. (The general told them that when non-evangelical cadets asked about the mysterious call-and-response, they should share the gospel.) There's Major General Robert Caslen - commander of the 25th Infantry Division, a.k.a. "Tropic Lightning" - who in 2007 was found by a Pentagon inspector general's report to have violated military ethics by appearing in uniform, along with six other senior Pentagon officers, in a video for the Christian Embassy, a fundamentalist ministry to Washington elites. There's Lieutenant General Robert Van Antwerp, the Army chief of engineers, who has also lent his uniform to the Christian cause, both in a Trinity Broadcasting Network tribute to Christian soldiers called Red, White, and Blue Spectacular and at a 2003 Billy Graham rally - televised around the world on the Armed Forces Network - at which he declared the baptisms of 700 soldiers under his command evidence of the Lord's plan to "raise up a godly army."

What men such as these have fomented is a quiet coup within the armed forces: not of generals encroaching on civilian rule but of religious authority displacing the military's once staunchly secular code. Not a conspiracy but a cultural transformation, achieved gradually through promotions and prayer meetings, with personal faith replacing protocol according to the best intentions of commanders who conflate God with country. They see themselves not as subversives but as spiritual warriors - "ambassadors for Christ in uniform," according to Officers' Christian Fellowship; "government paid missionaries," according to Campus Crusade's Military Ministry.

...

Within the fundamentalist front in the officer corps, the best organized group is Officers' Christian Fellowship, with 15,000 members active at 80 percent of military bases and an annual growth rate, in recent years, of 3 percent. Founded during World War II, OCF was for most of its history concerned mainly with the spiritual lives of those who sought it out, but since 9/11 it has moved in a more militant direction. According to the group's current executive director, retired Air Force Lieutenant General Bruce L. Fister, the "global war on terror" - to which Obama has committed 17,000 new troops in Afghanistan - is "a spiritual battle of the highest magnitude."

...

"There's a spiritual world, and oftentimes what happens in the physical world is representative of what's happening in the spiritual," an academy senior (a "firstie," in the school parlance) named Jon Butcher told me one night at New Life, a nearby megachurch popular with cadets.

...

The evangelical transformation of the military began during the Cold War, in a new American "Great Awakening" that has only accelerated across the decades, making the United States one of the most religious nations in the world.

...

"Evangelicals looked at the military and said, 'This is a mission field,'" explains Captain McLinda Morton, a Lutheran pastor and former missile-launch commander who until 2005 was a staff chaplain at the Air Force Academy and has since studied and written

about the chaplaincy. "They wanted to send their missionaries to the military, and for the military itself to become missionaries to the world."

Remember that these evangelicals are, in reality, brainwashed heretics, who profess great loathing for the Muslims, whose nations have not attacked America in the 20th century, and extol Israel, which is anti-Christian, and which has attacked NATO twice in the last half-century.

How did this farce occur? I suspect that the powers-that-be realized some time ago that the Middle East would be the battleground of the late 20th century, and accordingly made sure to brainwash their top military brass. The fundamentalist movement is too well organized and synchronized at the top. It is not a spontaneous development. Unfortunately, I have not the space, nor have I done the necessary research, to analyse the topic in detail.

Hersh's speech hit a nerve and provoked a telling response by the CFR's *Foreign Affairs* journal.

Seymour Hersh unleashed

By Blake Hounshell, January 18, 2011

In a speech billed as a discussion of the Bush and Obama eras, *New Yorker* journalist Seymour Hersh delivered a rambling, conspiracy-laden diatribe here Monday expressing his disappointment with President Barack Obama and his dissatisfaction with the direction of U.S. foreign policy.

...

He then alleged that Gen. Stanley McChrystal, who headed JSOC before briefly becoming the top U.S. commander in Afghanistan, and his successor, Vice Adm. William McRaven, as well as many within JSOC, "are all members of, or at least supporters of, Knights of Malta."

Hersh may have been referring to the Sovereign Order of Malta, a Roman Catholic organization committed to "defence of the Faith and assistance to the poor and the suffering," according to its website.

Who Are the Knights of Malta - and What Do They Want?

By Joshua E. Keating, January 19, 2011

In a speech in Doha on Monday, veteran *New Yorker* journalist Seymour Hersh alleged that the U.S. military's Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) had been infiltrated by Christian fanatics who see themselves as modern-day Crusaders and aim to "change mosques into cathedrals." In particular, he alleged that former JSOC head Gen. Stanley McChrystal - later U.S. commander in Afghanistan - and his successor, Vice Adm. William McRaven, as well as many other senior leaders of the command, are "are all members of, or at least supporters of, Knights of Malta." What was he talking about?

Not exactly clear. There's not much evidence to suggest that the Knights of Malta are the secretive cabal of anti-Muslim fundamentalists that Hersh described. (For the record, when contacted by Foreign Policy, McChrystal said that he is not a member.) But they are certainly an anomalous presence in international politics and have provoked their share of conspiracy theories over the years.

...

In recent years, the organization has become increasingly American in membership. The leader of the order, referred to as the prince and grand master, is elected for life in a secret conclave and must be approved by the pope.

...

Because of its secretive proceedings, unique political status, and association with the Crusades, the order has been a popular target for conspiracy theorists. Alleged members have included former CIA Directors William Casey and John McCone, Chrysler Chairman Lee Iacocca, and GOP fixture Pat Buchanan, though none have ever acknowledged membership.

...

In 2006, a newspaper article in the United Arab Emirates claimed that the Knights were directly influencing U.S. policy in Iraq and Afghanistan, reprising their role in the Crusades. Following the article, Islamist websites in Egypt urged followers to attack the order's embassy in Cairo, forcing the organization to issue a statement denying any military role.

To be fair, the Knights have been involved in their fair share of political intrigues. In 1988, the charge d'affaires at the order's embassy in Havana confessed to being a double agent, reporting to both the CIA and Cuban intelligence. According to journalist Jeremy Seahill's book *Blackwater*, Joseph Schmitz, a former executive at the company who also served as inspector general for the U.S. Department of Defense, boasted of his membership in the Knights in his official biography. The defense contractor now known as Xe's chief executive, Erik Prince, reportedly espoused Christian supremacist beliefs, and its contractors in Iraq used codes and insignia based on the order's medieval compatriots, the Knights of the Templar. However, there's no evidence to suggest the Knights of Malta had any direct influence over the company.

In other words - yes, the neo-Hospitallers have been penetrated by the Anglo-Americans; yes, they do have ties to the spooks; and yes, they do have ties to the bizarre 21st century condottieri of Xe, and therefore to the U.S. military's top brass.

Some American researchers, because of their Protestant hatred for Catholicism, tend to accuse the Knights of Malta of being the secret army of the Pope, bent on world conquest on behalf of the Vatican, etc. In reality, my impression is that the Anglo-American Oligarchs - who are Christian only in pretence - have infiltrated both the Papacy and the Knights, and are gradually dismantling the Catholic faith. More on this later.

5.13.3 Members

Here is one confirmed Knight of Malta: Geoffrey T. Boisi.³³ Who is this Boisi? Born in 1948, Boisi is "chairman and chief executive officer of Roundtable (!) Investment Partners LLC, a private investment firm with interests in various private equity, money management, real estate and corporate advisory organizations including Carleon Capital Partners LLC, a leading wealth management firm." He was a long-time vice-chairman of JPMorgan Chase and senior general partner of Goldman Sachs. He is also the founder of MENTOR/National Mentoring Partnership, a top 100 charity, which "is leading the movement to connect America's young people with caring adult mentors." Perhaps a NWO recruitment agency? Boisi is also a trustee of the Carnegie Corporation of New York (a branch of the Carnegie Foundation consortium). He is also a Trilateralist.

There we have it - Knights of Malta, the Round Table people, the Rockefeller gang, the foundations - all in one. The resumes of Boisi's RIP LLC partners are equally as impressive.³⁴

For a decent brief bio of Boisi, look up *The New York Observer's* November 2000 article *Welch's Juice Man: How Brash Barbarian Banker Geoffrey Boisi Thrills Neutron Jack*. Some quotes:

Jack Welch has an investment banker of choice, and his name is Geoffrey T. Boisi. It is not a fact you would tend to know, nor would the discrete Mr. Boisi ever say as much.

...Throughout the 80's, Mr. Boisi's imprint was to be found wherever a big deal went down. In 1984, he advised the Continental Group Inc. in its \$2.75 billion takeover by Peter Kiewit Sons Inc. and financier David Murdock. In 1985, he was there for General Foods Corporation in its \$5.75 billion takeover by Philip Morris Companies. In 1988, together with his client, leveraged-buyout maven Ted Forstmann, he became a key player

³³<http://carnegie.org/about-us/board-of-directors/geoffrey-t-boisi/>, accessed 3rd Dec, 2011 - lists Boisi as a KoM.

³⁴<http://www.roundtableip.com/people.html>, 3rd Dec, 2011.

in the epic fight over RJR Nabisco Holdings.

That earned him a place among the rapacious characters in *Barbarians at the Gate*, though not a spot in the HBO film.

... Those who worked with Mr. Boisi at Goldman Sachs remember him as operating on a higher moral plane than one would expect from your everyday Wall Street shark.

"Some people thought of him as a bit pious," says one ex-Goldman banker. "But it was real. You always had the sense that he cared about your spiritual side, that he might even be praying for you. That's not usual for an investment banker."

A pious banker indeed.

For a reasonably documented list of known Knights of Malta, consult the blog *Movers and Shakers of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta* at <http://moversandshakersofthesmom.blogspot.com/>. Also see <http://www.maltausa.org/>.

A few other confirmed members: Bowie Kuhn (1926-2007) - lawyer, Commissioner of Major League Baseball in the '70s and the '80s; Tom Monaghan (1937-) - founder of Domino's Pizza, owner of the Detroit Tigers in the '80s; Genevieve Garvan Brady, wife to Nicholas Frederic Brady (1878-1930), who was a chairman of a number of large corporations; Robert Ouimet - Council of Canadian Chief Executives, Petro-Canada and the National Bank of Canada; Mark J. Wolff - UN experience, St. Thomas University; John Fitzpatrick (1920-2007) - (*Washington Post*³⁵) "retired Navy commander and oil executive with long ties to Spain"; Burton Gerber - CIA; Fred Monroe Zeder (1922-2004) - corporate director, Director of the Territorial Affairs under Ford, ties with Bush; George William Strake (1894-1969) - oilman; Delano Lewis (1938-) - attorney, businessman, diplomat; etc.

5.14 And So On

Follow a few more minor secret societies, on which I have conducted only perfunctory research.

5.14.1 Knights of Columbus

The Knights of Columbus organization was founded in the United States in 1882. Today, it is the largest Catholic fraternal organization, with more than 1.8 million members worldwide. The emblem of the order consists of the old *fascis* symbol superimposed over a crossed sword and anchor.

Founded in New Haven, Connecticut by the Venerable Father Michael J. McGivney (1852-1890), the order of the Knights of Columbus gradually spread through New England, the States, and the world. The Knights started out as something like a co-op - the dues that members paid acted like insurance instalments. Today, the Knights possess a full-blown insurance firm. Since the Pope had prohibited Freemasonry on threat of excommunication, the Knights of Columbus were something like Freemasonry for Catholics.

Knights of Columbus rise only up to a fourth degree. About one sixth of all Knights have climbed to the top rung of the ladder.

Judging from their numbers, the Knights should be a fairly potent political lobbying organization. That is indeed the case. Some of their achievements include: convincing Congress to add "under God" to the pledge of allegiance; promoting the national holiday of Columbus Day (October 12); banning same-sex marriages in California in 2008 ("Prop.8").

The Knights annually invite the head of state of their host country to their Grand Convention. JFK was a fourth degree Knight. Nixon, Reagan, and Bush I each attended once.

Notable Knights: Samuel Alito (1950-) - U.S. Supreme Court; Carl Anderson (1951-) - "Special

³⁵<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/08/03/AR2007080302018.html>, 3rd Dec, 2011

Assistant” to Reagan, and later a Supreme Knight of the KoC; John Boehner (1949-) - Speaker of the House of Representatives; Jeb Bush (1953-) - son of one and brother to the other, Governor of Florida (1999-2007); Hugh Carey (1919-2011) - Governor of New York ('75-'82) and a congressman ('61-'74); Richard J. Daley (1902-1976) - the boss of the Chicago Machine, Mayor of the city ('55-'76), ally to the Kennedys; John Engler (1948-) - Governor of Michigan (1991-2003); Raymond Flynn (1939-) - U.S. Ambassador to the Vatican under Clinton, Mayor of Boston in the '80s; Manuel Lujan, Jr. (1928-) - Secretary of the Interior under Bush I; Al Smith (1873-1944) - Governor of New York in the '20s, presidential candidates in 1928; Malcolm Wilson (1914-2000) - Governor of New York in 1974; plus a plethora of congressmen, senators, other politicians, and Catholic prelates.

In sum, the Knights of Columbus are a fairly potent Catholic proto-Masonic organization, influential in the United States and Canada.

5.14.2 Society of the Cincinnati

The Society of the Cincinnati is a high-level Franco-American organization founded in 1783 for the purposes of strengthening the relations between France and the United States.

Present day members must be descendant from an officer who fought in the Revolutionary War. Primogeniture applies. The principles of the society are: "To preserve the rights so dearly won; to promote the continuing union of the states; and to assist members in need, their widows, and their orphans."

The society was instrumental in the founding of Cincinnati, Ohio and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Throughout its history, the order has maintained a membership of 2000-4000 souls. The current membership is 3,700.

From what I can tell, the Society of the Cincinnati is a highbrow club for the old American families. Since those families know each other anyway, the society likely really adheres to its stated goal - namely, the perpetuation of the memory of the American Revolutionary War.

5.14.3 Theosophical Society

The Theosophical Society is the brainchild of the mysterious Helena Blavatsky, the Russian Madame of the occult. Founded in New York in 1875 by Blavatsky, Henry Steel Olcott, and William Quan Judge, the Theosophical Society has mushroomed into the New Age neo-religious movement.

Helena Petrovna Blavatsky (1831-1891) was a noblewoman of a great Russian bloodline. Even as a child, Helena had a bad case of the wanderlust, combined with a distaste for the trappings of nobility. Infatuated with books, the young Helena devoured whatever she could find on medieval occultism.

In 1849, Helena married the vice-governor of Yerevan, one Nikifor Vladimirovich Blavatsky, in order to escape from home. The man was much older, and the marriage quickly collapsed. Helena returned home for a brief while, before leaving again to embark on an eclectic world tour. The exact details of her travels are unknown, but she spent time in Europe and the Middle East. In later years, she used to say that "This work is not my but he who sends me." (Sic.) On her birthday in 1851, Blavatsky met her "Teacher" in... Where else? Hyde Park, London. The Teacher told young Helena that she was needed and that she would have to go to Tibet. In 1852 she found herself in India, receiving money and directions by anonymous letters. Blavatsky returned to England, where she was renowned for her musical talents. She met the Teacher again, and dashed off to New York. After crossing the continent in the mid-1850s, Helena found herself in San Francisco. From thence, via Japan and Singapore, she returned to India. This pinball life appealed to the woman, and she continued to gallivant around the world as the years passed by. At some point she got to Tibet, where she studied Tibetan lore.

In the 1870s, Blavatsky spent a few years in the States, where she founded the Theosophical Society,

and got married. In 1879, she returned to India, where she wrote books and edited the magazine *The Theosophist*.

Blavatsky's most notable works are the monumental *Isis Unveiled* (1877) and *The Secret Doctrine* (1888).

Henry Steel Olcott (1832-1907) was an officer in the Civil War, a lawyer, a journalist, and a convert of Blavatsky's. He went to India along with Blavatsky, and stayed there for the rest of his life.

William Quan Judge (1851-1896) was an Irish-American lawyer and occultist. After Blavatsky and Olcott left for India, Judge took charge of the Theosophical Society's American branch.

The Society's stated goals were (Wikipedia):

- To form a nucleus of the universal brotherhood of humanity without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour.
- To encourage the study of comparative religion, philosophy, and science.
- To investigate the unexplained laws of nature and the powers latent in man.
- The Theosophical Society is absolutely unsectarian, and no assent to any formula of belief, faith or creed shall be required as a qualification of membership; but every applicant and member must lie in sympathy with the effort to create the nucleus of an Universal Brotherhood of Humanity.

We see here the embryos of the One-World dream. But the plot thickens.

Blavatsky's successor as the mistress of the Theosophical Society was Annie Besant of Britain. Besant (1847-1933), like Blavatsky, suffered through a brief unsuccessful marriage at a young age. In her 20s, Besant propagandised for the National Secular Society. Most importantly, Besant was an early member of the Fabian society. She fought for women's rights and the betterment of the workers' conditions. In 1890, Annie met Helena, and the dying older woman passed the torch to the younger, idealistic Besant. In 1898, Besant travelled to India, where she founded the Central Hindu College. Thereafter, she promoted "co-Masonry" (gender-neutral Masonry!) across England. After the Great War, she took up the cause of the Indian independence, which, incidentally, had also become a goal of the Round Tablers. Besant continued to preach Theosophy till the day she died. Besant left a wide array of writings. Her earlier works bore the mark of Fabianism: *The Law Of Population* (1877) was the standard Malthusian line; *My Path to Atheism* (1877) - the title speaks for itself. After 1900, Besant wrote a batch of books on Theosophy.

The English-American Alice Bailey (1880-1949) was the third major Theosophist. Like her predecessors', Bailey's first marriage failed, and she had to work in a factory to support her three children. The traumatic episode killed her Christian fanaticism and drove her to Theosophy. Bailey claimed to have been visited by a Tibetan "Master" in 1919. Alice proceeded to marry Foster Bailey (1888-1977), a 32nd degree Freemason, and dedicated the remaining 30 years of her life to writing on Theosophy. She managed to pen 24 hefty volumes.

Curiously, the prophetesses Annie and Alice bickered with each other.

Here the plot thickens again! In 1922, Alice and Foster founded the Lucifer Publishing Company. After some thought, it was decided that the name of their company might inspire undesirable associations, and, hence, the Lucifer Publishing Company became the Lucis Trust. This trust has headquarters in New York City, London, and Geneva. These days, the Lucis Trust is on the United Nations *List of non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council* (added in 1989). In 1932, the Baileys also created the World Goodwill organization, which

has been recognized by the UN as an NGO. The UN has used the Lucis Trust as a publishing company.

So what do the Theosophists (and remember, Theosophy is the original New Age movement) believe in?

Blavatsky rambled about "root-races" and Aryans and evolution and so on; and, yes, Adolf Hitler was an avid reader of *The Secret Doctrine* (if we are to believe, for example, the History Channel's *Occult History of the Third Reich* (1991)).

Helena also opined that "Hidden Masters" guide humanity's "evolution." Perhaps she was not entirely wrong; but it is hard to tell.

The other core doctrine of the movement is that a messianic "World Teacher" by the name of Maitreya would emerge sometime after the third quarter of the 20th century and lead humanity to its fate.

What can we conclude? The psychological make-ups of the three women were remarkably similar. Did they, therefore, naturally lean toward the same interests, or was some clever power recruiting them? Who were these "Teachers" and "Masters"?

That Theosophy had been transformed into the New Age movement, which seems to be the religion designed for the New World Order, we will show later.

It is tempting to regard Theosophy as a nonsensical mix of mumbo-jumbo - and that it is, to a degree - but unfortunately, the prevalence of the New Age cult, and the impressive pedigree of Theosophy, suggest that there is some method to the madness.

Who else was a Theosophist or an admirer of Theosophy?³⁶

Literary figures (question marks - uncertain): Lyman Frank Baum (1856-1919) - the author of *The Wizard of Oz*; James Cousins (1873-1956) - Irish playwright; Robert Duncan (1919-1988) - American poet; William Butler Yeats (1865-1939) - Noble Prize; Talbot Mundy (1879-1940) - English writer; Lewis Carroll (1832-1898) - author of *Alice in Wonderland*; Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930); Henry Rider Haggard (1856-1925) - author of *King Solomon's Mines*; Maurice Maeterlinck (1862-1949) - Belgian poet, 1911 Noble Prize; Jack London? (1876-1916); E. M. Forster (1879-1970) - English writer; James Joyce (1882-1941) - the incomprehensible Irish Noble Prize winning writer; D. H. Lawrence (1885-1930) - major English author; T. S. Eliot (1888-1965) - major Anglo-American poet, Noble Prize winner; Henry Miller (1891-1980) - American writer; Kurt Vonnegut? (1922-2007) - American writer; Manly Palmer Hall (1901-1990) - the top Masonic writer of the 20th century; and others.

Scientists: Thomas Edison (1847-1931); Sir William Crookes (1832-1919) - television; Rupert Sheldrake (1942-) - "parapsychology"; Jane Goodall (1934-) - chimpanzee lover; Roberto Assagioli (1888-1974) - "psychosynthesis"; William James (1842-1910) - major American psychiatrist; George R. S. Mead (1863-1933) - influential English author, read by Ezra Pound, W.B. Yeats, Hermann Hesse, Kenneth Rexroth, Robert Duncan, and Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) the famous psychologist, who owned a swath of Mead's works; John Algeo (1930-) - Distinguished Professor of English Emeritus at the University of Georgia; and others.

Various artists and actors, including actress Shirley MacLaine (1934-).

Politicians: Allan Octavian Hume (1829-1912) - British colonialist, supporter of Indian independence; Alfred Deakin (1856-1919) - second PM of Australia; Henry A. Wallace (1888-1965) - FDR's Vice-President during WWII, a rabid occultist, the man who put the pyramid on the back of the dollar bill; Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964) - first PM of India, in charge for 17 years; George Lansbury (1859-1940) - leader of the British Labour Party in the early 1930s; Gandhi (1869-1948) - the famous kook; Gloria Steinem (1934-) - rabid feminist, CIA dupe, Playboy Bunny, hater of shaving; etc.

Others: Maria Montessori (1870-1952) - famous educator, significant influence on B. Russell³⁷; Aldous Huxley was close to various theosophists, for example Rosalind Edith Williams (1903-1996);

³⁶Thanks to <http://www.katinkahesselink.net/his/influence-theosophy.html>, 3rd December, 2011.

³⁷See Russell's *Education and the Good Life*.

Franz Kafka (1883-1924) was familiar with Theosophy and the Cabala; Albert Einstein (1879-1955) - apparently, he was another avid reader of *The Secret Doctrine*³⁸. Finally, Dr. Stanley Monteith in his *Brotherhood of Darkness* claims that Margaret Sanger was another Theosophist.

Something is going on - but what? It is hard to tell, but one observation can be made - culture is created from above. To create a new creed, one must try to convince the major writers of the era of the creed's veracity - or turn faithful zealots into writers through favourable criticism. Also, it seems that Theosophy held an intrinsic appeal to certain personality types - I think Theosophy mentions something along the lines of the Nazi Fuhrerprinzip.

5.14.4 Rosicrucianism

Rosicrucianism is an occult secret society of a medieval origin. Supposedly, it was founded in the 14th century by the German Christian Rosenkreuz (Rose-Cross). Rosicrucianism relates to Sufism, Zoroastrianism, Hermeticism, gnosticism, and so on. The Rosicrucian mania was widespread among the philosophers of the Middle and early Enlightenment ages. Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), Georg Joachim Rheticus (1514-1574), John Dee (1527-1608) and Tycho Brahe (1546-1601) were all influenced by the cult; and the British Invisible College was permeated with Rosicrucianism through and through. Rosicrucianism also ties with Freemasonry in various ways. Martin Luther's (1483-1546) sigil was a rose and cross.

5.14.5 Golden Dawn

(Wikipedia) The Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn (or, more commonly, the Golden Dawn) was a magical order active in Great Britain during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, which practiced theurgy and spiritual development. It has been one of the largest single influences on 20th-century Western occultism.

The founders of this cabal were three Mason Rosicrucians - William Robert Woodman, William Wynn Westcott, and Samuel Liddell MacGregor Mathers. The trio founded the Golden Dawn in 1887.

Woodman (1828-1891) was a Victorian surgeon and lover of secret societies, to many of which he belonged. He was an avid gardener and a Grand Sword Bearer of the United Grand Lodge of England.

Westcott (1848-1925) was a Crown Coroner and another occultism fanatic.

Mathers (1854-1918) was a clerk, a vegetarian, a polyglot, and an occultist.

The order admitted both men and women, and taught them all gibberish imaginable.

Members: actress Florence Farr (1860-1917); Irish revolutionary Maud Gonne (1866-1953); William Butler Yeats; author Evelyn Underhill; the nut Aleister Crowley (1875-1947); Allan Bennett (1872-1923) - introduced Buddhism to America; Gustav Meyrink (1868-1932) - Austrian writer and banker; Bram Stoker (1847-1912) - *Dracula*; etc.

5.14.6 Order of St Joachim

The Order of St Joachim was founded in 1755 by Prince Christian Franz von Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld. The fourteen founding members were leading nobles of the Holy Roman Empire. They swore to (Wikipedia) "worship the Supreme Being, show tolerance towards all religions, loyalty towards their princes, support the needs of their military, the poor, widows and orphans."

³⁸<http://leonmaurer.info/einstein.html>, Dec 3, 2011.

Though a few members of the order joined the Illuminati, the St Joachim gang were generally aligned with the Gold Rosicrucian society, which was antagonistic to the Illuminati.

The British accepted the Order in 1802. Admiral Lord Horatio Nelson (1758-1805) was a member. Joachim Murat (1767-1815), Napoleon's marshal, took over the order when the French smashed the HRE in 1806.

The Order of St Joachim still exists.

5.14.7 Martinists & Synarchism

Martinism was a creed established in 1740 in France by the enigmatic Martinez de Pasqually (1727-1774). In 1886, Augustin Chaboseau and Gerard Encausse, called "Papus," founded a proto-Masonic Martinist Order.

Amazingly, Tsar Nicholas II sought advice from Papus in 1905.

At some point, many Martinists merged the Synarchist movement. The French occultist Alexandre Saint-Yves, Marquess d'Alveydre (1842-1909) developed the ideas of a Fabre d'Olivet (1767-1825) and in turn inspired Papus. Saint-Yves defined "Synarchy" as the ideal form of government, along the lines of a Platonic-type caste society.

LaRouche considers "synarchy" a secret oligarchy, and has attributed considerable significance to the Synarchist movement.

5.14.8 Aristotelian Society

This one was founded on 19 April 1880 at 17 Bloomsbury Square, London. The idea was to organize a biweekly salon of about 20 members, men and women. Philosophy would be the subject of discussion. The founder was one Shadworth H. Hodgson (1832-1912), an English philosopher whom no one has read.

Some past presidents: Bertrand Russell; Alfred Balfour; Richard Burdon Haldane (1856-1928) the secretary of war 1905-1912; G. E. Moore (1873-1958) the editor of *Mind*, key member of the Bloomsbury Set; William Inge (1860-1954) - Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral; Alfred North Whitehead (1861-1947) - Bertrand Russell collaborator in mathematics; Morris Ginsberg (1889-1970) the founding chairman of the British Sociological Association; A. J. Ayer (1910-1989) - MI6, UCL, Oxford; Karl Popper (1902-1994) - Austrian economist, LSE; Isaiah Berlin (1909-1997) - All Souls, founded his own college at Oxford, highly influential; etc.

It looks like this Society, which still exists, was, and perhaps still is, the focal point of the British philosophical establishment.

5.14.9 Society for Psychical Research

From Quigley's *Anglo-American Establishment*, Chapter 2:

One of the enduring creations of the Cecil Bloc is the Society for Psychical Research, which holds a position in the history of the Cecil Bloc similar to that held by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in the Milner Group. The Society was founded in 1882 by the Balfour family and their in-laws, Lord Rayleigh and Professor Sidgwick. In the twentieth century it was dominated by those members of the Cecil Bloc who became most readily members of the Milner Group. Among these we might mention Gilbert Murray, who performed a notable series of experiments with his daughter, Mrs. Arnold J. Toynbee, in the years before 1914, and Dame Edith Lyttelton, herself a Balfour and widow of Arthur Balfour's closest friend, who was president of the Society in 1933- 1934.

Today, the SPR website explains that "The SPR was the first organisation established to examine allegedly paranormal phenomena using scientific principles. Our aim is to learn more about events and abilities commonly described as "psychic" or "paranormal" by supporting research, sharing information and encouraging debate."

Between all these Masons, Illuminati, Theosophists, Luciferians, Christian Scientists, New Agers, and other assorted occultists, one begins to wonder. Was the occultism always just a front? Or did all of these occultists merely engage in hidden science? Could there be such things as magic and enchantment? The first conjecture remains the most palatable for me - but one wonders, one does...

Some members: Frederic William Henry Myers (1843-1901) - important psychologist; Henry Sidgwick (1838-1900) - utilitarian, economist; Edmund Rogers (1823-1910) - journalist, founder of the National Press Agency; Lewis Carroll; Alfred Russel Wallace (of evolution fame); W. B. Yeats; C. G. Jung; William James; Arthur Balfour; Arthur Conan Doyle; Charles Tart (1937-) - "parapsychologist"; plus an assortment of others, mostly high-ranking academicians.

The SPR crew regarded Blavatsky as "one of the most accomplished, ingenious and interesting imposters in history."

5.14.10 Fabian Society

From the Society's website:

The Fabian Society is Britain's oldest political think tank. Since 1884 the society has played a central role in developing political ideas and public policy on the left. It aims to promote: greater equality of power, wealth and opportunity; the value of collective action and public service; an accountable, tolerant and active democracy; citizenship, liberty and human rights; sustainable development; and multilateral international cooperation.

Similar outfits exist in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

The Society was founded in 1884. Its early (though not necessarily founding) notable members included (Wikipedia): George Bernard Shaw; H. G. Wells; Annie Besant; Graham Wallas (1858-1932) - founder of LSE, anti-Christian; Hubert Bland (1855-1914); Edith Nesbit (1858-1924) - author of books for children (get them while they are young); Sydney Olivier (1859-1943) - baron, bearer of the prestigious order of the Bath, member of the King's Privy Council, worked at Toynbee Hall; Oliver Lodge (1851-1940) - Royal Society, knighted by Edward VII; Leonard Woolf and Virginia Woolf; Ramsay MacDonald (1866-1937, PM 1929-1935) - had connections to the Milner band; and Emmeline Pankhurst (1858-1928) - militant suffragette.

Bertrand Russell was briefly a member.

The Webbs were the center of the society. Beatrice died in 1943.

The logo of the Fabian Society was - and this I find flabbergasting - the wolf in sheep's clothing. The "Fabian" moniker stems from the name of the Roman General Fabian Maximus (280-203BC), who fought Hannibal with a strategy of attrition. In other words, the Fabian strategy, as opposed to the Communist strategy, was one of gradualism and subversion rather than of outright revolution.

As to the Fabian goals, in addition to what the Fabians said for themselves, we can add eugenics, particularly in the pre-WWII version of the gang. As we have already seen, Beatrice was no less than Herbert Spencer's protege, H.G. Wells was a maniacal eugenicist, Bertrand Russell was a convinced eugenicist, G.B. Shaw wanted to kill those whom he did not like, and Annie Besant was a Malthusian. Quite a gaggle of would-be mass murderers we have here. In light of the American Establishment's refusal to relinquish eugenicist dogmatism, I see no reason to expect that the Fabians

have abandoned the cherished beliefs of their founders.

The Fabians were also for collectivism, and many of them favored the imperialist expansion of the wonders of the British civilization. To be fair to the British, their society had many good aspects. To be fair to the world, British imperialism was also frequently genocidal and inclined toward (sometimes unofficial) slavery.

Let me state here that, as should be clear, I have no dislike for the British people - they are the perfectly fine people of one of the great nations of history. Their leaders and masters, however, leave something to be desired.

Between the wars, the Fabians featured the influential writers (Wikipedia) R. H. Tawney (1880-1962), G.D.H. Cole (1889-1959), and Harold Laski (1893-1950). Laski the Marxist founded the important Institute for Social Research / Frankfurt School. Cole was a top professor at Oxford. Both Tawney and Laski taught at the LSE. There, they indoctrinated a good deal of the leaders of the post-war British "former" colonies.

A notable post-war member is one Ben Pimlott (1945-2004), the academic historian and biographer. Another one is Peter Townsend (1928-2009) the sociologist.

In general, the Fabian Society has been potent in the development of the policies and affairs of the British Labour Party. Tony Blair (1953-, PM 1997-2007) is a Fabian. In fact, the Fabians' web-sites tells us that all Labour prime ministers were Fabians: Ramsay MacDonald (1924, 1929-1935), Clement Attlee (1945-1951), Harold Wilson (1964-1970, 1974-1976), James Callaghan (1976-1979), Blair, and finally, Gordon Brown (2007-2010).

Currently (as of 2009), the Fabians have about six to seven thousand members, one thousand of them members of the Fabianjugend ("Young Fabians").

5.14.11 X Club

The X Club, founded in 1864, was Darwinism Central. It consisted of the major Darwinist enthusiasts of the day - (Wikipedia) George Busk, Edward Frankland, Thomas Archer Hirst, Joseph Dalton Hooker, Thomas Henry Huxley, John Lubbock, Herbert Spencer, William Spottiswoode, and John Tyndall.

Members officially met once a month until 1893. Their goal was the reshaping of the Royal Society along Darwinian lines. Theology and God were to be banished. So successful was the club, that some British scientists complained and accused the Xers of conspiratorial activities - which is exactly the type of activities that they engaged in. The Xers called their propagandism "Academic Liberalism."

The members of the club achieved great success in realizing their mission. By the late 19th century, they began to die out, and, Darwinism having been popularized, the survivors let the club lapse.

5.15 Conclusions

Since time immemorial, secret societies have existed and have allowed the ruling oligarchies of the ages to scheme, deceive, rule, and oppress. No great revolution has occurred without the backing of a foreign power, or the underground work of a properly organized secret society.

In our own era, the development of the form, and, to a certain degree, the reality of representative democracy and republicanism, has forced the powers behind the scenes to increasingly rely on secret societies and private clubs for the concoction and implementation of their countless nefarious plans and disgusting scams.

A good argument can be made for the incompatibility of true popular government and high-level secret organizations. If the people do not know the real policies of their representatives, they can not make rational decisions. Furthermore, the existence of secret organizations blurs the line between the appearance of power and the reality of power. Who can tell if a president who is a member of a secret society does not take orders from his higher ranking brethren?

In the long run, we should aim to abolish high-level secret societies. Our most immediate goal is exposing the Bilderbergs, the Trilaterals, Milner's gang, and the rest of them.

Chapter 6

The Foundations

The Oligarchs' favourite weapon apart from the banking system and the secret societies is the extensive international system of tax-exempt "private" or "non-profit" foundations, non-government organizations (NGOs), and think-tanks. The American "private," "philanthropic" foundations serve as tax-havens for the great fortunes of the Robber Barons, old and new. There are about 90,000 such foundations in the United States. The largest one is Bill Gates's outfit, a monstrosity valued at over \$38 billion. In aggregate, these private foundations command at least two-third of a trillion dollars.

Officially, the foundations supposedly administer the great American fortunes for charitable purposes. In reality, the foundations serve as 1) tax-havens, and 2) tools for social engineering.

6.1 Origins

As Quigley pointed out, the introduction of the estate (inheritance) tax in 1916, and the progressive income tax in 1913, forced the fortunes of the Robber Barons into the newly invented private charitable foundations. Those foundations also served as useful public relations fronts for the almost universally despised monopoly capitalists of the ilk of John D. Rockefeller. I suspect that the higher oligarchical elements always intended to use the progressive income tax as a means of robbing the middle-class.

For a classic overview of the Robber Barons, see Matthew Josephson's *The Robber Barons* (1934).

6.1.1 Carnegie

The pioneer of foundations was the famous Scotsman Robber Baron Andrew Carnegie, the prototype for Carl Barks's Scrooge McDuck (Scrooge was, really, a conglomeration of all the Robber Barons; he bears traits also reminiscent of C. Vanderbilt (1794-1877)). Carnegie (1835-1919) was born in relative poverty in Dunfermline, Scotland. In 1848, his family moved to Allegheny, Pennsylvania - the area, which would later become the heart of the U.S. steel industry. As he matured, Carnegie developed the following philosophy of life: spend the first third of life learning, the second third making dough, and the last third spending the dough for the "benefit" of society. A sharp lad, Andrew acquired the good graces of Colonel James Anderson, who gave the young Carnegie access to his personal library. By the age of twenty, Carnegie had seen much of the telegraph and railroad industries, and had managed to ingratiate himself with Thomas A. Scott (1823-1881) of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, which was, at its heyday, one of the largest corporations in the world. Scott would become the 4th president of the PRC in 1874; until then, he proved indispensable for the advancement of the young Carnegie.

In 1855, Scott, who was an avid insider trader, advised Andrew to invest in a certain stock. Carnegie quickly learned the ropes - to succeed, one needs: connections, dirty deals, monopolies, relentless

ambition, and a fair share of ruthlessness.

The Civil War broke the old America and created many of the crony capitalist (Robber Baron) fortunes of the late 19th century. Scott became Assistant Secretary of War in charge of military transportation, and Carnegie served under him as Superintendent of the Military Railways and the Union Government's telegraph lines in the East.

In 1864, Carnegie made a fortune from an oil investment. He got into the steel business. As America's industrial might burgeoned, so did Carnegie's steel empire. Between 1885-1900, the Scotsman aggressively bought out competitors, and established the American steel trust. By 1901, Carnegie wanted to retire, and so he sold his empire to J.P. Morgan, who formed the monopolistic United States Steel Corporation. The bonds representing Carnegie's wealth were stored in a specially built vault - uncle Scrooge's vault - at the Hudson Trust Company in Hoboken, New Jersey. Unlike Scrooge, Carnegie did not swim in his money.

In 1892, Carnegie's agent Frick smashed the famous Homestead Strike with some bloodshed. Carnegie's organization had the reputation of a staunch bastion of anti-unionism.

In accordance with his stated desires, Carnegie committed his wealth to philanthropy, via: the Carnegie Institution for Science, founded in 1902; the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1905); the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (1910); and the Carnegie Corporation of New York (1911).

In his political beliefs, Carnegie was: Anglophile, republican, pro-intellectual (in the positivist tradition), anti-imperialist, pro-evolutionist, aristocratic in the Ruskin tradition, pro-"free enterprise," and pro-League of Nations. For a further glimpse into the mind of the man, read his 1889 manifesto *Wealth*. Thence, Carnegie observed that

We accept and welcome therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment, the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few, and the law of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential for the future progress of the race.

...One who studies this subject will soon be brought face to face with the conclusion that upon the sacredness of property civilization itself depends - the right of the laborer to his hundred dollars in the savings bank, and equally the legal right of the millionaire to his millions.

William T. Stead of the original top echelon of Rhodes's secret society was Carnegie's pal.

Carnegie's philanthropic organizations built many libraries and helped establish the prestigious Carnegie-Melon University. Hagiographers tend to justify Carnegie's ruthless business tactics with the man's philanthropy. I disagree. Instead of doling out money to the people as a gesture of *noblesse oblige*, robber barons should consider not robbing the people in the first place. But, of course, it is up to the people to make use of the existing democratic channels and to reconstitute society to their liking. If they want to work for a pittance for a Carnegie, who may or may not build them a library - then, I suppose, good for them. Even if Carnegie meant what he said, his ideology would have driven him to projects, which most of us would not wholeheartedly welcome. And whatever his convictions, after the man's death, his foundations fell into the hand of the Rockefeller-Morgan-British Oligarchy cabal, which proceeded to conduct large-scale malignant social engineering.

The founding President of the Carnegie Institution was Daniel Coit Gilman (1831-1908), also the manager of the Russell Trust of the Skull and Bones secret society. As president of the Johns Hopkins University, Gilman was instrumental in the development of American postgraduate education. Gilman was also a member of Rockefeller's General Education Board.

In 1904, the Carnegie Institution founded the Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor, which has long been one of the most notorious eugenicist lairs in America.

6.1.2 Rockefeller

John D. Rockefeller (1839-1937) was the greatest of the Robber Barons. His Standard Oil Company completely dominated America's early oil industry, and was rivalled only by the Tsar's Baku oil fields, which were developed by a smorgasbord of international oligarchs, including Nobel, Rothschild, and, of course, Rockefeller.

Born in a New York family whose roots go back to the French Huguenots, the son of a vagabond con man, John D. was a (Wikipedia) "reserved, earnest, religious, methodical, and discreet" boy. In 1859 the sharp Rockefeller was already in business, and by 1863 he and his partner had built a refinery. Let the reader imagine what Rockefeller would have thought at the prospect of spending his youth in high school, and then university. The same, of course, applies to Carnegie. In February 1865, Rockefeller, who had made a good buck during the war, in which he had paid not to serve, bought out his partners and went in business solely for Number One.

A devoutly religious man, Rockefeller believed that "God gave me money." What, then, did God give to the pious paupers who have always peopled the Earth? It must all be a part of the Plan - but whose Plan?, one wonders.

In 1870, Rockefeller founded Standard Oil. Over the next three decades, he made sure to monopolize the oil industry. His avarice made him the richest man in America. Rockefeller's underhanded business tactics were a matter of legend. His 1872 buy-outs of Ohio competitors were dubbed the Cleveland Massacre. In the 1880s, Rockefeller set up shop in New York, where he entered the banking business. In the early 1900s, Rockefeller entered into an alliance with the Morgan faction. Ten years earlier, he had allied with the powerful banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co - Jacob Schiff's gang.

Journalist Ida Tarbell's 1904 work *The History of the Standard Oil Company* painted a massive stain on Rockefeller's already tarnished reputation. "Miss Tarbarrel's" blow bothered John D., but did not make him change his practices.

The 1911 break-up of Standard Oil did no great harm to the Rockefeller dynasty. John D. still controlled the companies, and his wealth grew steadily.

With the help of his crony Frederick Taylor Gates (1853-1929), who was the man in charge of Rockefeller's first philanthropic outfits, John D. gradually got into the philanthropy business. Like his fellow Robber Baron Carnegie, Rockefeller espoused the progressive "Efficiency Movement," which aimed, among other things, to create obedient workers. Accordingly, John D. founded the highly influential General Education Board in 1903. Let us again bask in the glory of GEB's *Occasional Letter Number One* (1906):

(From 2.8 of Gatto's *Underground History*) In our dreams...people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hands. The present educational conventions [intellectual and character education] fade from our minds, and unhampered by tradition we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive folk. We shall not try to make these people or any of their children into philosophers or men of learning or men of science. We have not to raise up from among them authors, educators, poets or men of letters. We shall not search for embryo great artists, painters, musicians, nor lawyers, doctors, preachers, politicians, statesmen, of whom we have ample supply. The task we set before ourselves is very simple...we will organize children...and teach them to do in a perfect way the things their fathers and mothers are doing in an imperfect way.

In 1890, Rockefeller founded the University of Chicago, which should always be regarded as a Rockefeller domain, just as All Souls and the London School of Economics are Fabian/ Round Table haunts. In 1901, Rockefeller founded the New York Rockefeller University, which to this day remains one of the top eugenicist institutions in the world. Among the Rockefeller University's many notable achievements are the development of the practice of travel vaccination, the invention of the AIDS drug cocktail, and the implementation of methadone, one of the sides effects of which is "sudden death," into a treatment for heroin. The Rockefeller influence in the organization and development

of America's medical establishment can not be overstated.¹ The premier American medical school, Johns Hopkins, was the recipient of generous Rockefeller grants, as was Harvard's medical school. Chicago University, of course, gave us the evil Chicago Boys "economists" and their mad-doctor guru Milton Friedman.

To safeguard his loot, Rockefeller established the Rockefeller Foundation in 1913. Soon thereafter, in 1914, Rockefeller interests sent the Colorado National Guard to crush the Ludlow coal mining strike. Resulted the Ludlow Massacre. Rockefeller's name had become blacker than the soot of coal. Something had to be done. And so, John D. retained the public relations pioneer Ivy Lee (1877-1934). Upton Sinclair dubbed Lee "Poison Ivy" for his efforts in the service of the Rockefeller overlord. Poison Ivy was one of the founders of the CFR.

In 1940, the third crop of Rockefellers - John D. III, Nelson, Laurance, Winthrop and David founded the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

6.1.3 Ford

Henry Ford (1863-1947) was born on a farm in Detroit. In 1891, he joined the Edison Illuminating Company, where he quickly became Chief Engineer by 1893. Between 1893 and 1899, Ford built a couple of prototype automobiles. In 1899, he founded the Detroit Automobile Company. It folded in 1901 - but now Ford had the necessary experience and know-how. In 1901, Ford became the chief engineer of the Henry Ford Company, formed by a number of investors of his acquaintance. The rest, as they say, is history. In 1908, the first Model T rolled about. In 1913, Ford introduced the revolutionary assembly line - the hallmark of efficiency. In 1932, Ford was producing one-third of the world's automobiles.

Ford was a convinced advocate of peace and the League of Nations, as well as a believer in the authenticity of the *Protocols of Zion*. As we will see, his company did a good deal of business with the Nazis. In fact, Adolf had a large portrait of Henry in his office. Though he did give his workers money enough to buy his cars, Ford was a believer in industrial aristocracy and maximum worker efficiency - Huxley made "Fordism" the religion of his Brave New World for a good reason. Not unexpectedly, Ford was a great enemy of unionism. The workers could get what was theirs - but only at the benevolence of uncle Henry.

Ford established his foundation in 1936.

Was Henry a Malthusianist? Of course he was! See John Caldwell's *Limiting Population Growth and the Ford Foundation* (1986), and Martin Wooster's *The Ford Foundation: Founder of Modern Population Control* (2004).

6.1.4 And a Few Others

John Harvey Kellogg (1852-1943) was another Robber Baron. In 1906, he founded the Race Betterment Foundation.

Or take Clarence Gamble (1894-1966) of Procter & Gamble. He was the patron of Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Federation of America and various similar outfits.

There is also the (Harry Frank) Guggenheim Foundation, which studies, tellingly, (Wikipedia) "violence related to youth, family relationships, media effects, crime, biological factors, intergroup conflict related to religion, ethnicity, and nationalism, and political violence deployed in war and sub-state terrorism, as well as processes of peace and the control of aggression."

¹Again, see Eustace Mullins's *Murder by Injection*.

The largest foundation today is that of Bill Gates, whose hysterical fear of over-population we have already discussed.

Thus did the noble philanthropist Robber Barons, those lovers of eugenics, efficiency, industrial aristocracy, and anti-unionism, create the infrastructure of the America-based hegemonic web of international foundations.

The foundations were the ultimate facade - who would dare accuse those lofty "philanthropic" institutions of deliberate sabotage? Are not the likes of Gates and Rockefeller noble-minded men who want to return all that they have taken? - and I have had heated arguments on this last point.

In pursuing their goals, the Oligarchs used the by-now familiar "as above, so below" motto. At the top level, they monopolized key institutions and manufactured highly prestigious policy-setting think-tanks. At the grass-roots level, they financed and covertly manipulated various organizations; furthermore, by the judicious use of grants, they exerted considerable control over the media and the schools. For example, a foundation would promise certain monies to a school, on the conditions that the school implements a "sex education" program, or a "green education" class, or something else of the sort. The foundations would fund certain leftist outlets - as long as those outlets would not cross the line and talk about 9-11, the JFK assassinations, the Bilderbergs, or other sensitive subjects. Favourite leftist topics such as feminism, "gay rights," and more "education" (i.e. family-breaking schooltime), have always been welcome.

Finally, at the same time, it should be admitted that the foundations have indeed made significant contribution to the real welfare of society. What is important to realize is that these contributions could have been made just as easily, and more cheaply, had the massive funds of the foundations been in the hands of public institutions - or the public itself.

6.2 History and Effects

The great foundations and their owners and directors engaged in their business of the quiet social re-engineering of American (and not only American) society unperturbed until the early 1950s, when the communist witch-hunt inadvertently stumbled upon some of the foundations' projects. In 1952, the U.S. Congress put congressmen Edward E. Cox and B. Carroll Reece in charge of the newly minted United States House Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations. The findings of the committee were summarized in 1958 by the committee's general counsel Rene Wormser in a book entitled *Foundations: Their Power and Influence*. Quigley characterized the book as "shocked, but not shocking." (*TEH*, p. 955)

Reece's entire 2000-page report is today available on the web (where it was posted by the progeny of the phenomenal Charlotte Iserbyt). However, I will stick to Wormser's summary.

Wormser starts out with the following paragraph (Introduction):

In his column in the New York *Daily News* of December 21, 1954, John O'Donnell said that the Reece Committee had the "almost impossible task" of telling "the taxpayers that the incredible was, in fact, the truth." "The incredible fact," he continued "was that the huge fortunes piled up by such industrial giants as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and Henry Ford were today being used to destroy or discredit the free-enterprise system which gave them birth."

O'Donnell was, of course, hampered by the kindergarden view of American industrialism. In reality, Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller were dedicated monopolists who loathed competition. The Robber Barons wanted a streamlined, efficient, hierarchical society with themselves at the top. Their views were not entirely different from those of Lenin and Hitler, both of whom they funded.

Wormser continues to say that the foundations present "grave dangers" to American society:

These dangers relate chiefly to the use of foundation funds for political ends; they arise out of the accumulation of substantial economic power and of cultural influence in the hands of a class of administrators of tax-exempt funds established in perpetuity. An "élite" has thus emerged, in control of gigantic financial resources operating outside of our democratic processes, which is willing and able to shape the future of this nation and of mankind in the image of its own value concepts. An unparalleled amount of power is concentrated increasingly in the hands of an interlocking and self-perpetuating group. Unlike the power of corporate management, it is unchecked by stockholders; unlike the power of government, it is unchecked by the people; unlike the power of churches, it is unchecked by any firmly established canons of value.

In regard to the motivation for creating foundations:

The chief motivation in the creation of foundations has long ceased to be pure philanthropy - it is now predominantly tax avoidance or minimization. ... The [IRS], according to a press report, says it sometimes receives up to 10,000 applications a month for tax-free status! [this in 1958]

The creation of a new foundation very often serves the purpose of contributing to a favorable public opinion for the person or corporation that endows it. Among public relations consultants the practice of publicly establishing the virtue of a previously despised person or institution by forming a tax-exempt foundation and beating the drum for it is quite common.

... Perhaps the best example of the use of foundations in estate and business planning is offered by the largest, The Ford Foundation. This foundation received about 90 percent of the stock of the Ford Motor Company, all nonvoting stock. Had not the Ford family created this foundation, it would have had to dispose of a large part of its ownership in the Ford Company to the public, for it is hardly possible that the family had enough liquid capital to pay the hundreds of millions of estate taxes which would have been due upon the deaths of two proprietors, Henry Ford and his son Edsel.

Wormser provides a few additional examples of tax evasion.

From Chapter 2, on the power of the foundations:

The giant foundation can exercise enormous power through the direct use of its funds. Moreover, it materially increases this power and its influence by building collateral alliances which serve greatly to insulate it against criticism.

... All its connections and associations, plus the often sycophantic adulation of the many institutions and individuals who had received largess from the foundation, give it an enormous aggregate of power and influence. This power extends beyond its immediate circle of associations, to those who hope to benefit from the bounty.

... The foundation's direct power is the power of money. Privately financed educational institutions have had a bad time during the period of rapidly increasing costs. Foundation grants have become so important a source of support that college and university presidents cannot often afford to ignore the opinions and wishes of the executives who distribute foundation largess.

This fact alone should put away the delusion of "academic freedom." In the academic world, the most respected professors are those with the most and most valuable grants - and who dishes out many of the grants? The foundations, and the government agencies, which have a revolving-door policy with the major foundations.

On the power of foundations in the social sciences, from Chapter 3:

The Social Science Research Council

"Foundations," said the Reece Committee report, "becoming more numerous every day, may some day control our whole intellectual and cultural life - and with it the future of this country. The impact of this interlock, this intellectual cartel, has already been felt deeply in education and in the political scene."

The report then discussed The Social Science Research Council, taking it as an example of the "association or individual foundations with one of the intermediary or executive foundations" - another form of interlock. Among the foundations which have supported this distributing agent are these: [all the large ones - Ford, Carnegie, Rockefeller - plus more]

With support as this, and even government support, it is no wonder that **the Social Science Research Council has become the greatest power in social-science research.** [emphasis mine]

This means that the foundations effectively control the mainstream views of history, sociology, etc., in the United States. Remember that the Milner band organized a similar takeover of the high-level historical establishment of Britain.

Moreover,

"The power of the SSRC," said the Reece Committee report, "seems to be used to effect control of the field of social sciences." This statement is not lightly made. "There is evidence," said the Committee, "that professional appointments all over the United States are influenced by SSRC blessing."

Another way of manipulating the academic world, which Wormser mentions, is the high-level control over the major scientific journals and similar publications. In short, an academic is rated by his publications, and the more, the better. To publish, one must submit a paper for peer review to one of a few *privately owned and/ or controlled* prestigious journals, which will always promote the party line, particularly in highly ideological fields such as the social sciences.

Via the journals, the grants, and a few other tricks, the Oligarchs maintain almost total control over the supposedly liberal-minded scientific community of the West - and what is worse, they do that without the realization of the scientists, most of who - and this is tragic - honestly think that grants and publications are awarded solely on the basis of merit.

As a disconcerting example, consider the *Annals of Mathematics*. The *Annals* is perhaps the most prestigious mathematical journal in the world. Who is its publisher? Princeton's Institute for Advanced Study - which Quigley identifies as (*T&H*, p. 953) "a reasonable copy of the Round Table Group's chief Oxford headquarters, All Souls College. This copy, called the Institute for Advanced Study, and best known, perhaps, as the refuge of Einstein, Oppenheimer, John von Neumann, and George F. Kennan, was organized by Abraham Flexner of the Carnegie Foundation and Rockefeller's General Education Board after he had experienced the delights of All Souls while serving as Rhodes Memorial Lecturer at Oxford. The plans were largely drawn by Tom Jones, one of the Round Table's most active intriguers and foundation administrators." I can heap swaths of dirt on the names listed above, but this is not the place.

Or take *Acta Mathematica*, the highly-prestigious Swedish journal. Since 2006, the journal has been published by Springer. And this in mathematics, which, on the surface, is a non-political science - though in reality the Pentagon has been recruiting top mathematicians for the duration of its history.

Another interesting contraption is the American Council on Education:

The American Council on Education is an intermediary to which the Reece Committee also gave special attention. It is a council of national education associations, financed by membership dues, by government contracts, by heavy contributions from major foundations, and by donations of associated organizations. Among its supporters have been: [the usual suspects]

...The Reece Committee report commented:

...However laudable much or most of its work may have been, the *Council* has certainly been one of the media through which foundation funds have been used to effect considerable control or influence over education in the United States. Some may argue that this control or influence has been wholly good - were this so, we should still believe that the power of great foundations to affect educational policies and practices is one which should concern the public. By the same token, we believe that "clearing house" organizations, while they may serve a purpose in the direction of efficiency, are of questionable desirability when interlocked financially or by personnel with these foundations. [Emphasis in original.] *The aggregate power involved in such a concentration gives us concern.*

For more details on the foundations' control of the education of America's young (and old), refer to Gatto and Iserbyt's works.

Also note that the foundations are heavily interlocked, and the large foundations dominate the smaller ones. The separate pieces of the whole system are, as Wormser notes, amazingly homogeneous in thought and action.

In Chapter 4 of his book, Wormser complains about the foundations' support for pseudo-science and "scientism." He is particularly annoyed with the so-called "behavioral" sciences, which delight in the rabid empiricist collection of data for the purposes of - and Wormser uses the identical term - social engineering.

As one of many examples of the insidious nature of the behaviourists' research, Wormser provides the following:

The jury-tapping project financed by the Ford Foundation, conducted in connection with a "sociological" project of the University of Chicago, illustrates the danger of overindulgence in the empirical approach. The problem of the project, I suppose, was to determine whether or not the jury system could be improved. To go about this by eavesdropping on juries to find out how they deliberate is fact-finding of a nature which is extremely dangerous. The term "fact," in itself, is misused by the overanxious empirical researcher. Of what value is the well-known "fact" that jurymen spend part of their time discussing the baseball scores, and that much of their argument would hardly do on a debating team. Have these "facts" any scientific fact-value? Are we to conclude, through a collection of such "facts," that jurymen are not competent to fulfil the function which our legal system has assigned to them? Are such "facts" to be the basis of a plea that we should, in some way, control juries to make them more attentive to duty, or screen them to confine jury duty to those with a high I.Q.?

Obviously, Wormser hit the nail on the head. We will take another critical look at the behaviorists later.

Wormser lists dozens of quotations indicating the desire of the top foundation operatives to develop "scientific political control" - their words, not Wormser's. Amusingly, Wormser seemed to think that a communist technocratic cabal had managed to infiltrate the great foundations. The far more prosaic reality is that the technocrats merely did the bidding of their Oligarchical benefactors - and why not? Those who obeyed Rockefeller with more than unusual zest could count on a prestigious career, a good deal of money, and perhaps a Noble Prize or two.

One of the more amusing - and disgusting - Rockefeller ventures was the manufacture of the sex-guru

Dr. Kinsey. We will examine the mad doctor Kinsey later. For now, note that Kinsey's "research" was the major propelling force of the 1960s so-called "sexual revolution."

The SSRC also influenced pre-WWII military doctrine with their study *The American Soldier*.

In Chapter 7, Wormser explains how, through organizations like the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the foundation operatives control America's foreign policy. Of course, the CEIP is only a branch of the CFR-RIIA organization. The foundations promoted the notions of globalism, world government, and so on.

Also see G. Edward Griffin's 1982 interview with Normad Dodd, available on the web. Follows a quote from that interview. By chance, Dodd, who had worked high-up at a top bank just prior to the 1929 crash (the bank was either Chase or City, from I have gathered), and who was the director of research for the Reece Committee, had managed to have an agent of his look at the minutes of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

(About 26 minutes in) Dodd: ...We are now in the year 1908, which was the year when the Carnegie began operations. And in that year, the trustees, meeting for the first time, raise a specific question, which they discuss throughout the balance of the year in a very learned fashion. And the question is: is there any means known more effective than war, assuming you wish to alter the life of an entire people?

And they conclude, that no more effective means than war, to that end, is known to humanity.

So then, in 1909, they raise the second question, and discuss it, namely: How do we involve the United States in a war? ... And finally, they answered that question as follows: We must control the State Department. And then that very naturally raises the question of - how do we do that? And they answer it by saying: We must take over and control the diplomatic machinery of this country. And, finally, they resolve to aim at that as an objective.

Then, time passes, and we are eventually in a war, which would have been World War I. And, at that time, they record on their minutes a shocking report, in which they dispatch to President Wilson a telegram cautioning him to see that the war does not end too quickly.

And, finally, of course, the war is over. At that time, their interest shifts over to preventing what they call a "reversion" of life in the United States to what it was prior to 1914, when World War I broke out. And, at that point, they had come to the conclusion that: to prevent a reversion we must control education in the United States. And they realized that that's a pretty big task. To them, it is too big for them alone, so they approach the Rockefeller Foundation with the suggestion that: that portion of education, which could be considered domestic be handled by the Rockefeller Foundation, and that portion, which is international, should be handled by the [Carnegie] Endowment.

And they then decide that the key to the success of these two operations lay in the alteration of the teaching of American history. So they approach four of the then most prominent teachers of American history in the country, people like Charles and Mary Bird (sp.?), and their suggestion to them is: Will they alter the way in which they present the subject?, and they get turned down flat.

So they then decide that it is necessary for them to, as they say, "build our own stable of historians." And then they approach the Guggenheim Foundation, which specializes in fellowships, and say: When we find young men in the process for studying for doctorates in the field of American history, and we feel that they are the right calibre, will you grant them fellowships on our say-so? And the answer is "yes."

So, under that condition, eventually, they assembled twenty, and they take this twenty

potential teachers of American history to London, and there they are briefed into what is expected of them when, as, and if, they secure appointments in keeping with the doctorates they will have earned. And that group of twenty historians ultimately becomes the nucleus of the American Historical Association.

And, then, toward the end of the 1920s, the Endowment grants to the American Historical Association 400,000 dollars for a study of our history in a manner, which points to what can this country look forward to in the future. And that culminates in a seven volume study, the last volume of which is of course in essence 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.

This is yet another incontrovertible source pointing out the existence of a global conspiracy.

Though they came after the Reece Committee's report, the phenomena of radical feminism and "gay rights" were also pushed forward by the foundations. As Aaron Russo explained in his interview with Alex Jones,

(About 34 minutes in) Russo: ... [Nick Rockefeller] started laughing. "Aaron, what do you think women's liberation was about?" And I said - I've a pretty conventional thinking about it at that point - I said "women won the right to work, to get equal pay with men, just like they won the right to vote" - you know? And he started to laugh and he said, "You're an idiot!" And I said "Why am I an idiot?" He said, "Let me tell you what that was about. We the Rockefeller funded that. We funded women's lib. (You know?) And we're the ones who got all the newspapers and television - the Rockefeller Foundation." He says "And you wanna know why? There were two primary reasons. And they were: one reason was, we couldn't tax half the population before women's lib; and the second reason was, now we get the kids at school at an early age. We can indoctrinate the kids how to think. It breaks up their family. The kids start looking at the state as their family - as the school, as the officials as their family, not as the parents teaching them. And, so, those were the two primary reasons for women's lib - which, I had thought up to that point, was a noble thing - you know? When I saw their intentions behind it, where they were coming from when they created it, thought of it, I saw the evil behind what I thought was a noble venture.

Verifying that the Rockefellers funded radical feminism is trivial. A search sends one to, for example, a University of Michigan webpage entitled *The History of the Women's Studies Program*:²

In 1970, seventeen courses in Women's Studies were taught in American colleges and universities. Ten years later, there were at least 350 programs and 20,000 courses. By 1986, 503 programs were recorded by the National Women's Studies Association. Increasing numbers of universities are making tenure-track appointments in Women's Studies; in 1988-89 alone, more than two dozen universities advertised tenure-track appointments in Women's Studies.

Along with this institutional development, Women's Studies has generated an extensive body of scholarship in the social sciences (particularly psychology, sociology, history and anthropology; to a lesser extent, political science and economics) and the humanities (particularly literature and languages; more recently, art history, film studies, religion and philosophy). Several major university presses have series dealing exclusively with Women's Studies (for example, Indiana University Press, Columbia University Press, University of Chicago Press, Cornell University Press, etc.), and there are now many interdisciplinary Women's Studies Journals (e.g., *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society*; *Feminist Studies*; *Feminist Issues*; *Women's Studies International Quarterly*; *Differences - A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*).

²<http://www.umich.edu/~womenstd/background.htm>, accessed December 5, 2011.

This volume of research and publication in Women's Studies has been supported by foundations and federal agencies. In the past few years, at least two major sources of funding of dissertation research have been specifically designated for Women's Studies (Woodrow Wilson Women's Research Grants; American Association of University Women). The National Science Foundation, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Russell Sage Foundation, National Institute of Education, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Institute of Mental Health, and other agencies have given both support and visibility to research on women's studies.

Who published those journals? *Signs* (founded 1975) - (Rockefeller) University of Chicago Press. *Feminist Studies* was founded in 1972 by a gaggle of gals from Columbia University, which is a banker-controlled university found a few blocks north of Wall Street. *FS* found asylum at the University of Maryland, College Park - an institution heavily controlled by the federal government. *Women's Studies International* was founded in 1977 by Robert Maxwell's Oxford Pergamon Press. Finally, *differences* was founded in 1989 and is published by Duke University Press. Duke University is so-named, because in 1924 the tobacco Robber Baron James Duke blessed the institution with the The Duke Endowment.

In sum, since their inauguration in the early 20th century, the tax-exempt foundations have influenced to a great degree, and in some instances controlled directly or indirectly, the education, the historical establishment, the foreign policy, and various academic disciplines in the universities, of the United States. In particular, through their power of culture creation, the foundations have, on behalf of their masters, and in conjunction with other arms of the global Cabal, manufactured such phenomena as the Sexual Revolution, the Women's Liberation Movement, and the "Gay Rights" Movement.

6.3 Color-Coups

One particularly interesting recent invention of the foundations has been the Color Revolution. The idea has been discussed in detail by F. William Engdahl in his *Full Spectrum Dominance: Totalitarian Democracy in the New World Order* (2009). Also of interest is Mark MacKinnon's *The New Cold War* (2007). Tarpley is aware of the situation - see his *Obama: The Postmodern Coup*.

MacKinnon was (a) the Moscow bureau chief for *The Globe and Mail* from 2002 to 2005, (b) a two-time National Newspaper Award winner (Canadian Pulitzer), and, judging by the content of his book, (c) a great admirer of George Soros. The writing on the inside of the dust jacket of his book says it all:

When the Berlin Wall fell in 1989 and the Soviet Union collapsed two years later, liberal democracy was supposed to fill the void left by Soviet Communism. Some Eastern Europeans greeted change, but the citizens of the "Evil Empire" itself saw little of the promised freedom, and more of the same old despots and corruption.

Recently, a second wave of reform - Serbia in 2000, Georgia in 2003, Ukraine in 2004, and Kyrgyzstan in 2005 - has proven almost as monumental as those in Berlin and Moscow. The people of the Eastern bloc, aided in no small part by Western money and advice, are again rising up and demanding an end to autocracy. And once more, the Kremlin is battling the White House every step of the way.

... Mark MacKinnon has spent many of these years as a journalist in Moscow, and his view of the story and access to those involved remains unparalleled. With *The New Cold War*, he reveals the links between these democratic revolutions - and George Soros, the idealistic American billionaire behind them - in a major investigation into the forces that are quietly reshaping the post-Cold War world.

Note that in this ridiculous hagiography we have a document that counts as official history, rather than as "conspiracy theory." Yes, George Soros is a Color Revolutionary - and we know, because a top *Globe&Mail* journalist has written a book about it! Engdahl, being the soberer and better informed of the two authors, provides a far more honest analysis of the Color-Coup phenomenon.

What had happened is that by the late 1990s, the US intelligence agencies and the international bankers had perfected their techniques of "soft" political warfare. Via the foundations and various CIA fronts, the spooks and the oligarchs had created a system for the efficacious manufacture of seemingly popular grass-roots revolutions. After 1989, many of the less Russophile Eastern European nations - such as Poland, Croatia (after the partition), West Germany, and the Czech Republic - had fallen into the Western sphere of influence. A few nations, however, remained close to Russia for political or plain geographic reasons. Among those were Serbia (which had dragged Russia into World War I), the Ukraine, and Georgia. Soros & co decided to conquer those nations via the carrot of pseudo-democracy.

The main players in the scam are: the State Department's United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and National Endowment for Democracy (NED), behind which stand Tavistock and RAND; the CIA's Freedom House; Gene Sharp's Albert Einstein³ Institution (AEI); and George Soros's Open Society Institute (OSI) and various Soros Foundations. The agents of these organizations quietly sneak into the target country, and proceed to recruit dupes, who receive a generous (often Western taxpayer-funded) indoctrination, as well as basic training in revolution-making. When the time comes, the carefully coordinated dupes swarm the major squares of the target nation and demand regime change. The Western media hypes up the wonderful grab for democracy, the Western governments apply pressure on the existing head of state, and before you know it, a banker stooge has wormed himself - or, rather, been "elected" - into power.

Where appropriate, the "soft-coup" NGOs simply use the target nation's privatized media to promote a candidate to their liking. When the elections come, if their candidate loses, the Westerners scream "voting fraud." Of course, as Michael Parenti and Greg Palast have proved, the United States 2000 and 2004 presidential elections were manifestly fraudulent - but that does not bother the world's high-minded lovers of faux-democracy.

Serbia had the honour of being the first victim of the 21st century wave of Color Coups. Miraculously, the nationalistic Slobodan Milosevic (1941-2006) had survived - in the political sense - Clinton's three-month bombing - but where the bombs failed, the "non-violent" coup succeeded. Tricked by the agents of the NGO-manufactured gang Otpor! ("Resistance!"), hundreds of thousands of Serbians descended upon Belgrade following a close election in October 2000, and in a few days Milosevic was history. To add insult to injury, the Westerners organized a kangaroo court for the Serbian leader - except that he proved too good at defending himself, and had to be allowed (?) to die prior to his conviction. This is not to say that Milosevic was an angel - but he was a nationalist, and he had a fair degree of popular support.

Milosevic was succeeded by Vojislav Kostunica (1944-) and Zoran Djindjic (1952-2003), a couple of stooges who remained resolutely pro-Western even after the bombing of their nation. To get an idea of the moral fibre of Djindjic, observe that during the bombings, he shook the hand of none other than Bill Clinton. And instead of being banished for treason, this man became prime minister. In 2003, Djindjic received a bullet to the heart at the orders of the former head of the Serbian special ops. Kostunica, who was somewhat more of a nationalist, held the presidency and opposed Djindjic's "reforms." Over the first decade of the 21st century, the Western Oligarchs finished the dismemberment of Serbia via the secessions of Montenegro (2006) and Kosovo (2008). From a fairly developed and strong nation in 1990, Yugoslavia had been partitioned into a jigsaw-puzzle of minor and minnow states, some of them relatively prosperous (Slovenia), and some totally wrecked (Kosovo).

³By the way, Einstein was a rabid Zionist, a dedicated one-worlder, and, in the opinion of many physicists - see Christopher Jon Bjerknes's *The Manufacture and Sale of Saint Einstein* - one of the greatest scientific frauds in history.

One obvious indication of nefarious behind-the-scenes activity is the various "resistance" movements' recycling of symbols and slogans. For example, during the 2011 Egyptian destabilization, the "April 6 Youth Movement" adopted Otpor!'s clenched fist symbol (which in fact dates back to the 1960's CIA-infiltrated American SDS). The slogan "Enough!" appeared in both the Egyptian and the Georgian (and other) revolutions. Otpor! and its Ukrainian counterpart also used the ancient "It is time!" slogan, which has a fascinating story going through the French Revolution and the English 14th century Peasant Rebellion back to Jesus.

The spread of the Internet has given unprecedented opportunities for coordination to the revolutionary dupes and their puppet masters. Unfortunately for the spooks, the Internet has also given people the opportunity to expose the Color Coups.

Georgia was next. Its ruler was the old communist hack Edward Shevardnadze (1927-), Gorbachev's minister of foreign affairs. In charge of Georgia between 1995 and 2003, Shevardnadze and his pals made Georgia into a nice semi-feudal fiefdom, and proceeded to enjoy life. Unfortunately for Edward, he was deemed insufficiently pro-Western, and in 2003 his time was up. George Soros had mobilized his Serbian Otpor! cadres into training the Georgian opposition. In late 2003, Shevardnadze was accused of rigging an election. The lovers of "democracy" swarmed the streets, and a few weeks later the raving lunatic Washington stooge Mikheil Saakashvili was installed into power. In the early 1990s, Saakashvili, backed by a US State Department fellowship, had toured through Columbia Law School and The George Washington University Law School. After gaining the presidency of Georgia, Saakashvili held a staunchly pro-Washington policy, and even tried to join NATO.

In 2008, the madman Saakashvili decided to invade Southern Ossetia, a nominally Georgian Russian protectorate guarded by Russian forces. The South Ossetians wanted independence, but, while the US-occupied Kosovo was allowed to secede, South Ossetia of the Washington's puppet Georgia had to stay put. But then, the Anglo-American axis has always been legendary for its spectacular hypocrisy. The inevitable happened, and the Russians smashed Saakashvili's NATO-trained forces in a few days. Dick Cheney, who even after the conflict expressed support for Georgia's integration into NATO, huffed and puffed.

A year earlier, in 2007, Saakashvili had cracked down on a demonstration led by elements allied to Badri Patarkatsishvili, the Georgian Jewish tycoon close to the Russian oligarch Boris Berezovsky. Who was aiming for what is not entirely clear; what is clear is that when democracy-loving stooges like Saakashvili crack down on protesters, it is OK by Washington's book. But let us proceed away from these aphorisms.

The real goals behind the Georgian "Rose Revolution" were the encirclement of Russia, and the provision of a stepping-stone toward the various projected trans-Caucasian and trans-Caspian pipelines. The next step in the pipeline war and the post-"Cold War" encirclement of Russia - which the Anglo-Americans do not control - came in 2004 with Ukraine's Orange Revolution.

In 2004, Viktor Yushchenko and the photogenic Yulia Tymoshenko allied their forces to oust the Leonid Kuchma - Viktor Yanukovich configuration. Kuchma (1938-), who had taken the helm as president in 1994, was moderately pro-Russian. In his youth, the Polish-Russian Yanukovich (1950-) had been something of a *huligan*. He straightened up and became an engineer. In the 1990s, Yanukovich enter politics, and quickly rose in the ranks. In 2002, Kuchma appointed him as prime minister. Yanukovich was cautiously pro-Russia and anti-NATO, though he did entertain the idea of the Ukraine joining the EU.

The irascible folks in Washington decided that Russia should not be close with the Ukraine, which is the historical area of the medieval Old Russia. Following an extremely close election in late 2004, the duped mobs stormed the streets, and soon enough Yushchenko was president and Tymoshenko was PM.

Who were the members of this dynamic duo? Tymoshenko (1960-) made good during the 1990s "privatization" looting of the Ukraine. By the late 1990s, Tymoshenko - surely with a little help

from some new friends in the West and the Moscow mobs - had become a high-ranking Ukrainian oligarch. The gas business of the Ukraine was under her control. Tymoshenko served under Kuchma as minister of energy. In 2001, the two got into a row, and Tymoshenko was fired. Kuchma slapped her with a corruption charge, but it did not stick - then. Just to be on the safe side, Moscow maintained for some years an arrest warrant for the ravishing oligarchess.

Yushchenko (1954-) got an economics degree, and was put in charge of the Ukraine's post-1989 central bank. After navigating through the 1998 hyper-inflationary tsunami, Yushchenko was made prime minister by Kuchma. Yushchenko held the post through 2000 and the spring of 2001. A political manoeuvre ousted Yushchenko in May 2001. In 1998, Yushchenko married an American-Ukrainian graduate of the University of Chicago and former State Department cadre.

Tellingly, Yushchenko's January 2005 inauguration was attended by Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, the Secretary General to NATO. In August, Yushchenko signed a pact of cooperation with none other than Saakashvili. In September, Yushchenko went and fired Tymoshenko under charges of corruption, only to see her return two years later, a few weeks after the wily Tymoshenko had published an article (ghost-written by Mr. Kissinger) lambasting Putin in *Foreign Affairs*.

In 2010, Yanukovich (who had been the PM during the Tymoshenko interregnum) beat Tymoshenko in an elections, and became president. Soon after, the parliament threw Tymoshenko out. In 2011, the Ukrainian government went after Tymoshenko in force. She is currently under lock and key, and involved in a number of trials.

The key to the whole soap opera was Washington's desire to sabotage Russia by controlling the Ukraine's gas and oil pipelines, and by expanding NATO eastwards. The shameless opportunism of the various players further complicates the situation. Yushchenko was pro-"free-market" and pro-NATO. Today he is held in low regard in the Ukraine. Tymoshenko was also, generally, pro-NATO and pro-EU. She refused to extend Russia's lease on the old Soviet Black Sea naval bases. To her credit, Tymoshenko was against the privatization of the gas transportation system of the Ukraine. During the Yushchenko-Tymoshenko era, between 2005 and 2009, Russo-Ukrainian relationship suffered heavy strains because of a gas-pipe scandal.

Moscow had smelled a foul odour in the wind in the 1990s, and had dropped an oil pipeline in the Baltic between 1997 and 2001. After quarrelling with Belarus over oil pipelines in 2007, the Russians decided to strap another pipe along the bottom of the sea. The project should be completed around 2012. Moscow has also considered the possibility of a southern pipeline - an idea that strikes terror in the hearts of the American oil-igarchs, who have dreamed of their Nabucco pipeline for over a decade.

The pipeline wars will intensify over the next decade. Unfortunately, the extremely aggressive Anglo-American approach holds the potential of a World War III. Moreover, the Western-led Middle-Eastern rampage has led to blowback in the shape of another scenario dreaded by New York and London - the alliance between Russia and China.

In regard to China, the Anglo-Americans do not control Beijing, though they would certainly like to. It is likely that the Rockefeller gang plans to gain control of China via a synthetic "democratic" revolution. In general, economic prosperity tends to raise the desire for a perceived participation in a democratic process. The most dedicated revolutionary dupes tend to be the well educated, Western-oriented members of the small "middle classes" of target nations. This would explain the otherwise bizarre - even suicidal - US policy of exporting industry to China, and training hordes of Chinese cadre at the American universities. If this is the case, the game is an ambitious one. One wonders how the Chinese top brass sees the world.

Indeed, as Engdahl points out (p.81), the US has quietly been funding "democracy" in China. In the fall of 2007 and in 2008, Myanmar, which had recently become a vital Chinese ally, experienced the joys of the Color (Saffron) Coup. Currently, the chosen one in Burma is the telegenic Oxford grad-

uate and Western agent Aung San Suu Kyi (1945-). Again in 2008, Washington sponsored unrest in Tibet in what was called the Crimson Revolution. The destabilization attempt must have been a test for and a warning to China on the eve of the Olympic Games. As we have already noted, Parenti has studied Tibet and has determined that the Tibet of the Llamas was a rigid caste-society-type hellhole. Engdahl refers (p.113) to a Parenti study, which shows that the CIA backed terrorism and secessionism in Tibet in the 1950s and 1960s.

In 2009, a "Green/Twitter" Revolution failed in Iran.

In 2011, we had the meticulously orchestrated Arab wave of destabilization. The governments of Tunisia and Egypt fell. Libya was demolished and Qaddafi was slaughtered. At the time of this writing (late 2011), Syria is in the crosshairs, as are Pakistan and Iran. A Russian fleet arrived in Syria in late November. The situation is tense, especially in the light of the critical current stage of the unfolding world financial crisis.

There are indications (as of early December 2011) that Russia will soon be experiencing an attempted Color Coup. Putin is highly unsavoury to the West.

Conclusions

The great "philanthropic" tax-exempt foundations were founded in the early 20th century for the purposes of: 1) tax-evasion on the part of the Robber Baron tycoons; 2) public relations white-washing; 3) surreptitious social engineering; and 4) since before the Second World War, the quiet meddling in the affairs of foreign sovereign states.

One of two things must be done with the foundations: 1) they must be forced to operate in total transparency, or 2) they must be nationalized and broken-up, and the government must assume their useful functions at the appropriate levels. The malignant functions we can do without.

Chapter 7

A Few Concepts

In this chapter, let us examine, and try to model, the following three important concepts: tribalism, the political revolution, and the state.

7.1 Tribalism

One of the most powerful, and least understood by the general population, driving forces of human action is the tribal mentality. The tribal mentality functions like an underlying, semi-instinctive, foundation for ideologically driven political activity. What is interesting about tribalism is that it applies to all ideologies, including racial identification and religious affiliation.

To begin with, observe that the entire population of the planet can be regarded as a countable set of discrete elements - i.e. at a point in time, there exists a fixed number of individual human beings.

Each of these humans identifies himself, and can be identified by others, with a number of ideologies, including, in the current context, race, gender, and so on. The ideological groups (sets) may nest in each other (e.g. the group of boys is a subset of the group of male humans) and may overlap (e.g. the group of women overlaps with the group of Christians).

The self constitutes a group for every individual.

Furthermore, each conscious individual identifies himself with certain groups, identifies others as belonging to certain groups, and holds the various groups in varying degrees of esteem. The esteem can be expressed numerically (though in an abstract sense) - say, with a value from 1 to 10; or through appropriate adjectives - unaware, zero, low, subpar, medium, moderate, high, extreme, etc.

Follow some rough examples. The specific details are not as important as the general idea. No offence is intended to anyone - the colorful - and somewhat stereo-/arche-typical - examples are selected for fun rather than for any political message.

Take a gangster (or, in the words of the poet Tupac, "thug nigger") from Watts in Los Angeles of the early 1990s. This gangster may hold the following group values: self - high esteem (8), family - high (7), mother - extreme (9), own gang - extreme (10), gang leader - extreme (10), black people - high (6), white people - low (3), cops ("pigs") - hatred (0), enemy gang - hatred (1), American west coast - moderate (6), America - moderate (6), Argentina - unknown (-), Christianity (or Islam) - high (8), atheism - subpar (4), men - moderate (6), women - low (3), humanity as a whole - low (3), etc, etc.

A blue-collar German in 1911: self - moderate (6), Germans - extreme (10), Westerners - high (8), French - low (2), Austrians - moderate (7), Christians - moderate (7), humanity - moderate (5), Africans - low (2), Kaiser - high (8), workmates - high (9), family - high (9), communism - low (2), etc, etc.

Midwestern white American in the '50s: self - high (8), family - extreme (9), Christians - high (8),

America - high (8), "capitalism" - high (8), own State - medium (6), neighbouring state - low (2), "communism" - abysmal (0), Mongolia - unknown (-), own town - high (7), co-workers - medium (6), boss - subpar (3), whites - high (8), blacks - subpar (4), etc, etc.

A modern male oligarch: self - extreme (10), the rich - high (8), the not-so-rich - subpar (3), various ethnic and religious groups - medium (5), attractive women - high (8), his own bank - high (8), some enemy bank - subpar (4), an allied bank - moderate (6), family - no contact with parents and no kids (-) OR dynasty - extreme (10), close friends - medium (6), Republican Party - high (7), Democrats - subpar (4), and so on.

21st century depressed American underclass lesbian: men - low (2), women - high (9), self - low (3), humanity - low (2), co-workers - medium (5), lover - extreme (10), family - no contact (-), the rich & famous - respectful (8), professionals - low (3), fellow members of underclass - moderate (7), smokers - high (8), drunks - high (7), and so on.

10 year old Western boy: self - semi-unaware (5), daddy - high (8), mommy - high (7), annoying sister - low (3), other boys - high (8), girls - subpar (4), admirers of Spiderman - high (8), classmates - high (7), children from neighbouring class - low (4), teacher - high (8), Burmese - unknown (-), Muslims - vaguely menacing (3), all ethnic groups - unconcerned (5), humanity - unconcerned (5), "Mother Nature" - moderate (7), and so on.

A "savage" man: self - poorly understood (6), family - moderate (6), own tribe - extreme (10), chief - high (9), other tribes - low (3), the rest of humanity - unknown (-), men - moderate (5), women - moderate (5), various ideologies/ religious - unknown (-).

Medieval European serf: self - subpar (4), family - high (9), local lord - low (3) OR high (8), king - high (8), Christianity - high (8) or moderate (5), God - extreme (10) or unconcerned (5), neighbours - varying, let us say generally high (7), Muslims - low (3), nearby town - high (7), the rest of the world - unknown (-).

This should suffice to convey the point. The reader can come up with additional examples.

We can furthermore order the groups - from the perspective of a specific person - in terms of their priority. A rule of thumb based on proximity should be the job - the self is the first priority; then immediate persons such as family, co-workers, and next-door neighbours; then one's neighbourhood or city or province plus groups unique to it, one's church, one's school, or one's firm; then the nation, the social strata, the professional groups, and the gender divisions; finally the large ethnic, religious, and ideological groups.

Of course, the priorities vary from person to person. An American Southerner of the 1950s would be more concerned with race than a person living in the then homogeneously white Poland. A convinced feminist would place more importance on gender than other people would. The late 19th century Englishman would be more class and manners conscious than his contemporary American. And so on, down the line through the various stereotypes.

Now, these groups interact with two important human instincts - those of self-preservation and co-operation. I do not like the adage that "human are animals," nor am I certain that it is true. However, humans do defend themselves, and they are social, and hence they pool forces to undertake complex projects. The traits of self-preservation and co-operation are both necessary and commendable.

The problem is that when a member of one tribe (group) strikes a member of another tribe, all hell can break loose. This act of war looks all the worse in the minds of men, when many people strongly approve of and identify with one tribe, and strongly despise the other one. Sometimes the situation involves a complex net of groups - for example, in 1914, a German and French farmer would both have identified with Western civilization, Christianity, the *paysan* archetype, and perhaps the working class - but, through the schools and the newspapers, the priority of the nationalistic identification had been raised far above other strong personal associations. In a certain sense, the priority

of the nationalistic group had been raised above the priority of the self.

Worse, tribal hatred and violence are susceptible to positive feedback - thus, one commits acts of cruelty to those whom he hates, and acts of cruelty beget further hatred, as well as retaliation. This is why when a serious war *waged at least partly on an ideological basis* gets going, it can keep on going until one side has suffered utter destruction, or the two sides have become too weak to hold up their swords. The 16th century European Wars of Religion, the 20th century World Wars, and the Bolshevik-led civil war in Russia are examples of such horrific conflicts. Mark Twain masterfully analysed this issue with the Grangerfords and Shepherdsons subplot of *Huckleberry Finn*.

Now, it is important to realize that group identifications are affected to a large degree by the lens of rationality. Thus, nationalism, viewed *emotionally, from below*, can seem as natural as breathing. Viewed *rationally, from above*, nationalism is an ideology, subject to historical processes stemming (let us say) from the baggage of the French Revolution, and from the development of brainwashing techniques and technologies in the 19th century. Likewise, religions may appear natural and simple, but are in reality synthetic, complex, and affected by political forces and movements.

During the course of the 19th century (though, likely, men knew about it earlier), the oligarchs gradually perceived the discrepancy between the rational and the emotional prisms of ideology - and, evil psychopaths that they were, they concluded that most humans are inherently irrational, when the correct conclusion is that most humans can be brainwashed. The development of these notions finally culminated in the late 19th century in the form of Freud's asinine "discoveries" and Wundt's proto-behavioristic "experimental psychology." The far sharper Gustave Le Bon put his finger on the problem with *La psychologie des foules* (1895), but his ideas were hidden from the public and assiduously adopted by such folks as Hitler, Mussolini, and Bernays the founder of modern public relations (which he correctly called "propaganda"). Instead of teaching Le Bon in the schools, the oligarchs took the demagogic methods he decried, and employed them industrially. The result has been a century of lunacy.

Of course, this issue goes back through Leibniz to Plato, and likely beyond.

In general, we can say that there are two ways of goading people into war - power-play, which is generally rational; and ideology, which is generally irrational. The first reason tends to be regarded as barbaric, because it amounts to saying "We are tough, so let's go and grab some loot." Ideological justifications, however, can always be made to appear holy and good. People, who tend to be decent, rarely fight for loot. Instead, they fight for the defence of their group, for "democracy," for the utopia that will follow the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the King, or for God. Goering put it perfectly (the source of this famous quote appears to be the diary of U.S. Army Captain Gustave M. Gilbert):¹

Goering: Why, of course, the people don't want war. 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.

Gilbert: There is one difference. 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.

Goering: 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

¹<http://answers.google.com/answers/threadview/id/235519.html>, 6 December, 2011.

any country.

In general - and particularly in modern times - those who govern policy tend to think fairly rationally, in terms of power-play, while those who fight have been trained to act irrationally, in pursuit of ill-understood ideological values. Of course, the men at the top have their own ideologies - for example the one-world feudalism ideology. It is something of a chicken and egg problem.

Some more interesting questions arise: What drives the development of group values? What group values are desirable? In what directions are traditional values moving? What new ideologies are on the rise?

Though there has always been direction from above, historically group values developed in relation to the inter-related factors of: geography; technology, particularly in terms of (transport and) communications; philosophical outlooks; and, most recently, systematic deliberate brainwashing from the top down.

Geography clearly plays some role in tribal differentiation. For example, Europe, cut off by the Urals and the Caucasus to the east, and the Mediterranean and the Bosphorus to the south, forms a contiguous area, over which one can travel over the rivers and over the coasts of the Baltic, Black, and Mediterranean seas along with the Atlantic coast. Thus, one would have expected Europe to develop a certain global group identification. That came along in the form of Christianity. Likewise, the Hindus have their peninsula, the Chinese are cut off by the tundra and the great central-Asian mountains, the Japanese have their island, the South Americans have the Isthmus, and so on. On a smaller scale, the French hexagon is demarcated by the Atlantic, the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Rhine. The Italians have their boot, protected by the Alps, the Spanish have their peninsula - and so on.

Communications - which depend partly on technology - are also of great significance. In general, people tend to be suspicious of the unknown (though I may be mistaken?). One's appreciation of a foreign culture typically increases along with one's improved understanding of the culture. Now, clearly, it is hard to understand a foreign culture without: 1) speaking the language of its people and having access to members of the culture; 2) being able to read about the culture in your own language, for reasons of personal illiteracy, lack of access to reading material, or lack of interest. Access to reading material depends on someone having written the material, and on the existence of public libraries or the means for the printing of cheap books. Moreover, to talk to foreigners, one needs either the opportunity to travel, or access to something like the telegraph, the telephone - or the Internet.

With the development of universal communication in the 20th century, the world has certainly become more civilized. At the same time, tragically, the power of technology has found less than benevolent uses. The proliferation of cheap newspapers, institutions of indoctrination full of carefully written pieces of propaganda, and particularly the pernicious medium of television, has rendered the mass brainwashing of the population eminently practicable. In the old days, the duties of brainwashing fell mostly to the man behind the pulpit - and he could only do so much, especially in the face of such core doctrines as "thou shalt not kill" and "Jesus hates usurers." Back in those days, however, brainwashing was not that necessary in the light of the prevailing mass ignorance stemming from the lack of means and opportunities for study.

Today we find ourselves in an interesting situation. The Internet gives us instant communication, access to a vast amount of important literature (as well as to oceans of garbage), and the opportunity to access a mass audience. The Oligarchs needed the Internet in order to construct their society of total surveillance - but perhaps they have miscalculated. That remains to be seen.

In terms of tribalism, people clearly tend to understand and identify with those, with whom they have the opportunity to converse.

A society's general outlook, which is something between an ideology and a conglomeration of ideologies, also plays a role. It is easier to get a xenophobic, inward-looking society to go to war. Meiji Japan is an example; as, unfortunately, is the United States. Americans are notoriously ignorant of the larger world, which, perhaps, is why they have been goaded into fighting practically everywhere on the globe over only a little over a century. The stereotypical American - and those exist - has not the faintest clue of what Japan, Russia, Indochina, and the Middle East are about. All the brainwash job knows is that the nip, the commie, the hun, the gook, and the islamofascist are bad and constitute a "threat" to America, which is "a force for good." So he goes and bombs people into the stone age - and to him they are not even people, because at its extreme, the tribal mentality denies the humanity of the enemy tribe. That this is well understood at the top is evident from the propaganda posters of the two World Wars.

The above example is only an example. Many current and former American soldiers are decent, thinking individuals in a bad spot. As we saw earlier, soldiers often did not bother to shoot their enemies even when subjected to enemy fire.

Another interesting aspect of outlook is the individualism versus collectivism dichotomy. The kindergarten version of the world says that England and the United States have always been great bastions of individualism and "freedom," while evil silly peoples like the Germans, the Russians, and the Chinese have been prone to sheepishly following demagogues and charlatans to their destruction. The reality is subtler. For one thing, *individualism and collectivism can and do co-exist*. In the modern world, for example, people have been taught to express their "individuality" and "uniqueness" in trivial ways, and so they go and buy blue and black i-phones, and blue and black jeans, and get tattoos, and listen to fringe "indie" bands, never realizing that Apple's marketing supremacy, the fashion industry, and pop music are all carefully manufactured mass cultural phenomena. Americans will babble about "individualism," never realizing that the notion has become as much of a meaningless party line as the "free-markets," the strange Jesus who kicks Arab teeth, and the driving around in an SUV. This is not to disparage of Americans, real individualism, Jesus, or even SUVs. The point is - and it sounds like a vapid slogan, but it is true - that instead of talking about individualism, people should stop and think about what individualism is, and how one can really become an "individual."

Individualism and collectivism are vague notions, but let us define them as follows: individualism is the process of one's attempt at seeking not perfection but improvement, not godhood but godliness, not renown but inner satisfaction. It is the process of trying to understand the world, of formulating an outlook of one's own while realizing that too many ideas have been chewed over forever before, of learning when to kiss and when to snarl... As Raymond Chandler put it,²

In everything that can be called art there is a quality of redemption. It may be pure tragedy, if it is high tragedy, and it may be pity and irony, and it may be the raucous laughter of the strong man. But down these mean streets a man must go who is not himself mean, who is neither tarnished nor afraid. The detective in this kind of story must be such a man. He is the hero, he is everything. He must be a complete man and a common man and yet an unusual man. He must be, to use a rather weathered phrase, a man of honor, by instinct, by inevitability, without thought of it, and certainly without saying it. He must be the best man in his world and a good enough man for any world. I do not care much about his private life; he is neither a eunuch nor a satyr; I think he might seduce a duchess and I am quite sure he would not spoil a virgin; if he is a man of honor in one thing, he is that in all things. He is a relatively poor man, or he would not be a detective at all. He is a common man or he could not go among common people. He has a sense of character, or he would not know his job. He will take no man's money dishonestly and no man's insolence without a due and dispassionate revenge. He

²Raymond Chandler, *The Simple Art of Murder*, 1950.

is a lonely man and his pride is that you will treat him as a proud man or be very sorry you ever saw him. He talks as the man of his age talks, that is, with rude wit, a lively sense of the grotesque, a disgust for sham, and a contempt for pettiness. The story is his adventure in search of a hidden truth, and it would be no adventure if it did not happen to a man fit for adventure. He has a range of awareness that startles you, but it belongs to him by right, because it belongs to the world he lives in.

If there were enough like him, I think the world would be a very safe place to live in, and yet not too dull to be worth living in.

Chandler's ideal is serviceable but not unique. The aspect of loneliness is important, because one need be alone to truly concentrate and look into oneself. And that is where it all starts, because one should learn to enjoy one's company before he crashes other people's parties.

And what of collectivism? In general terms, collectivism is the notion of "go along to get along," of doing something just because everybody else does it, of adhering to poorly understood creeds, of repeating what one hears on the TV, of being afraid of being alone, of always seeking the church or the stadium or the rock show to experience the ecstasy of merging with the crowd, of enjoying the violent might of the mob because it gives power to the ordinary impotent atomized person, of not thinking, of following blindly.

Mark Twain, again, and in the same classic work, judged by Hemingway to be the foundational piece of American literature, provides a memorable example of the difference between the individual and the collective - reread the episode featuring Colonel Sherburn.

Just to be clear, accessorizing is not a manifestation of individualism, and neither is watching quirky TV shows, nor fanatically championing a sports team, nor "supporting" (with buttons and car stickers?) one's troops when they wage wars of genocide, nor committing petty acts violence, nor developing bizarre idiosyncrasies of behavior, nor knowing trivia, nor, indeed, going to the churches of the likes of Pat Robertson and Billy Graham.

Though it should be noted that Christianity is by no means necessarily collectivistic in nature. Quite the contrary - the notions of the personal responsibility in regard to repentance and salvation, of one's personal quest of understanding and serving God, of seeing others as the fellow children of God, and so on - is in fact the bedrock of the so-called idea of Western individualism.

The individualism versus collectivism split is more complex yet. In political terms, collectivism is the idea of the precedence of the society, or community, or state, over the privileges of the individual. As an extreme illustration, the collectivist might say that given a hundred people, of which ninety-nine are guilty of hideous crimes, and an unknown one is innocent, society should justifiably jail and perhaps hang the entire hundred for the common good. The "individualist," on the other hand, would want the "state" to keep out of his "business."

From another perspective, a person espousing "individualism" may argue that re-distributing the wealth of the rich is inadmissible, inasmuch as such action constitutes a breach of their individual rights. Of course, the same person would ask the state to enforce the contracts the powerful rich have imposed on the weak poor. Thus, the American "patriot" movement tends to conflate individualism with the idea of extreme "free-market" fundamentalism.

Nor are individualism and collectivism mutually exclusive. For example, pre-1945 Germany is the notorious historical example of the dangers of full-blown collectivism. And yet, in that society, the members of the German officer corps, though highly class conscious and dutiful to their state, were legendarily inventive, intelligent, and ready to assume risk. This is why the German officers were the best in the world. Typically, the goal of oligarchs is to institute collectivism at the bottom and

individualism amongst themselves.

Collectivism is not necessarily an abhorrent evil. A collectivist-minded society endowed with certain safe-guards for the individual can exist and prosper, as modern Japan shows.

At the same time, I find George Carlin's take on the subject rather inviting:

(From the beginning of Carlin's *Brain Droppings* (1997):)

The decay and disintegration of this culture is astonishingly amusing if you are emotionally detached from it. I have always viewed it from a safe distance, knowing I don't belong; it doesn't include me, and it never has. No matter how you care to define it, I do not identify with the local group. Planet, species, race, nation, state, religion, party, union, club, association, neighborhood, improvement committee; I have no interest in any of it. I love and treasure individuals as I meet them, I loathe and despise the groups they identify with and belong to. So, if you read something in this book that sounds like advocacy of a particular political point of view, please reject the notion.

More can be said on this topic, but let us move on.

Now, to attain the dream of a collectivistic neo-feudal world society, the Oligarchs have been trying to restructure the value system of the world population under their control along the following lines: the individual is to feel helplessness, self-alienation, and, if possible, self-hatred. This tendency is well-analysed in Gatto's works. A society comprised of weak, unsure, politically ignorant people is the more susceptible to penetration and manipulation.

Furthermore, the Oligarchs want to destroy the traditional family. In the days of agricultural society, people lived close to their extended families. In the urbanized West in the 20th century, the idea of the nuclear family - mom & pop & the kids - gained precedence. Today, the "globalized" world society is moving toward a total atomization of the individual, who moves around in search of jobs, never at rest, never at peace, never able to create a nest and build a family. Alvin Toffler looked at this developed as long ago as in 1970.

Patriotism has been deemed passé, and suffers a slow but painful dismantling. As the League of Nations showed, a world government can not coalesce as long as strong, sovereign states exist. In the place of nationalistic affiliations, the Oligarchs are trying to install a global collective consciousness along the lines of "we are all in this together, and we are bad children, destroying the planet, and we must make collective sacrifices for the common good."

To give you an idea of the virulence of the above mentality, consider this quote from Chomsky, who is hardly the world's most convinced fascist:³

From Noam Chomsky's *Understanding Power*, p. 388.

MAN [Interviewer?]: I just get the sense that we're waiting for some ecological disaster before people really start to get active in these movements on a massive scale.

Chomsky: Well, if we wait for an ecological disaster, it'll be too late-in fact, we might not even have such a long wait.

Look, it's certainly true that as the threats mount, it may energize people - but you don't wait for that to happen: first you have to prepare the ground. For example, suppose it was discovered tomorrow that the greenhouse effect has been way underestimated, and that the catastrophic effects are actually going to set in 10 years from now, and not 100 years from now or something. Well, given the state of the popular movements we have today, we'd probably have a fascist takeover - with everybody agreeing to it, because that would be the only method for survival that anyone could think of. I'd even agree to it, because there just are no other alternatives around right now.

³Thanks to the Modern History Project for the reference. <http://modernhistoryproject.org/mhp?Article#Piper>, Dec 7, 2011.

A fascist takeover indeed, Noam!

Aware that people will inevitably gravitate to a group affiliation of one type or another, the Oligarchs have been trying to substitute innocuous apolitical group entities for the traditional outlets of the local churches, the trade unions, the local pubs (bars), and so on. One obvious example is the promotion of ball-game fanaticism. This is particularly blatant in England, where the football (soccer) games take place around noon on Sunday - so that people would not go to church - as well as throughout the week, and where the pubs, which used to be hotbeds of political discussion and agitation, have been infested by "tellies" blaring play-by-play commentary. The reader should understand that here we are considering the church solely in its political function, without reference to its religious purpose.

So now, people, instead of caring for their community or nation or whatever, spend their hours thinking about Manchester United and Wayne Rooney. The big football clubs have become worldwide brands as well as the objects of neo-pagan cults. Indeed, the stadium offers the same crowd ecstasy that can be found in a large church. The churchgoers sing hymns, and the football fanatics sing chants. The former glorify saints and the latter glorify old footballers. The parallels are unmistakable.

Various other "sub-cultures" and mini-cults have proliferated. Take the gay "sub-culture." Many gays tend to completely submerge their personality in the established precepts of their group. They adopt the perceived normative accent, mode of behaviour, code of dress, etc, and they become extremely clannish - except that the "gay rights movement" is utterly politically impotent except in disrupting the fabric of society by seeking to acquire minor privileges.

The large corporations try to associate their brands with a tribal affiliation. Thus we have the absurd Coca-Cola versus Pepsi debate.

Then there are the Star Wars and Star Trek cults, which have their own large annual conferences, and even their own languages.

The general goal of the Oligarchs is to disrupt the traditionally potent groups of the self, the family, the trade union, the local church, and so on, and to substitute them with impotent synthetic groups combined with a collective global mentality.

Traditional religious groups suffer a dual attack. On the one hand, the Oligarchs try to portray religion as an obsolescent phenomenon burdened by ignorance and superstition, and on the other hand, they are trying to destroy the religions from within, by promoting heresy and fanaticism.

What group affiliations would be desirable? Follow my opinions, which are, by all means, subject to debate.

First, people should avoid placing any importance on groups that do not really matter. Who cares what kind of music the other person listens to, or what ball-team she follows? In general, people ought to like themselves, their families, their regions of birth of residence, their nations, their global sub-regions, and the whole world - like all of those, and not only like, but also understand, because love without understanding is a dangerous thing. The esteem, in which people hold these groups, should be high but not extreme, because extreme tribal identification tends to lead to xenophobia. This last point can be argued.

In regard to important alien national, cultural, racial, and religious groups, people should strive to maintain equanimity and absolutely avoid a double standard.

A relatively strong identification with the world group should exist. Most likely, the emergence of the Internet has rendered the development of the world tribe inevitable. What is important is to maintain the traditional national and regional cultures in conjunction with the global world culture. The Oligarchs want to mix all cultures and create a soup of lumpenized drones obsessed with trivialities and various barbarous pastimes. That should not be allowed. Let the world cultures develop in parallel, not in melange. One is perfectly capable of appreciating and admiring the achievements and mores of a foreign culture while resolutely denying some of its core principles.

EU member of parliament Nigel Farage of the Eurosceptic Party eloquently espouses similar views.

To summarize: human beings naturally adopt tribal mentalities in adherence with the instincts of self-preservation and co-operation. Ignorance, caused by lack of opportunities and/ or systematic brainwashing, tends to lead to xenophobia, which, apart from power-play, is the fundamental cause of wars. Oligarchical elements have abused tribal affiliations for ages, and all the more so in the last two centuries, when the modern techniques of indoctrination were developed. Today, the Oligarchs are trying to erase and synthetically supplant the traditional groups of affiliation of most people.

7.2 Revolutions

Revolutions have played a major part in the history of the modern era. So let us see how they work. We are concerned here with the political, rather than the cultural revolution. Cultural revolutions are an interesting subject in themselves, but let us leave them for another time.

Structure

In general, we can distinguish between two types of "revolutions" - the general insurrection, and the coup. Insurrections are popular, chaotic, more or less spontaneous, and almost universally unsuccessful. Coups are the products of secret cabals; they are deliberate, organized, often funded from the outside or from powerful domestic interested parties, and frequently enough successful in attaining political power.

"Left-wingers" tend to view "socialist" coups as popular and spontaneous, and "right-wingers" often regard popular insurrections as communist conspiracies.

Moreover, revolutions tend to occur in times of instability and illegitimacy of the government, when the various powerful domestic and foreign factions weave plots and schemes to dismember the already weakened nation, state, or kingdom.

Finally, failed revolutions universally invite reaction in the short term, accompanied occasionally with grudging concessions in the long term. Successful revolutions always begin with a purge, since the new government must eradicate all traces of the old rulers in order to fortify its own legitimacy. With very few exception in pathological cases when a strong, intelligent, and benevolent government succeeds a corrupt unpopular regime, revolutions cause unnecessary bloodshed and widespread suffering and pain.

Examples

Some historical examples:

The 1381 Wat Tyler English peasant uprising is an interesting case, inasmuch as is both a popular revolt and, apparently, a carefully organized campaign of revenge.

To pursue the wars in France, the English Crown had kept hiking taxes throughout the second half of the 14th century. This created popular fury and unrest, and, finally, the lid blew off on May 30 1381, when villagers in Essex refused to pay their poll tax. A series of local incidents grew into a full insurrection. A band of rebels from Kent, led by the shadowy Wat Tyler (1341-1381), marched to London. They managed to penetrate the city around June 12, and had themselves a feast of destruction. On the 14th, the rebels parleyed with the young King Richard II (1367-1400, King 1377-1399). They made a number of demands. In the meantime, a band of rebels entered the Tower of London and massacred the Lord Chancellor / Archbishop of Canterbury Simon of Sudbury, and the Lord Treasurer Robert de Hales. The next day there was another parley. Wat Tyler, in a fit of madness and arrogance - or perhaps mistaken trust? - rode straight into the paws of the king's men,

who slaughtered (or at least mortally wounded) him. The king told the rebels that he would make concessions and that another round of parleys would take place at St John's Fields. Meanwhile, the nobles had managed to recruit a militia. The St John's Fields meeting resulted in a backstab. The rebels were routed, and their leaders captured and executed. The insurrection collapsed. Richard II and his nobles retracted all their promises and punished various people.

John J. Robinson in his *Born in Blood* makes the argument that certain Knights Templar-affiliated forces used the rebellion - which bore the marks of organization - as a vehicle for their revenge over the Hospitallers, who had acquired all of the former Templar British holdings following 1307. From the first lines of Chapter 2 of Robinson's book:

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* calls it a "curiously spontaneous" rebellion.

Barbara Tuchman, in her fourteenth-century history, *A Distant Mirror*, said that the rebellion spread "with some evidence of planning."

Winston Churchill went further. In *The Birth of Britain* he wrote, "Throughout the summer of 1381 there was a general ferment. Beneath it all lay organization. Agents moved round the villages of central England, in touch with a 'Great Society' which was said to meet in London."

Curiously, the triggering code-phrase for the rebellion was the classic "Now is tyme."

(p.21) On June 10, one rebel band "burned a major commandery of the Knights Hospitallers called Cressing Temple."

For some strange reasons, the bridges to London had not been defended on June 13, and the rebels had simply walked into the City. Once there, instead of looting ad hoc, they had made their way to Fleet Street, whence they opened the Fleet Prison's gates, and then "They destroyed two forges that the Hospitallers had taken over from the Templars. Some joined a London mob and went to the Savoy Palace of the hated royal uncle, John of Gaunt, pausing on the way only to destroy any houses they could identify as belonging to the Hospitallers."

From the Savoy the rebels returned to the Hospitaller property between Fleet Street and the Thames, to buildings leased by that order to lawyers who practiced before the king's court in the adjoining royal city of Westminster. They vandalized and burnt the lawyers' buildings, burnt their records, and killed anyone who registered an objection. They destroyed the other Hospitaller buildings on the property, with one exception. Instead of burning the rolls and records stored in the church where they found them, they went to the trouble of carrying them out into the high road for burning, avoiding any damage to the church itself. One historian goes so far as to say that certain of the mob "protected" the church from damage. This attitude was an anomaly in the midst of an orgy of destruction of church property and church leaders. This property, too, had been taken from the Templars and given to the Hospitallers, and even today that portion of the City of London is known simply as "The Temple." The church that was left unscathed by the rebels had been the principal church of the Knights Templar in England. This attitude toward the old Templar church stands out in marked contrast to the mob's feeling for the grand priory of the Hospitallers at Clerkenwell, where they turned next. Still seeking out Hospitaller property for destruction along the way, they arrived at Clerkenwell and embarked upon an effort of total destruction. While the Templar church still stands today, all that remains of the principal Hospitaller church at Clerkenwell is the underground crypt.

Amazingly, while many of the king's high nobles accompanied him to the June 14 parley, the high-ranking Sudbury and de Hales stayed at the Tower of London, which, again for some strange reason, was not properly defended from Tyler's raiding force. de Hales happened to be the Hospitaller Grand Master for England. The Archbishop Sudbury was likely viewed as a servant to the Papacy, which, along with Philip IV, carried heavy blame for the destruction of the Templars.

Moreover, "While the rebels roamed the City with their hit list, the rebel leadership mounted another

unexplained project of its own. A group was organized and sent out from London by Wat Tyler, commanded by his lieutenant Jack Strawe and apparently guided by Londoner Thomas Farndon. They marched about six miles out of London for the very specific purpose of destroying the Hospitaller manor at Highbury, which a contemporary chronicler said had been "recently and skillfully rebuilt like another paradise."

Nor were the rebels' attacks limited only to the environs of London. Hospitaller holdings across England suffered annihilation. The Church, which owned a third of England, also incurred some ire. Certain nobles and rich merchants were also killed during the unrest. When the Parliament convened in November of 1381, some speakers used the memory of the recent revolt to press for changes in policy. The poll tax was abandoned, and the Parliament obtained more power. Robinson could find no record of attacks on the members of Parliament. Notes he, "it would appear that to that group, at least, the rebellion was a rip-roaring success." Following a wave of amnesties, a total of fewer than 120 rebels had been executed - an insignificant figure, compared to the rebel's own depredations and murder sprees.

Thus, in the end, as a *popular insurrection*, the English 1381 Peasant Revolt was a failure and a blowing off of steam. Regarded as a *political coup*, however the Wat Tyler Rebellion was a meticulously organized political move, which, from what we can tell, admirably achieved its aims. The men behind the coup likely were noble elements with connections to an underground Templar-related organization.

Across the channel, in France, the Jacquerie uprising had flared up in 1358. The underlying cause of the revolt, again, had been the Hundred Year War, and particularly the ignominious, tragic, and idiotic French defeat at Poitiers in 1356. The French King, Jean II le Bon (1319-1364, King 1350-1364), had been captured, and the English had demanded a terrific ransom from the French. Taxes were raised, and those, in combination with the inept pursuance of the war on the part of the French nobility, sparked discontent. The struggle for power between the deeply psychotic Charles II of Navarre and the Dauphin Charles V Valois contributed to the instability. Here as elsewhere, it should be seen that revolutions usually occur in times of instability and crisis, when the public legitimacy of the official government is at a low ebb.

The insurgence commenced at the village of St. Leu north of Paris. Angry peasants convened at, appropriately, the cemetery, and decided that the nobles had caused a royal mess at Poitiers and deserved to be massacred. And so, the peasants hunted down the nearest knight that they could find, and roasted him in front of his wife and children. They then raped the woman and murdered her and the children. Impressed by this incident, peasants all over the place engaged in re-staging the same play. The nobles, startled by tasting some of their own medicine, initially panicked. Soon enough they got their act together, organized their forces, and invited the peasant leader Guillaume Cale to a parley. The fool Cale acceded, and was, naturally, captured, tortured, and decapitated. Followed the rout of the peasants at the Battle of Mello (10 June 1358), after which the nobles lynched about 20,000 peasants in retaliation for the murder of a few hundred nobles. That is how it goes. Little credit can be extended to either side of the conflict.

After enjoying a few months' worth of bloodbath, the nobles handed out general amnesties along with heavy fines levied from the cities of the region of the insurrection. The Jacquerie traumatised the nobility for centuries. Indeed, in a certain sense, every oligarchy lives in constant trepidation over the potential revocation of its privileges. Moreover, the oligarchs abhor the possibility of the discovery of their underhanded methods of control and manipulation of society and history.

Another interesting episode was the Russian Time of Troubles in the early 17th century. Following the death in 1598 of Ivan IV Grozny's (1530-1584, Tsar 1533-1584) son, Feodor I (1557-1598, Tsar 1584-1598), whose only child, a daughter, had died at the age of two, the Russian throne passed into the hands of the Tsar's brother in law, Boris Godunov (1551-1605, Regent 1585-1598, Tsar 1598-1605). In 1601-1603, a terrible famine, likely caused by a climactic change in what is called

The Little Ice Age, decimated a third of Russia's population. After Godunov died in 1605, his son Feodor II (1589-1605) sat on the throne only to be murdered a few months later by a rival oligarchical faction. The combination of political instability and natural calamity open the gates of hell. For a decade, Russia teetered on the balance.

The situation was further compounded by the mysterious circumstances surrounding the death of Ivan Grozny's younger son, Dmitry, who had perished of a stab wound in 1591. Stunned by the famine, the already superstitious serfs stuck to the belief that the Tsarevitch had survived and would return to save Russia. Instead, in 1603, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth - a great European power at the time - invented a false Dmitry, whom they sent to mount the throne in the Kremlin. Some Russian boyars decided to support the False Dmitry in pursuance of schemes of their own. Following the demise of the Godunovs, the False Dmitry entered Moscow. A few months later, Prince Vasily Shuisky (1552-1612, Tsar 1606-1610) of the ancient Rurik dynasty (of Ivan Grozny) organized a coup, and massacred Dmitry and 2,000 of his Polish retainers.

The Poles came up with another False Dmitry. Shuisky allied with the Swedish. On July 4, 1610, the Russo-Swedish forces were routed at the Battle of Klushino, and Shuisky abdicated. Instead of False Dmitry II, the Poles decided to install Wladyslaw (1595-1648), the son of their king, as tsar. The Russians decided to allow this on the condition that the Poles did not try to convert them to Catholicism. After the Polish forces occupied the Kremlin, Sigismund (1566-1632, King 1587-1632) the King of the Poles decided to convert Russia to Catholicism after all. Unrest followed. The Swedish king produced a False Dmitry of his own (III), and set him up in Ivangorod. Riots, massacres, mercenary raids, and general insanity followed.

In 1612, the Russians managed to regroup under the banner of one Prince Pozharsky, who proceeded to retake the Kremlin. A Grand National Assembly elected the boyar Mikhail Romanov (1596-1645) as the new Tsar. Tried by the decade of devastation, all classes of Russia united behind the authority of the new Tsar. By 1617-1618, the wars ended, and Russia began to rebuild. The Romanovs would rule for three centuries.

The familiar trends loom large: instability begets revolutions and adventurous foreign interventions. Alliances shift and conspiracies hatch. The populace falls prey to obscurantism and irrationality. Few of those close to the action ever win. At the end of the cycle, the tortured nation (or kingdom) - if it has survived - tends to unite behind a strong leader out of a desire for political stability.

France experienced a period of instability of its own during the Fronde insurrection of 1648-1653. The Peace of Westphalia had just been signed on 24 October, 1648. Germany lay in ruin, a third of its population having been obliterated. Hardened French troops accustomed to license returned home.

After a war comes the time to pay the debts to the money-lenders and the wages to the troops. Naturally, the French crown raised taxes, to the chagrin and fury of the chartered towns, which insisted on keeping their ancient feudal prerogatives, and which bore the brunt of the tax hikes in light of the nobility's refusal to pay anything (again based on ancient feudal privileges). Louis XIV (1638-1715, King 1643-1715), still young at the time, depended largely on his minister the Cardinal Mazarin (1602-1661, Minister 1642-1661), in whose shadow he had matured. The latter was seen as an Italian Papist impostor in many quarters.

And so, in 1648, the scene was set, and three factions would vie for power - the royal faction of Louis XIV and Mazarin, the noble faction, and the burgher-merchant faction of the chartered cities.

The first Fronde, or *Fronde Parlementaire*, blew up in the early summer of 1648, when the *parlements* of some towns, notably Paris, refused to pay their *tailles*. In August, Mazarin arrested the leaders of the Paris parlement. In response, the Parisians rose and barricaded the city streets. After the Treaty of Munster in November, the powerful Prince of Condé (1621-1681) besieged Paris with the French army. Bereft of choice, the Parisians surrendered.

But the real trouble came with the second Fronde, the *Fronde des nobles*, in 1650. Dissatisfied with the foreign quasi-regent in Paris, and confident of their strength, the great princes and nobles of France, among them the mighty general Condé, plotted against Mazarin. The latter, having secured

some strong allies, suddenly arrested Condé, Conti, and Longueville in January 1650. Followed a year of turmoil, insurrection, counter-insurrection, Spanish intervention, and general chaos. By February 1651, the princes were freed, and Mazarin fled. Following April, things quieted down, though the atmosphere in France remained toxic. Condé proved as poor as a politician as he had been great as a general. In the fall of 1651, he grabbed for the throne. In December, Mazarin returned with a small force. In July 1652, Condé sacked Paris, perhaps having forgotten that he was no longer in Germany. In charge of the royalists was Turenne (1611-1675), another great veteran of the Thirty Years War, and a target of Mazarin's in January 1650. Now pardoned by Louis XIV, Turenne fenced with his former comrade Condé, who had the backing of the Spanish. After a few more months of fighting and rampage, Turenne managed to smash the Frondeurs at the Battle of the Faubourg St Antoine near Paris in July 1652. Condé withdrew inside the walls of the capital with some of his forces. Mazarin, unsure of his prospects, left France again. Desperate and besieged, Condé fled to the (Spanish) Netherlands in September. Turenne retook Paris in October. Mazarin came back in February the following year. The Fronde had been crushed.

Conde and the Spanish remained a threat until 1658, when Turenne finally defeated Condé for good at the Battle of the Dunes near Dunkirk. Mazarin expired in 1661, and Louis XIV took the reigns of power. He put Turenne in charge of the army, and set about to reforming France after the "absolutist" model. Having lived through the Fronde during his formative years, Louis XIV had learned a number of important lessons. Impressed by the brigandage of the semi-mercenary armies that had fought in Germany and beyond, Louis made sure to centralize the army under his command. He extended the power of the crown as much as he could, though he never would wield as much power as Napoleon, or, say, Stalin, would acquire in the centuries to come.

And what of Condé? In accord with the important but hard to apply principle of sparing one's crushed opponents if certain that they are men of honor, Louis XIV pardoned Condé, who spent the rest of his days in service to the now strong and legitimate crown.

The insurrections had accomplished nothing beyond the destabilization and ruination of France. In reality, the object of the conflict was - from what I can tell - the balance of power between the obsolescent feudal model of government, and the developing modern state. This is only discernible with the advantage of retrospect. The French Revolution would be a variation on the theme - but a great variation at that.

America's Revolution of 1776 was inspired by a faction of American-born gentlemen, who had decided to establish a nation of their own. It is one of the few examples of a revolution that can be regarded as successful and beneficial for the population. At the same time, there were plenty of Americans who sided with England, and, moreover, in the long run Canada attained some independence by peaceful means. It must, however, be admitted that the great American expansion and industrialization of the 19th century would likely have been impossible under British rule. But the point remains that the American Revolution war was organized from above. It was never a "popular" revolution of the motion picture type.

The French Revolution and the European 19th century revolutions we have examined in detail. Louis XVI's demise was the product of a complex plot backed by deep-seated secret societies and the pretender Orléans. Likewise, the nationalistic revolutions came from the secret societies, and in many cases only succeeded after foreign interventions. For every ultimately successful revolution there were many massacres and reactions, which bred further instability and repression. In the end, the whole European system collapsed in 1918.

Of the Bolshevik Revolution little more can be said. It was always a plot and a conspiracy, and the Bolsheviks succeeded through the backing of German and Anglo-American interests - among others.

Over the 20th century, the same patterns could be seen. The 1953 coup against Iran's Mossadegh

was manufactured by the CIA and the MI6. In 1973, Pinochet overthrew Chile's Allende with the backing of the Chicago Boys and Washington. Pinochet himself was a general. Of course, the military coup is the classic form of coup, always a conspiracy since the times of Rome. The Nasser and Qaddafi military coups can be regarded as beneficial to Egypt and Libya, because they replaced colonialist puppets with nationalistic charismatic leaders. For a long list of staged coups and suppressed popular insurrections since 1945, consult Bill Blum's *Killing Hope*. Castro won power with his motley crew, because - perhaps - Washington stopped selling guns to Batista, and the *New York Times* made Castro into a hero. One suspects the Anglo-Americans had miscalculated with their regime change effort - but who knows. After gaining power, Castro, naturally, conducted a purge. Perhaps he has achieved much for Cuba and history will absolve him - but he is no angel. Every time the same thing happens - the popular revolutions fail in bloodshed and repression, while the coups that enjoy military, foreign, or domestic oligarchical backing tend to succeed.

Conclusions

The important lesson is that the utopian leftist (and rightist-libertarian) popular revolution simply does not exist and never has existed. The best a revolutionary cabal can hope for is: aid from above, as in the case of the Greek revolution in the 1820s - but such help usually comes with strings attached; support from patriotic elements in the army - probably the best prospect; or overwhelming support from the domestic oligarchy - the problem being that in the event of success, the backers of the coup will demand their share of the loot. In certain cases, the domestic oligarchy can be regarded as preferable to foreign domination.

Revolutions practically *never* directly lead to "democracy." This has been shown again and again. The French ousted Louis XVI only to get Napoleon. They banished Louis Philippe, to end up with Louis Napoleon. The Russians lost their Tsar to gain the repugnant Lenin and the psychotic Stalin.

The Americans got a republic in 1787 - a great gift indeed, except for the hundreds of thousands of slaves and those too poor to be given the vote (poll taxes existed in the United States well into the 20th century). The Bill of Rights only came four years later, and was meant to apply mostly to the relatively wealthy, of whom, it has to be admitted, there were relatively many in America. The Bill was a good idea, but it barely passed, and had men like Alexander Hamilton as its opponents.

Two more important points stand out in regard to the American Revolution: First, the British Crown had forsaken its legitimacy by inflicting economic restrictions upon the Colonies, notably, as Benjamin Franklin remarked, by proscribing the Colonial paper money. And second, the American Revolution succeeded with explicit foreign (French) support.

Eastern Europeans got to vote in 1989, but only in Washington-influenced elections (even in Russia Gorbachev and Yeltsin were stooges). The entire Eastern European society collapsed in the 1990s, following the 1989 "revolution." Even the East Germans had it so bad, that - would you believe it? - a majority favored the old days over the new glorious days of gonzo capitalism. So says *Der Spiegel*:

Spiegel Online International, 07/03/2009⁴

Majority of Eastern Germans Feel Life Better under Communism

Today, 20 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, 57 percent, or an absolute majority, of eastern Germans defend the former East Germany. "The GDR had more good sides than bad sides. There were some problems, but life was good there," say 49 percent of those polled. Eight percent of eastern Germans flatly oppose all criticism of their former home and agree with the statement: "The GDR had, for the most part, good sides. Life there was happier and better than in reunified Germany today."

⁴<http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,634122,00.html>, Dec 7, 2011.

Another illustrative example can be found in the fate of the American Negroes in the postbellum era. Thaddeus Russell in his *Renegade History of the United States* shows that many Black Americans found formal slavery more palatable than the wage slavery that greeted them in 1866.

"Democracy" comes from the simultaneous trends of industrial development and popular organization. It can not be given away and it does not arrive from sudden spectacular revolutions, and most certainly not from *popular* revolutions. The idea of everyone rising one morning, getting his gun, and going to town to kick out the rascals and restore true democracy, is nice and romantic, but remote from reality. In a powerful modern state, only a coup organized by patriotic elements in both the army and the intelligence services has any prospects of both succeeding and being any good for the overall population - and even then the coup would probably require at least some foreign support. But if people hope that the CIA will save them, they have another thing coming.

Note that I do not object to the glorification of revolutions because of wishy-washy pacifism - no at all! My objection is that revolutions generally do not work, and can only work in highly specific circumstances. Let would be revolutionists beware, and plan their actions circumspectly.

The way out of a mess that is not totally degenerate (e.g. military occupation or a collapsed society) is not through a revolution, but through thinking, discussing, and organizing. People must identify their problems, convey the issues to others, and form politically potent groups of action. Sitting at home and polishing one's gun while waiting for the day when "it is tyme" will never work.

Real democracy means non-pathological social organization and widespread participation in the political process. People must have specific realistic useful demands, and must demonstrate power in order to obtain those. In a truly "democratic" ("republican") society, people would just be able to directly vote on issues or elect non-corrupt representatives. In faux-democracy and other non-popular regimes, people have to adopt other strategies. Strikes and demonstrations - together with explicit useful demands! - are good displays of power where applicable. Open letters from prominent personalities are also useful. The American patriot movement has a few militias - now, having a militia in itself is a good way of displaying power and organization. The problem is that in the event of martial law, the militias will be hunted down and smashed. Other ways of displaying force can be thought of.

As far as demands go, asking for "change" - in particular regime change - is largely useless (though as of January 2012, it would be good to impeach Obama). What change? Because change can be change for the worse. The Eastern Europeans learned this lesson after 1989, and the Arabs are learning it now.

In regard to elections and similar mechanisms of popular expression, they are not necessarily bad, but neither do they constitute a panacea. Electoral mechanisms without popular consciousness and organization are of little use.

In general, an unpopular regime maintains control over the "legitimate" use of violence. This means that if elements of the public resort to violence, two things will happen: 1) the regime will react by applying disproportionate counter-violence; and 2) it will use its propaganda channels to discredit the rebels/ terrorists/ freedom-fighters. Petty acts of violence are absolutely useless and must always be avoided. Concentrated acts of violence must only target legitimate widely-reviled targets - and even then will generally be counter-productive. At the same time, most people would commend the assassinations of Nazi officers by, say, the French resistance. But then, the German occupational government of France was wholly illegitimate, while most governments today, even among the dictatorships, are legitimate to some degree.

In our current situation, people should put ideas of violent uprising on the back-burner, and should instead focus on energetic political organizing. It is conceivable that the "New World Order" political arrangement will, at some point, completely lose legitimacy, and collapse existing society. In such an

event, insurrections would inevitably occur. The people involved in those insurrections would have to establish organization, and would have to gain the support of both domestic and foreign professional military / intelligence / high-profile elements. In principle, these type of affairs are beyond me and beyond the scope of this work, and should be considered and discussed by those concerned.

Assassinations

A quick word on political assassinations - except, I suppose, in a very few cases, political assassinations are the product of planning and secrecy, often in the hands of powerful cabals. The assassination of Julius Caesar (100BC-44BC) is a classic example. In the centuries that followed the Ides of March, assassinations proliferated. Oh, it was a bloodbath. Let us look at a few notable examples in the 20th century.

Walther Rathenau (1867-1922), the German industrialist and nationalist and assimilated Jew, was assassinated on June 24, 1922. In his then-capacity of Foreign Minister, Rathenau had recently signed the Treaty of Rapallo, which established a foundation for the co-operation between the two beleaguered Baltic Powers. Germany was struggling under the impossible reparations imposed on it, and the USSR was totally politically isolated. Rathenau had been one of the German signers of the Versailles Peace, and had insisted on paying the reparations while arguing against them. Many saw him as a traitor. The murderers, members of a "rightist" organization with links to the army, shot Rathenau and also blew him up with a grenade - just to make sure, one supposes.

The famous 20 July Hitler assassination plot was hatched by high-ranking members of the German General Staff, and executed with cold precision by Colonel Stauffenberg (1907-1944).

General de Gaulle's (1890-1970) renegade actions incurred him the wrath of both the Anglo-Americans and certain French generals. The general complained that the Anglo-Americans dominated NATO and in 1966 even withdrew France from the NATO military command, after refusing to participate in NATO manoeuvres the previous year. He also attempted to shift France and Germany away from the Anglo-American axis, and even vetoed Britain's attempt to join the European Economic Community in 1963. He got France out of Algeria.

In light of his activities, it should not be a surprise that de Gaulle was the subject of numerous assassination attempts - which he survived. Blum in the above-referenced work links some of the attempts with the CIA and with disgruntled French generals.

Panama's president Omar Torrijos (1929-1981) died in a mysterious plane crash in 1981. John Perkins in his *Confessions* said that Torrijos had been assassinated by "jackals" - meaning either spooks or corporate assassins.

Many more examples can be provided. The point is, of course, that the "lone nut" theory is absurd. The John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Malcom X murders all stink to high heaven. There is a good deal of solid literature on the subject - for an introduction, look up Jim DiEugenio's work. Academics such as Peter Dale Scott (Berkeley) and Michael Parenti (PhD from Yale) have supported the "conspiracy theories" surrounding the four notorious 1960s murders. In his *History as Mystery* (1999), Parenti suggests that President Zachary Taylor (1784-1850), inaugurated in 1849 as the 12th President of the United States, was assassinated.

Supposedly, the Huey Long assassination was another "lone nut" affair. That is wrong, as we will see in the next chapter.

History is so full of political assassinations. More will undoubtedly occur in the future. It is important to recognize this fact to avoid falling prey to "lone gunman" bedtime stories.

7.3 The State

The idea of the state is one of the most important and least understood notions of modern history. This is because both prevalent views of the state - the Hegelian-Communist and the Anarcho-Libertarian - are thoroughly misguided, simplistic, and doctrinaire. As we have seen, in essence, the Hegelians see the state as an ultimate good, and the Anarcho-Libertarians see it as an ultimate evil. Neither doctrine has any solid grounding in reality. Both stem from the same late 18th century occult utopian roots.

Early history and background

To perceive the problem, try to define the state. One standard definition goes along the following lines: the state is a monopoly of power, particularly in regard to the power of dispensing violence. The notion of the state is also intricately tied to the notion of sovereignty, and, as we have seen with Hobbes and Spinoza, the general idea is that, for their own good and for the good of the community, people surrender their personal sovereignty to the state, which is sometimes personified by the sovereign.

Now, this definition is reasonable, but too limited. What are the parameters of the state? How does an observer identify a certain power structure as a state? Are states necessarily good, or necessarily bad, and if neither, what is a good state and what is a bad state?

The monopoly of violence definition of the state is serviceable; however, one can also consider the state a tool of social organization. As such, the state is value-neutral, in the sense that a tool can be applied to both good and bad ends.

My main source here is Carroll Quigley excellent 1976 three-part lecture *Public Authority and the State in the Western Tradition: A Thousand Years of Growth, A.D. 976 - 1976*, a transcript of which can be found on the official webpage commemorating Carroll Quigley.⁵

To begin with,

The area of political action in our society is a circle in which at least four actors may intervene: the government, individuals, communities, and voluntary associations, especially corporations. Yet, for the last century, discussion of political actions, and especially the controversies arising out of such actions, have been carried on in terms of only two actors, the government and the individual. Nineteenth century books often assumed a polarization of the individual versus the state, while many twentieth century books seek to portray the state as the solution of most individuals' problems. Conservatives, from von Hayek to Ayn Rand, now try to curtail government in the excuse that this will give more freedom to individuals, while liberals try to destroy communities with the aim of making all individuals identical, including boys and girls. And since what we get in history is never what any one individual or group is struggling for, but is the resultant of diverse groups struggling, the area of political action will be increasingly reduced to an arena where the individual, detached from any sustaining community, is faced by gigantic and irresponsible corporations.

A decent summary of some of the core themes of the current work.

Though the Classical Civilization is interesting, let us stick with Quigley and begin our examination with the dissolution of the Roman Empire. In the, say, 6th and 7th century, in the West there was no real state ("government"), and no real individualism. The basic social structures were the communities, which Quigley separates into local (village, parish, manor) and kinship (clan, family,

⁵http://www.carrollquigley.net/Lectures/Oscar_Iden_Lectures_Introduction.htm, Dec 8, 2011.

dynasty) communities. Moreover, those communities had no written or explicit laws, because people - who spent most of their lives inside their communities, with little contact with the outside world - had internalized the traditional laws of the community. In today's era of mass migration and written law, it is hard to realize that the prospect of banishment was a terrible one in an era, in which a man was a member of his community or he was nothing, and when every little region had its dialect. Apropos, the British, to this day, are highly dialect-conscious.

Quigley furthermore identifies two types of civilizations in respect to a civilization's outlook in regard to the individual. In his nomenclature, Class B (Asiatic) Civilizations "generally do not attempt to deal with individuals or with the problems of individuals," while with Class A Civilizations (including the Western Civilization), "although the civilization begins as an area of common culture made up of communities, there is a long term trend to destroy and break down those communities." Thus,

What happens in the course of a Class A Civilization, over a thousand or more years, is that the fundamental communities are broken up and gradually disintegrate into smaller and smaller groups, and may end up simply as what we call nuclear families, a father and a mother, who eventually lose all discipline and control of their children. The result of this process is a state which is not only sovereign but totalitarian, and it is filled with isolated individuals.

The following observations are tangential, but relate to subjects that were discussed earlier, and, besides, deserve attention on their own merit:

To us today, who shove religion off into a corner and insist that it must have nothing to do with politics or business or many other things, it may be hard to grasp that one of the most potent things in establishing the structure of the state in any civilization has always been men's ideas of the nature of deity. I will not take time to give you my paradigm for that; I'll simply point out to you something which should be obvious. The deity - God - has many different attributes. He is creator; he is masculine; he is transcendental, that is, he is outside of the world of space and time - that was established by 500 B.C. Eventually, he is one; that is what Muhammad insisted on. And then he is omnipotent, all-powerful. I stop at this point; Providential Empires [certain Class B Civilizations like the Byzantine and the Muslim ones] never got further than this.

The next development in our ideas of deity in Western Civilization was that God is good. That was established by the prophets of the desert by the fifth century B.C. Then came the Christian message, God is love, and by the year 1250 A.D., the scholastic inference that God is pure reason. If God is good, he cannot do everything; he can only do things that are good. And if he can do only good, and cannot do evil, then there is something higher than God: the rules of ethics. Thus the great contribution, even before Christ, to the Western idea of deity, was the idea of Transcendental Ethical Monotheism.

On the other hand, if God is one, omnipotent and providential, which means he interferes in the world, then whatever happens in the world does so because he permitted it. And whatever he permitted, who is any ordinary human being to question it?

We can draw the following conclusions: 1) religion, whether one likes it or not, is extremely important even today, at least from the historico-philosophical perspective; 2) the outlook of the "Providential Empires" is very similar to the gnostic outlook; and indeed, to this day "Byzantine" means both "complicated and labyrinthine" and "devious and surreptitious in manners of operation."

In the context of the analysis of the state one should realize that the development of the notion of God accompanied the development of the modern state.

Moreover, "the Western idea is that God gives man free will, and if men do evil things, they are responsible. In the West, accordingly, you get the rule of law. In Providential Monarchy you get

the rule of will. Their slogan became, "one God in heaven; one ruler on earth," which meant that Providential Monarchs frequently tried to conquer the world. I have already said that Jenghiz Khan was the greatest of them."

Another interesting point is that Providential Empires - including the (pre-1989) Russo-Soviet one - have no clearly established constitutional rules of succession, while the West, "where even God is under the rules of ethics," has such rules. Even with the general acceptance of primogeniture, the Romanovs had arbitrary successions, such as that of Nicholas I's to Alexander I in 1825-26. Under the Soviets, the rules of succession became even less well-defined. As pointed out before, strong rules of succession are extremely important in maintaining the stability and the integrity of the kingdom/ state/ government - but to have those, the society must possess a sufficient degree of rule of law.

Now, the establishment of a Providential Empire in the West was impossible for three reasons: the idea ran against the core values of the Western Civilization; and the economic disintegration, which accompanied the Roman decline, and did not halt until about 900, had so emaciated the transportation and communication networks of Europe, that it was impossible to control the separate provinces; and the supremacy of defensive weapons - castles - dominated the offensive weapons of the era, rendering widespread conquest difficult. This is why the Carolingian effort failed. The Ottomans, on the other hand, inherited the providential Byzantine Empire, which had been a major power capable of building solid infrastructure, and which was conquered with the aid of the cannon. It is worth noting that the Roman organizational and technological parameters of warfare were better developed than those of early medieval Europe. The 200-900 A.D. disintegration was spectacular indeed, and is a dire warning to those living in our own time.

Thus, the structure of societal organization in Western Europe around 900 consisted of a mass of serfs and a small percentage of mounted nobles living in castles. Unable to control the area beyond their castle, the nobles could not "protect nor control commerce," and raised revenues by taxing their serfs. There was no state, except a vague one in the form of the church. Now,

This period, and these social conditions, we call a Dark Age. There is nothing wrong with Dark Ages; they are frequently the most productive periods in the history of any civilization. Any of you who have read Lynn White's book on the technological advances of the Dark Ages, such as the plow and harnessing, know that Western Civilization got a great deal from its Dark Age. But, most significantly, out of the Dark Age that followed the collapse of the Carolingian Empire, came the most magnificent thing we have in our society: the recognition that people can have a society without having a state. In other words, this experience wiped away the assumption that is found throughout Classical Antiquity, except among unorthodox and heretical thinkers, that the state and the society are identical, and therefore you can desire nothing more than to be a citizen.

In the 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries, the Vikings exerted a great deal of influence on Europe with their raiding. Indeed, both the Russian Civilization (Kievan Rus') and the English (through the Normans) included notable Viking elements after about 900.

The Vikings introduced taxation on the basis of land assessment, and through that, standing armies (when the European armies at that time consisted of bands of recruited peasants, who would hurry home for the harvest). The "Northern Monarchies" also had advanced battle tactics, and, notably, an understanding of the nature of naval power. The "tactics" of the noble knights of that period - and in places well into the 14th century - amounted to glorious charges, which brought France disaster and humiliation in the Hundred Years War.

A couple of words on the Western (in particular French) notion of the King. The title of "King" was (and is today) religious (the Sultan always claimed to be the Defender of the Muslim Faith). The King's main duty is to dispense justice and to see that everyone gets protection. Thus, "The interesting thing is that in 1792, when Louis XVI was going to the scaffold, he still believed that the

obligation he had as king was to support the rights of everyone, including the nobles and the Church. This was the central core of the Old Regime and it cannot be emphasized too much: the king is the source of justice. And as such, he was bound more than anyone else in the society to obey the laws." This is important for understanding the pre-modern period in the West. Today, Kings tend to be regarded as arbitrary despots - but that was not really the case in the West.

One further distinction can be made between the person and the office of the king. For example, the French kings did not personally own their domain - rather, the Crown owned those, and people like all the Louises and Henrys filled the office of the King. This distinction stems from the medieval notion of *proprietas* - the idea is that people did not care if they *owned*, say, the King's forest (which he was not at liberty to give away) - they cared about whether or not they could, say, have the *rights of hunting* in the forest. The king could give those away to individual dynasties, and had a hard time revoking established *proprietas*.

After 1000, the French (Capet) monarchy, which had initially been very weak, gradually began to assume the responsibilities of government - i.e. command of the realm's army, regulation of commerce, coinage of money, administration of justice, charter of municipalities, etc.

Another fascinating moment here is that the Capetians had the fortune of having heirs (if we include the jump to the Valois branch in 1328) for six centuries. Other powerful French feudal lords, on the other hand, extinguished their families by dying in pursuits of glory like the Crusades. And when a noble dynasty had no heir, its domain reverted to the Crown, boosting the Capet-Valois power. The kings gave away many of the territories, often to members of the dynasty, as political tit-for-tats - thus, France hardly acquired a great degree of centralization in the Middle Ages.

Another curious custom was that of prescription - after one has done something for a while (21 years in England), he gains the *right* to do it in the future. Amusingly, "You may notice that every few years Rockefeller Center in New York City is roped off and you are not allowed to walk between the buildings. This is to prevent you from walking there for twenty-one years and gaining a prescriptive right to do so." In England, the right of prescription could not be exercised against the state; in France, on the other hand, the king even had the duty of upholding prescriptions.

These processes and phenomena coalesced into the rule of law. Here is another vital curiosity:

(This opened the way to something which is typical of the West: the rule of lawyers and judges. There have been three periods in the history of Western Civilization during which we have been overwhelmed by lawyers and judges, who tell us again and again that we cannot do certain things because they are illegal, even if those things are absolutely essential. The first period would be from 1313 to about 1480; the second was from about 1690 to the French Revolution; which was a revolt against a mass of confused, legalistic rigidity preventing necessary reforms. The third is our own day, when judges and lawyers are running everything and we are obsessed by legalism and litigation.)

Note that, in general, the development of the state in England was always more advanced than that in France. This is one of the reasons as to why England, which was less populated and poorer than France, managed to eventually attain world supremacy.

France got into its late 18th century conundrum via Charles VII's (1403-1461, King 1422-1461) 1454 Montils-le-Tours edict, which asked each locality to codify its customs as the law of the region. Thus, by 1580, France had 365 regions operating under different legal structures. Hence, "This meant the king had condemned France to what we would call legal or administrative disunity, and it was one of the chief, if not the most important, causes of the Revolution of 1789. Accepted by the kings and applied by the courts, this legal structure so hampered the actions of the government that the monarchy was never able to achieve a fully sovereign state and was in semi-paralysis long before 1789."

In Quigley's opinion (and the Old Regime was one of his fields of expertise), the French kings were not only not absolute, they were not even sovereign. They had achieved the height of their power in the 16th century.

For example, the kings could not borrow money, because they had no collateral. They went around that by giving away incomes to properties. This led to all sorts of trouble - for example, by giving away a certain great rent ("*Rentes sur l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris*") to the Church of France in the 16th century to pay immediate debts and interests, the king allowed the Church to become, 150 years later, in the words of Quigley "more of a sovereign political entity than the monarchy itself." And, of course, by 1789 (in fact much earlier) the monarchy had ran out of rents to give away, which was why it was "bankrupt." Like today's farcical debt clog, the problem was not *physical* in nature, but one of *legality and unperceived obsolescent traditions*.

Definition

Now, going back to the structure of the state, back in 900 there was no state - only communities, and in the subsequent centuries proto-states gradually developed around the bureaucracies of the monarchs. This went along with the development of sovereignty, which, like its sister-concept the state, is hard to define.

Quigley defines **eight aspects of sovereignty**: self-defence; arbitration over internal disputes; "administrative power" - i.e. the power to institute policy; taxing power - i.e. the power to mobilize resources for public services; legislative power - i.e. the power to codify laws; executive power - because laws are useless if not enforced when the population has no internalized controls; money control; and incorporating power.

Of these, some are clear. Administrative power Quigley defines as "the power to take those discretionary actions which are necessary for the continued existence of the community" - for example, control of grain surpluses for the purposes of avoiding starvation in times of scarcity. Writes Quigley, "in my opinion it is almost the most important of the eight aspects of sovereignty, and there is no provision for it whatever in the Constitution of the United States."

With legislative power, it is important to reiterate that the idea of making new laws rather than looking back to old customs is relatively new.

Law enforcement is interesting, because it barely exists in homogeneous (as opposed to synthetic) communities. This is why Americans will tell you - correctly - that there barely were any cops back in the good old days (and in many ways, they were good) in small-town America. This is because back then, small town America was stills strongly communal and homogeneous, and the people held internalized values. The process of urbanization, the development of the nuclear family as the elementary community, and today's Globaloney, have shattered the old communities, and made law enforcement more pronounced. Of course, this development has been encouraged by the Oligarchs for obvious reasons.

As we have seen, the power to control money in the Western world rests *entirely in private hands*, even though money is one of the most important factors of sovereignty.

Incorporating power amounts to "the right to say that a group of people is a single legal entity, that is, to create corporations."

Clearly, most states in the world are not fully sovereign. The Western states have no control over their money supplies. Those in NATO do not really have sovereignty of self-defence. Those that have signed treaties like GATT, or have joined the EU, have ceded legislative powers and even powers of arbitrage over domestic disputes. The IMF and the Maastricht Treaty have damaged the states'

powers of taxation. The smaller states can not really control the big international corporations. What are we left with? Police power!

The goal, of course, is the dismantling of both the sovereign state (except in its policing aspect) and the community. This leaves the atomized individual and the corporation-type organization as the main players. In such a scheme, the most powerful, meaning, in our context of states possessing the power to enforce contracts and certain social policies favorable to corporate-Oligarchical interests, the richest individuals, and the corporations that they own, are in charge. This is the problem with the (neo-)liberal / "objectivist" / libertarian-conservative / gung-ho radical-corporate-conservative / Fabian corporate-socialist co-ideologies of today. To counter-act these forces, people need communities, control over a sovereign state, or the traditional supremacy of a state (not necessarily controlled by the public) built to counter-act excessive private force - which, to a certain diminishing degree, is what the Americans have.

In contrast to the 21st century states, what do the corporations have? They have proxy power of self-defence via the right to hire guards to protect their property. They have proxy-power of legislature through the foundations. They have quasi-taxing power via the monopolies. The banks, which are tied with the corporations, command the money supply. They can dictate policy via the lobbying groups. In effect, the corporations are quasi-states. When people complain about "big government," they really mean the power of the government to enforce the legislature and the policies surreptitiously implemented by the corporations.

Formation and development

Gradually, starting from peasants & lords, by at the latest 1300, society broke into five categories: peasants, nobles, clergy, burghers/ merchants, and the monarch with his bureaucracy. An additional group - that of city craftsmen and guildsmen - developed in the 14th century. In some places, like England, there were landlords who were not noble - the gentry.

The monarch, to fulfil his duties, had to seek allies. Nobody cared about the peasants; various configurations of alliances took place - but by and large, the king would have to ally himself with the weaker classes, such as the burghers or the gentry. In cases where the dominant aristocratic class took over the bureaucracy of the king (Poland and England), the aristocrats ended up destroying the sovereignty of the monarchy.

After, say, 1550, four general areas of development of Europe can be identified - England, west of the Rhine, Rhine to Elbe, and Elbe to eastern Poland. Of these, England and the East (including Prussia) were areas of large estates, and France and Germany were areas of small farmers.

England already had a sovereign state by 1400. This permitted the British to achieve the terrific levels of organization, which produced the British Empire. The English had a King in Parliament, the idea being that the king could do whatever he wanted *as long as the parliament agreed*.

The English peasants, by 1300, started paying their landlords instead of working for them. This ended serfdom, but also ended the claim of the peasants to the land. So England broke into large land-holdings, whose owners monopolized the power on the Albion. Thus,

By 1776 ... there was a landed oligarchy in England. That landed oligarchy controlled the Parliament: it had taken it away from the king in the civil wars of the seventeenth century. It also controlled the court system and the interpretation of the law. Naturally, when any dispute arose, "What rights does someone have in this piece of land?" they invariably decided in favor of the landlord group and against any other group, above all, any peasants. As a result, England's rural areas became depopulated.

In turn, this led to the urban industrialization and to the British colonialism - because the peasants wanted to go somewhere to be left to farm in peace. Of course, one wonders if this was all done deliberately, or if it happened accidentally as a historical process. Francis Bacon and Shelburne must

have known what they were doing.

In West Germany, in accordance with the "Holy Roman Empire" heritage, the Roman Law was adopted. The Prince became sovereign and allied with the peasants, using his power to protect their holdings, and gaining power from their allegiance in turn. The Prince also became the head of the Church.

Since the Holy Roman Emperor was elected, he had to make constant concessions, and could never obtain sovereignty over the entire Empire, and so the Princes had their sovereignty, often over tiny bits of land. This state of affairs only ended in 1870 when Bismarck unified Germany. As Quigley points out, the greatest intellectuals of the post-Renaissance pre-modern era came from Western Germany - Leibniz, Gauss, the great composers, Goethe, etc.

In Eastern Europe, the younger sons of the aristocracy monopolized the royal bureaucracy, administering the kingdom to their own benefit, and so the aristocrats held on to power. This collapsed monarchical sovereign power, and with it the ability of the states to defend themselves, and so many vanished, notably Poland.

Another notable development in that era (1500-1800) was the improvement of artillery, which was expensive and negated the importance of fortifications. Thus, those (sovereigns) who managed to obtain enough resources to amass artillery, could smash the other powers in the land and reign supreme. In general, aristocracies held on to the ideal of the cavalry - particularly in Poland. The Polish had the greatest cavalry in the world in the late 17th century. But in the long run they could not compete militarily.

Also interesting is the aristocracy's opposition to the development of a domestic mercantile class. The aristocrats would instead allow foreign agents, or aliens dependant on them (like the Jews), to dominate the nation's trade for a cut of the loot. This turned Eastern Europe into a colonial domain. An identical process can be found in the latifundista-infested Latin America.

As for France, we have already looked at its troubles. The situation was a complete mess, the king had no real sovereignty, and eventually things reached an impasse, which destabilized the French society and created the preconditions for the Revolution. In turn, the Revolution founded a fully sovereign state, which erased the old system and introduced the Code Napoleon in place of the legal nightmare of the Old Regime.

What happened was that instead of relegating power to the old communities or landlords or judge-ships or chartered towns or whatever, the state reached out to make a "contract" with the single individual - the citizen.

Also notable is that the Italian Napoleon imposed the Italian model of the state - developed, as mentioned before, about the 14th-15th century around Milan and Florence - on the nation of France. The modern state in the European tradition can be traced directly to Revolutionary France and from thence to Renaissance Northern Italy. The Anglo-American tradition is somewhat different, and, as Quigley noted, goes, in some of its aspects, back to the Vikings.

Into the Modern Era

Quigley offers the following definition of the state:

A state is an organization of power on a territorial basis. The link between a society, whether it be made up of communities or individuals, and a state is this: Power rests on the ability to satisfy human needs.

And those needs, or "levels of culture" or "aspects of society," are: military, political, economic, social, emotional, religious, and intellectual. These being the needs,

Power is the ability to satisfy those needs. And someone who says that power is organized force, or that power is the outcome of an election, or that power is the ability to cut off our oil supply, has a completely inadequate way of looking at it. My experience and study of the destruction of civilizations and of the collapse of great empires has convinced me that empires and civilizations do not collapse because of deficiencies on the military or the political levels. The Roman army never met an army that was better than it was. But the Roman army could not be sustained when all these things had collapsed and no one cared. No one wanted to serve, no one wanted to pay taxes, no one cared.

This comprises one of the aspects of the concept of "legitimacy" that I have been using in this chapter. A government (or state), which fails to satisfy the above needs, will be perceived as illegitimate by its subject population. The other anchor of legitimacy is tradition and legality - thus a governing body, which has not gone through the traditional motions of acquiring power, is regarded as illegitimate. This is why succession crises were so severe in the times of kings and emperors, and why military occupations are regarded as illegitimate.

Perceived illegitimacy tends to lead to revolts and revolutions. Note that what matters is the opinion of those who have power. Thus, if an oligarchy considers a popular leader illegitimate, off he goes to where Kennedy and the Kingfish are. Likewise, if an oligarchy benefits from a foreign occupation, it may regard it as legitimate.

Quigley makes the following observation:

Persons, personalities if you wish, can be made only in communities. A community is made up of intimate relationships among diverse types of individuals - a kinship group, a local group, a neighborhood, a village, a large family. Without communities, no infant will be sufficiently socialized. He may grow up to be forty years old, he may have made an extremely good living, he may have engendered half a dozen children, but he is still an infant unless he has been properly socialized and that occurs in the first four or five years of life. In our society today, we have attempted to throw the whole burden of socializing our population upon the school system, to which the individual arrives only at the age of four or five. A few years ago they had big programs to take children to school for a few hours at age two and three and four, but that will not socialize them. The first two years are very important. The way a child is treated in the first two days is of vital importance. He has to be loved, above all he has to be talked to. A state of individuals, such as we have now reached in Western Civilization, will not create persons, and the atomized individuals who make it up will be motivated by desires which do not necessarily reflect needs. Instead of needing other people they need a shot of heroin; instead of some kind of religious conviction, they have to be with the winning team.

Furthermore, as Quigley notes, "The state is a good state if it is sovereign and if it is responsible. It is more or less incidental whether a state is, for example, democratic. If democracy reflects the structure of power in the society, then the state should be democratic. But if the pattern of power in a society is not democratic, then you cannot have a democratic state."

Quigley's definition of legitimacy is somewhat different: "When I say governments have to be responsible, I'm saying the same thing as when I said they have to be legitimate: they have to reflect the power structure of the society. Politics is the area for establishing responsibility by legitimizing power, that is, somehow demonstrating the power structure to people..."

Along this line of thought, the revolutions of the Age of Revolutions occurred, because of crises in legitimacy. For example, the Americans grew powerful enough to regard the rule of the oligarchical British Parliament as illegitimate. Louis XVI refused to make necessary reforms out of adherence to old laws and customs, and ultimately lost legitimacy. The spread of nationalistic ideologies in the

19th century killed off the Hapsburg and Ottoman Empires. The catastrophic Great War finished the Kaiser and the Tsar. The "despotism" of the monarchies was never a real issue - many Western states which did not suffer excessively in the World Wars still have monarchies, and the Russians and the Germans went straight back to despotism by 1939.

Quigley seems to regard the balance of power as an evolutionary development, but I think that it should be clear that 1) interested parties can affect the balance of power, and 2) revolutions can be caused deliberately by creating crises of legitimacy, particularly by fomenting wars and economic depressions.

The Napoleonic conquests showed that the social organization of the modern state can be extremely potent. It took the combined might of Europe, plus some blundering of his own, to bring down Napoleon. In the aftermath, every government had to develop a modern state, if for no other reason than at least for self-defence.

Quigley concludes with the following:

Now I come to my last statement. I regret ending on what is, I suppose, such a pessimistic note - I'm not personally pessimistic. The final result will be that the American people will ultimately prefer communities. They will cop out or opt out of the system.
 ... Now I want to say good night. Do not be pessimistic. Life goes on; life is fun. And if a civilization crashes, it deserves to. When Rome fell, the Christian answer was, "Create our own communities."

Conclusions

To sum up, let us stress that:

First, the units of social organization can be discretized into: the individual, the communities, the cooperative organizations (including the corporations), and the state.

And second, the state is sovereign if it has the following powers: self-defence, arbitration over internal disputes, administrative power, taxing power, legislative power, executive power, money control, and incorporating power. The good state must be sovereign and responsible.

The state is not at all necessary for the existence of society, but, in general, a strong state impeded by no cultural restrictions to expansion will swallow up everything around in its reach.

One can argue that a society should try to reach some balance between the four types of organization. The individual must have some privacy and opportunity for self-expression, but he can only fully satisfy his needs as part of a community. The cooperative organizations and the state are useful for certain large-scale projects (notably self-defence and some types of industry), but they should never be allowed to gain supremacy over the two elementary components of society.

It should be understood that history is neither the unfolding of a pre-written God's plan, nor the realization of some inevitable evolutionary process. There is no need for fatalism. People must understand the nature of current developments, and, unless willing to accept the hell that has been designed for them, should try to act to change things for the better. In some sense, the prospects of success are really not particularly important.

Chapter 8

Bits and Pieces of History

In this chapter, let us explore a few more subtle episodes of modern history. For lack of space, we will focus on subjects that are too important to ignore, or are of personal interest to the author.

We postulate that:

- It is impossible to understand modern history without understanding the influence of Malthusianism.
- It is impossible to understand modern history without understanding the way secret societies work.
- It is impossible to understand history in general without some understanding of the nature of power-politics (Machiavelli's *The Prince*, and so on), and without looking at the mindsets of people and societies.
- And finally, it is impossible to properly understand the modern world without understanding modern history.

I admit without complaints that my comprehension of the history of the last two-two and a half centuries is relatively limited; but at the same time I am reasonably certain that my ideas are largely in the right direction. Figuring out history is a lifelong process, and one of the greater pleasures in life - for people like stories, myths, and legends - and history has the greatest stories of them all - and they are real!

8.1 The American Founding Fathers

The American Patriot movement tends to regard the Founding Fathers as the prophets of what constitutes, essentially, an American national religion. Hardcore "leftists" condemn the Founding Fathers as a gang of oligarchical patricians and slave-owners. Researchers of Freemasonry claim that the Founding Fathers were crafty occultists who aimed to create a Freemasonic world empire. Of the three views, that of the leftists is the most accurate. At the same time, the Founding Fathers did do some good, and did exhibit bizarre occult tendencies.

Michael Parenti, Howard Zinn, and Noam Chomsky have at various times presented the leftist view of the Founding Fathers.

Many of the Founding Fathers were slave owners. This is a non sequitur and by itself demolishes the "noble builders of democracy" approach to Founding Father theology. The Founding Fathers committed another utterly indefensible act in perpetrating the destruction of the America of the "Indian" natives. But there is more.

Apart from the black chattel slaves, early America featured indentured (debt) slavery. Whites unable

to pay their debts were forced to work for their debtors. Immigrants were heavily targeted for debt slavery.

In regard to the myth of "democracy" in America, we can point out that: 1) originally, only the wealthier Americans were allowed to vote. The poll tax lasted well into the 20th century in some American states. 2) With some exceptions, women did not get the vote until 1920; 3) until 1912 and the Seventeenth Amendment, Senators were elected by the state legislatures rather than by the people. The Senate was explicitly modelled after the Roman Senate, which was heavily oligarchical.

Another illustrative example of the oligarchical mindset of some of the Founding Fathers can be found in the American treatment of the Haitian Revolution of the late 18th century. The Haitian black slaves massacred their French overlords and sought America's help in setting up an independent state. Some Americans advocated helping the Haitians, but the ruling powers, who did not want to give any ideas to their black slaves, and who did not want to lose the lucrative plantation trade with Hispaniola, and who, perfectly understandably, were negatively impressed with the slaughter of their French Haitian counterparts, sabotaged the Haitian Revolution. Jefferson (1743-1826, President 1801-1809) was generally pro-slavery (though he did abolish the slave trade in 1807) and against an independent black Haiti. He banned arms exports to the island and tried to isolate Haiti diplomatically. A full embargo was installed in 1806. Official recognition of black Haiti by Washington did not take place until the Civil War. Is this course of action "democratic" or "enlightened"? Some will argue that this such was the spirit of the times, etc. But the fact is, the Founding Fathers wanted "democracy" (or "a republic") only for the wealthy whites of America, who constituted a relative minority of the population of the United States. That is what they wanted, that is what they got, and that is what we have today, albeit in another form.

This is not to say that the Constitution is bad. The Constitution is perfectly fine, though it could use some updates. Unfortunately, one of the stated goals of the Oligarchs is the dismantling of the Constitution. Zbig explicitly advocated a rewriting of the Constitution in his *Two Ages* (1970). More recently, in June 2011, *Time* published an article by the title of *One Document, Under Siege* to gauge popular opinion regarding a future dismantling of the Constitution. At the current juncture, the Constitution should be defended and used against the Oligarchs.

Also of interest is the 1789 Whiskey Rebellion. A bunch of farmers revolted against the imposition of onerous taxes by the newly minted American government, whose owners had to pay off the debts incurred during the Revolution. Now, the Founding Fathers fought their war partly in protest against "taxation without representation." It was explained to the western farmers that they were now taxed with representation. The farmers were not impressed and took up arms. The government smashed the rebellion, and that was it.

And there is the 1787 rebellion of Daniel Shays (1747-1825) - who was no slouch of a man, but was a veteran of the Revolutionary War! He went home to tend a wound, to find himself hounded for non-payment of debt! The European bankers who had financed the revolution wanted their loans paid back in silver and gold, of which there was not enough in America; and so the American banker-types put the squeeze on the poorer people, causing deflationary problems, of which Shays and his likes suffered. Hence the rebellion - which was crushed. How was being exploited under the sanction of the government he had fought for better for Shays than British rule? One wonders.

The reality is that by 1776, the American-born upper crust of Americans felt powerful enough to take on the remote British rule, which, in the meanwhile, had become more onerous as the Colonies had developed economically. Forget the talk of ideals and the other mythological detritus - the Founding Fathers fought to defend and promote their own interest. They won, imposed their own government, and smashed all opposition they could find, including popular insurrections such as the Whiskey Rebellion, and various slave revolts. That the Founding Fathers were relatively enlightened was incidental if fortuitous. In the interest of honesty and history, we ought to take those men as they were - and they were great enough and wise enough - without unnecessarily and perniciously

sanctifying them.

To be fair to those men, they wanted to create a nation - which they knew could grow into the greatest nation on Earth - and to create a nation, they had to compromise. Abolishing slavery was impossible in 1789 America. The government had to crush petty opposition, or fold. Political realities are a cruel mistress. The Founding Fathers did as well as could have been expected of them.

As mentioned before, the "freedom" that Americans do enjoy stems from two factors: first, because America was a colonial nation, many Americans up until the mid-20th century were small farmers with a strong streak of self-sufficiency. They were free because they worked hard to make do within the confines of their families and communities. Those people were *intrinsically* free - their privileges stemmed from their mode of living rather than the from the government above them. As the industrial (Robber Baron) revolution developed, and as domestic oligarchs strengthened their hold of America, this farmer class gradually disappeared, and along with it the real freedom of the American population. Fortunately, vestiges of the old days and the old customs remain. Those must be defended against the oligarchical onslaught.

The other reason for the American "freedom" is the relative security and prosperity enjoyed by Americans over the last two centuries. The security is largely the product of geographical factors. The prosperity, however, came in no small part thanks to the overall protectionist-expansionist policies of the federal government. Because of their security, wealth, and traditions, the Americans had the opportunity to organize strong political movements and labor unions, which proceeded to exact real privileges for the American working and agricultural classes of society. Instead of salivating over the mythological Founding Fathers, the Americans ought to thank their own fathers and grandfathers, who sweated and bled not for some painted flag, but for their own "rights" and the "rights" of their children. These are the realities of power - no Founding Fathers will give you "liberty" - that is something a population has to win for itself - not through revolutionary war - though sometimes that is also necessary - but through strong communal and familial ties, and political organization. Goodness save me from preaching "socialism" - what I am talking about is Americanism at its best. The classic examination of pre-Civil War America remains de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* (1835).

I will leave the subject of Freemasonry among the Founding Fathers to the reader. It suffices to note that: many of the Founding Fathers were Freemasons. This is because: 1) Freemasonry was widespread among the upper classes of the day; and 2) revolution requires secret societies. The city of Washington, D.C., is indeed a heavily Masonic city. The Washington monument is a Freemasonic phallic symbol of Egyptian origins. Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790), easily one of the greatest Founding Fathers, was a rabid occultist who gallivanted with the English Oligarchs and was initiated into high-level French Masonic lodges. Despite all of this, I do not see an overarching Freemasonic Founding Father conspiracy. I see some possible indications of such a phenomenon, but not enough to work with. This does not mean that such a conspiracy did not exist. Let me state here that I advocate against placing excessive faith into the writings of Freemasons.

8.2 The American Civil War

Mainstream history says that the Civil War was about slavery.¹ The bad southerners were for slavery and the good northerners were against slavery and the forces of good and evil fought and the good guys won. In reality, slavery served as the symbolic linchpin of broader issues. The two primary causes of the Civil War were: 1) the question of the Union - the British, exploiting slighted Southern interests, wanted to divide the United States in order to be able to play the South against the North and thus curb the American threat; and 2) the clash, economic as well as cultural, between the

¹For an insightful and readable overview of some of the causes of the Civil War, try Douglas Harper's writings found at <http://www.etymonline.com/cw/apologia.htm>, accessed Dec 26, 2011.

pastoral, aristocratic, plantation society of the South, and the industrial, mercantile, urban society of the North.

One of the main reasons for the South's attraction to Britain was the cotton trade. The South supplied cotton for the British mills and bought British goods in return, and thus benefited from "free trade" with the British. Hence, the Southern Democrats, influential in the House of Representatives in the antebellum period, consistently lowered tariffs after 1816. The Northern industrialists wanted protection and higher tariffs. "Free trade" then was widely considered to mean British quasi-colonial domination. The Southern plantation owners did not mind conserving their dominant position in a relatively backward (but still advanced by world standards) colonial society. The Northerners had greater dreams. They wanted independence, and perhaps an empire of their own.

When it comes to 'Big Business,' morals tend to take second place to economic considerations. The industrialists of the North had a purely economic reason to detest slavery. Under their system of wage bondage, the chattel slave was a liability. One has to take care of one's chattel slave, since he is an investment. Wage slaves, on the other hand, can be discarded at will. With unemployment, one has an endless supply of wage slaves who must work or starve. The Southern slave population presented an untapped source of cheap labor for the factories, and the industrialists knew it. Furthermore, the issue in 1860 was not unemployment, but lack of workers. The industrialists needed laborers for the factories and the railroad projects. Note that this point demolishes the "good vs evil" view of the Civil War. The Southerners were not all that racist, the blacks did not necessarily fare better after the war, and the Yankees were anything but saints.

It is also useful to realize that slavery settled in the South because it "worked" in the South because of the cotton and tobacco plantations. The notion that the British (and the other Europeans) abandoned slavery for moral reasons smacks of whitewashing and propaganda. Where were their morals before 1807 and 1833? They banned slavery, because it no longer worked - as did the Northerners. There is also the broader moral question: if the Founding Fathers were justified in rebelling against a government which they felt failed to represent their interests, then does not the same rule apply to the Founding Fathers of the Confederacy?

Another useful point to make is that the South was designated to be something like a colony of the North from the start (i.e. Washington and Hamilton's time). The South would provide the raw materials and the North would industrialize. In the long run, such a policy inevitably benefited the North at the expense of the South.

For economic and for "moral" reasons, the North wanted to abolish, or at least contain, slavery, which was fairly widespread in the South - from a fifth to a half of the families in the cotton states owned slaves. Still, very few people owned in excess of 100 slaves. By itself, slavery would not lead to war. The real problem was the latent nationalism of the South, which grew into secessionism. The North, and Washington in particular, could not allow the division of the United States. Buchanan (1791-1868, President 1857-1861) had been open to the prospect of bloodless secession, but Lincoln (1809-1865, President 1861-1865) was categorical - secession would mean war.

Herein come the British. They regarded the United States as a dangerous rising power, and resented America's independence on principle - after all, America was supposed to be theirs. And so they used their ties to the South to promote the notions of Southern independence and Southern nationalism. In the war that ensued, the British desired a stalemate, or an incomplete victory for one of the sides, followed by the mutual recognition of a divided America.

Thus, in effect, the British exploited an existing rift in American society to foster the Civil War. Had slavery not been an issue, the British would have found some other problem to work with.

For a specific example of the British involvement in the cooking of the Civil War, take the case of the British agent Judah P. Benjamin (1811-1884), who served, successively, as Attorney General, Secretary of War, and Secretary of State of the Confederacy before retiring back to England, where he pursued a lucrative career as a lawyer, and was elected to the Queen's Counsel in 1872.

Once the war began, the British tried to aid the Confederacy as much as they could without provok-

ing a declaration of war from the North. British help was instrumental in keeping the South in the war. Once hostilities commenced, the North blockaded the South, cutting Richmond off from much needed foreign war materiel imports. British blockade runners delivered weapons and other supplies to the Southerners, keeping them in the war. The British also gave the Confederacy a number of raider ships, most notably the notorious CSS *Alabama*, which became the subject of a diplomatic scandal after the war, when the victorious North demanded compensation from the British for the damage done by the *Alabama*.

The British could not explicitly join the war for a number of reasons. For one, they were dependant on grain imports from the North. Canada was vulnerable to invasion. Prussia and Russia kept throwing surly glances at the Albion, and Alexander II, by allying with the North, forced London to contemplate the possibility of a war against both Washington and St. Petersburg. For these reasons, despite Palmerston and Russell's desires, Britain did not manage to even recognize the government of the South.

As for Lincoln, he was a great man who rose to a terrible occasion. He explicitly said that his main concern was the unity of the United States - if preserving that unity meant preserving slavery, he would gladly have made the bargain. The object of the effort to forestall violence by agreeing to slavery on the eve of the war was the Corwin Amendment, which Lincoln supported.

Not that Lincoln had any love for slavery - on the contrary, he reviled the custom - but the man understood political realities, and had his priorities.

After the North's setbacks at the beginning of the war, Lincoln took responsibility and installed himself as commander-in-chief - meaning virtual dictator. He did what had to be done.

The bankers greeted the war with great glee and proceeded to loan money to both the North and the South at exorbitant rates. Lincoln was not willing to pay. At the time, the banking system in the United States was rather chaotic.² Hard as it is to believe, before Lincoln, there was no real national currency. "Wildcat" state-chartered banks released all sorts of notes and promises across the United States. The value of the papers fluctuated widely and counterfeiting was a serious problem. On the positive side, cheap credit abounded and America prospered. Andrew Jackson struck a heavy blow on all paper money by stating that the government will not accept them in 1837, causing a financial panic. Some banks continued to print notes. The situation was an utter mess. In 1846, Polk created a Treasury system but no single currency. Enter Lincoln, on the wings of fortune and history. The president decided that if the states (or rather, state sanctioned banks) and the bankers could print money, so could he, the commander-in-chief of a great nation. And so he commissioned his famous fiat "Greenbacks," mandating that they were legal tender. Backed by the might of the United States Government, the notes were accepted. Of course, Lincoln's gambit condemned him in the eyes of the bankers. The moment Lincoln ordered the Greenbacks, he was a dead man. The bankers protect their secret. Note that one of Jack Kennedy's last major acts was identical - Jack had ordered the US Treasury to print debt-free fiat money. Hitler had pulled the same trick, and Huey Long was on his way toward attempting to follow in Lincoln's footsteps. Saddam and Qaddafi are two other notable monetary heretics. Both were savagely slaughtered, and their countries destroyed - for no example of success may survive to undermine the private central banking system scam.

Lincoln furthermore established a national banking system, which shifted the power of chartering banks from the state level to the federal level. It is worth doing the research to determine whether this action took useful credit power away from the states to weaken them, or banned useless speculation and concentrated useful credit creation into the hands of the federal government.

Unfortunately, after the war, the US government went back to the gold and silver standard, and began to retire the Greenbacks. The gold standard is no good, since there is a limited supply of gold in the world - meaning that a government or a community can not just print money to finance a project of its liking, no matter how useful and necessary the project is. All money, including gold

²See the Wikipedia article on the National Banking Act; accessed by the author on Dec 25, 2011.

money, is legal fiction, but the tangibility of gold tends to confuse people, leading them to believe that gold has some intrinsic value. It does not, beyond its over-rated ornamental quality. As long as people regard gold as money, however, the fixed supply of gold turns the metal into an excellent store of value.

Silver is a far better type of money, since there is plenty of silver out there. The United States was a major producer of silver. Unfortunately for the Americans, Germany went off the silver standard upon its formation in 1871. The price of raw silver declined dramatically. Startled by the devaluation of their silver, in 1873 the American Feds dumped the silver standard, causing massive panics and a long deflationary depression in the United States.

By 1878, the Greenback circulation was fixed and the currency was given a quasi-gold backing. In 1913, the (privately owned) Fed came in with its Federal Reserve Notes.

The banking history of America is complex and merits deeper study than we can afford it here.

The war was one of the first large scale modern, industrial wars. The people were not particularly eager to kill their fellows for strange reasons, and so desertion and draft evasion were rampant. In the North, one could buy out of the draft, and many did, thus forcing the brunt of the war on the poorest members of society who stood the least to gain from "abolishing slavery" and "preserving the union." As during any war, there was considerable profiteering among the "big businessmen." Robber Barons rose like demogorgons out of Hell. More than 600,000 thousand people perished out of a population of about 32 million - a death-rate of the order of 2% of the total population. The Civil War was by far the bloodiest war waged by America, and the only great conflict to take place on American soil after 1812-1815.

After the war, the South was re-colonized by the North, and has remained relatively backward to this day.

In terms of manpower and industrial might, the South was significantly inferior to the North (though still powerful by the standard of the age). This leads one to the question - why did they insist on seceding, when: 1) they knew they were weaker (though they thought they possessed greater martial spirit, etc); 2) they knew Lincoln would wage war to preserve the Union; 3) Lincoln had offered to allow them to keep slavery to maintain the Union? I can perceive four possible answers: 1) the Southerners miscalculated the strength of their position, or thought that they had to strike soon, because the expansionism of the North continually emasculated the South in relative terms; 2) they mistakenly thought that Britain (and/or perhaps France) would support them militarily; 3) they were quite mad with the religion of nationalism; 4) they felt they had their backs against the wall. Whatever the case, war could have been avoided in 1861. In the long run, the issue of slavery, and the economic clash between the two societies, could have been resolved politically. Moreover, in a certain sense, the abolition of slavery did not really accomplish all that much - blacks officially remained second-class citizens in America for an additional century, and do not fare all that well even today. That the Civil War was a lamentable tragedy in human terms is axiomatic - the point is that the South should not have started a fight it could not, barring a miracle, win.

Thanks in no small part to Lincoln's decisiveness and energy, the Union stood, and America became the greatest nation on Earth, and, in time, the greatest Empire in recorded history (perhaps save for the Mongol Empire). Lincoln himself was a master orator and writer, a highly ambitious man (axiomatically so, or he would never have become president), a manic depressive given to fits of rage and despondency, and as ruthless as Stalin when he felt the circumstances called for ruthlessness. Lincoln was no saint - he was a politician. He instituted the scorched-earth policy against the South toward the end of the war. His faith in Christianity is questionable. But when it came to the Constitution and the 1776 Revolution, he was a fanatic.

Hundreds of thousands died in the carnage, the Robber Barons made the bases of their fortunes and obtained the conditions for building their empires, and history rolled on to the next bout of horror.

Ah, the Robber Barons! I quote just one example of their profiteering from Howard Zinn's famous

People's History.

(Ch. 11) J. P. Morgan had started before the war, as the son of a banker who began selling stocks for the railroads for good commissions. During the Civil War he bought five thousand rifles for \$3.50 each from an army arsenal, and sold them to a general in the field for \$22 each. The rifles were defective and would shoot off the thumbs of the soldiers using them. A congressional committee noted this in the small print of an obscure report, but a federal judge upheld the deal as the fulfillment of a valid legal contract.

Morgan had escaped military service in the Civil War by paying \$300 to a substitute. So did John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Philip Armour, Jay Gould, and James Mellon. Mellon's father had written to him that "a man may be a patriot without risking his own life or sacrificing his health. There are plenty of lives less valuable."

It was the firm of Drexel, Morgan and Company that was given a U.S. government contract to float a bond issue of \$260 million. The government could have sold the bonds directly; it chose to pay the bankers \$5 million in commission.

Chapters 10 and 11 of Zinn's book are well worth reading in regard to the Civil War.

8.3 The Extension of World War I

As Norman Dodd said, the Carnegie Endowment for "Peace," acting on behalf of its powerful backers, after a "very learned" discussion, kindly advised Woodrow Wilson to make sure to extend the war in order to establish world peace. The Carnegie was part and parcel of the Anglo-American Establishment. The English head honchos did their part in prolonging the war as well. They did that for the profits, for the Malthusian purge, for the one world government, and for their sheer psychopathy.

Those in power could quietly manipulate the course of events in three ways - first, by controlling the flows of strategic supplies; second, by manipulating diplomatic alignments; and third, by (mis)directing the high-level strategy of the key belligerents.

For an example of how the English donated supplies to the Germans, we consult M. W. W. P. Consett's *The Triumph of Unarmed Forces* (1923).³ Rear-Admiral Consett was the British Naval Attaché in Scandinavia between 1912 and 1919. Here is what he had to say:

(Preface, p. vii-) The war, however, was prolonged far beyond the limits of necessity. It is the causes that led to the undue protraction of this struggle that are made the subject of examination and comment in this book...

...

When Germany drew the sword in August, 1914, it is beyond all reasonable doubt that its work was to be short, sharp and decisive; and that it was to be returned to its scabbard for a time-pending preparation for a future task. It is certain that Germany was neither prepared nor equipped for a struggle of four years' duration.

...

England's entry and the battle of the Marne had placed all hope of an early decision for Germany out of the question; and the problem with which Germany was faced from the very beginning was an economic one: she was not self-supporting, and the supplies upon which she depended for feeding, clothing and munitioning her armies, and for supporting her civil population, had to come from oversea.

...

For more than two years Germany maintained an unequal economic struggle with us: she

³Thanks to Henry Makow for providing the reference.

suffered famine, but she won through. In 1917 she sealed her own doom by declaring war upon all merchant vessels in the waters round the British Islands; for by this act trade with the outside world overseas was virtually stopped. British trade with Germany's neutral neighbours, which had continued throughout the war, ceased. America entered the arena and Germany was reduced to starvation: her troops left the fighting line in search of food.

The main thesis being,

(p. ix-x) The oversea supplies that reached Germany came mainly through Scandinavia and Holland, passing through two stages in their journey : one by sea and one by land.

...

Having passed the scrutiny of the British fleet and found sanctuary in Scandinavia, merchandise, in its second stage, was free from further belligerent interference. Nevertheless there were at our command very powerful and effective coercive measures by which it could be controlled, and which could not be disregarded with impunity. Oversea supplies came not only from neutrals, but from Great Britain and her Allies, including, it is to be remembered, Japan. Scandinavia was herself dependent upon oversea supplies for her industrial and economic existence. But she was dependent largely upon certain products of the British Empire and especially upon British coal. With our own goods we were free to do as we wished. Had there been certainty that our supplies would neither reach nor indirectly benefit Germany, there was every reason that trade with Scandinavia should have been encouraged. But from the very beginning goods poured into Germany from Scandinavia, and for over two years Scandinavia received from the British Empire and the Allied countries stocks which, together with those from neutral countries, exceeded all previous quantities and literally saved Germany from starvation.

...

(p. xiii-) There was a time when meat was so scarce in Copenhagen that butchers' shops had to be closed down: special fast trains packed with fish, the staple article of diet among many of the Danes, carried it to Germany when fish was unprocurable in Denmark; incidentally, be it mentioned, the trains were run on British coal and the fishing tackle was supplied by Great Britain; Swedish spindles were idle when the wharves and quays of Swedish ports were choked with cotton for Germany; and coffee, the favourite beverage of the Swede, was unobtainable in Swedish restaurants at a time when Sweden was exporting large quantities to Germany.

A man of manners and understanding, Consett quipped that

(p. xiv) It is most difficult to reconcile statements made from time to time by H.M. Government on this subject. ... Without apparent discourtesy to either one side or the other it is not possible here to make appropriate comment.

Coming from a Britisher of the Victorian-Edwardian age, this is a strong accusation.

Figures

(p.76) "number of tons of food lost by England and gained by Germany from Denmark during the years 1915, 1916 and 1917 as compared with 1913." : Lost by England - 59,356 (1915); 100,654 (1916); 154,331 (1917); Gained by Germany - 150,854 (1915); 190,781 (1916); 73,360 (1917); totals 314,341 versus 414,995. While this went on, the British supplied the Danish with finishing materials and coal. Before the war, the British had held about 60% of Danish produce exports (especially dairy products), and the Germans about 25%. In 1916, the main Danish shipping company - East Asiatic - paid 30% dividends.

These figures should be viewed with the German Turnip Winter (1916-17) in mind.

(p. 78) Denmark also exported Greenland cryolite, a component necessary for the production of Zeppelins. During 1915-1917, 22,000 tons of Greenland cryolite, carried over the ocean by ships powered with British coal, reached Denmark. Germany bought 7,000 tons of cryolite, and England and France a combined 8,000.

Throughout both World Wars, Sweden provided high-quality iron and steel to the Germans. In WWI (at least the early years), the Swedish trains and ships ran on British coal. (p. 80) "Nothing would have hastened the end of the war more effectively than the sinking of ships trading in ore between Sweden and Germany in the Baltic, or by economic pressure brought to bear on the Swedish ore industry."

(p. 82) In 1913, Sweden sold 26,567 tons of foodstuffs to the UK, and 37,043 tons to Germany and Austria. In 1914, the figures were 28,626 tons and 56,685 tons; in 1915 - 8,563 versus 104,203 tons; in 1916 - 115 vs 90,835 tons; in 1917, when the Germans started their serious submarine warfare, and the British Oligarchs began to worry and pulled the plug on the scam - 0 versus 16,451 tons. Sweden also sold Germany munitions, iron ore, sawn timber, zinc, steel wire, machinery, electric motors, and many important metals, and bought from the Allies and neutrals coal, cereals, lubricants, petroleum, fodder and fertilisers, cotton and woollen goods, animal and vegetable oils and fats, copper, lead, tin, tanning materials, bleaching powder, jute, rubber and groceries. (p. 85) "Sweden had nothing that was vital to the Allies, whereas, in addition to coal, Great Britain's large control over the raw materials for agricultural purposes was a source of great power."

The Norwegians sold fish and also needed British coal. As a fellow seafaring nation and a near neighbour, Norway was very close to Britain. Nevertheless, the Norwegians managed to sell - at a premium price - hundreds of thousands of tons of fish to Germany and Austria between 1914 and 1917: (p.156) 78,771 tons (1913); 67,746 (1914); 161,409 (1915); 194,167 (1916); 82,948 (1917). For their part, the Swedes and the Danes sold the Central Powers about two-thirds as much fish. England bought less than 10,000 tons. Writes Consett, (p.157) "It is not suggested that the country that supplied the fishing gear should by right and without regard to other considerations receive all the fish; but it is suggested that such a country should have cared more for its own interests than to allow its enemies to receive forty-six times the amount received by itself."

One could argue that had the British applied pressure on Copenhagen, Germany would have invaded Denmark. Consett quotes Ludendorff's opinion on the subject: (emphasis in original)

(p.96) Only with extreme regret could we refuse to pronounce in favour of unrestricted submarine warfare on the ground that, in the opinion of the Imperial Chancellor, it *might possibly lead to war with Denmark and Holland*. We had not a man to spare to protect ourselves against these States, and even if their armies were unaccustomed to war, they were in a position to invade Germany, and give us our death blow. We should have been defeated before the effects, promised by the Navy, of an unrestricted U-boat campaign could have made themselves felt.

The discussion, however, afforded an opportunity of overhauling our *defensive* arrangements on the Danish and Dutch frontiers.

Also worth pointing out is that because of the Schleswig-Holstein campaign of 1864, the Danish heartily loathed Germany. The Danish did not trade with Germany to help out the Kaiser - they were mainly interested in filling their pockets.

Stockholm (meaning the upper crust of Swedish society), on the other hand, was Germany's friend and supporter. It should be understood that the Swedish were utterly dependant on imported coal and grain. Thus, Sweden simply could not afford to join the Central Powers. An act of that sort would have meant embargo and mass starvation. Therefore the British could and should have blackmailed Sweden, which was pro-German to begin with.

Indeed, one of - by far - the greatest reasons for Sweden's being one of the world's richest nations lies in the fact that not only did Sweden survive both wars unscathed - she even got to trade vital war materials with both belligerent parties! And could help finance and supply both reconstructions! Note that Sweden had been rather poor in the 19th century. What are the two other richest European nations (barring Luxembourg)? Norway and Switzerland. The Swiss, enjoying the bankers' blessing, also got to sit out the two World Wars. Norway did not participate in the first war, but fell under German occupation during the second. Norway, however, has oil - the most per capita oil in Europe (in fact the world outside the Middle East). That is a momentous boon. Portugal, which is an ancient ally of England, participated in the first war, but managed to stay out of the second one, though it was affected by the Spanish Civil War. Spain participated in neither war, but had the Civil War, which we had safely throw into the global 1914-1945 conflict. That's it - the rest of Europe fought - and lost.

So, yes, the obvious is true - peace makes for prosperity. War 1) takes otherwise productive members of society and sends them to die, until which time they must be fed and clothed; and 2) takes otherwise useful things like nitrogen and copper and steel and turns them into things which explode or will be exploded by the "enemy." But, of course, the men who own the corporations, which manufacture war materials, profit immensely - because a nation at war is a cornered buyer. This alone should be sufficient indictment of the concept of a for-profit based society. Worse, powerful banking-industrial interests will benefit from a war even when the war manifestly damages the host nation. Hence, say, Vietnam. So you have the Fabian socialist types who want war to change society, the communists, who support war, because it supposedly weakens the "capitalist" nations, and the big industrialists and bankers, who want war to make profits. What an unholy mess!

But back to the subject at hand. To get an idea of the power which Britain held over Scandinavia, consider the following figure - (p. 113) in 1913, the British shipped close to 10 million tons of coal to Scandinavia, while the Germans shipped slightly more than a third of a million. Moreover, once the war commenced, the Germans had no coal to spare. The conquest of Belgium (a great coal-producing power) gave the Germans some breathing space, but they had nothing to compare with the British coal advantage in bargaining with the Scandinavians. The Germans did manage to send 1.2 million (1915), roughly 3 million (1916), and near 1.5 million (1917) tons of coal north - but it was poor quality coal. The British had the Scandinavians in their pocket. The latter even *expected* (p.119) the British to cut off coal supplies. And yet, "Coal was supplied without there being imposed any restrictions on its use; the trade in coal continued as in peace time."

(p. 130) In total, the British sold 21.6 million tons of coal to the Scandinavians during the war before trade halted in 1917, and the Germans traded 7 million tons of much poorer coal.

The British finally turned the screws on Scandinavia in 1917.

Much more can be said, but let us close the topic with the following illuminating quote:

(p.125) On 4th July, 1917, in the course of a speech on the blockade in the House of Lords, Lord Milner said (in all good faith) :-

At the same time it must be remembered that Germany has means of pressure, too. To give only one instance, the industries of some of the neutral countries adjacent to Germany are almost entirely dependent upon coal supplies from Germany for their continued activity. Germany is able to furnish them with coal at very much more favourable rates than they can get it from this country, and in that and in other respects Germany is just as well able to bring pressure to bear on them to induce them to send their goods into Germany as we are to bring pressure to bear on them to try and prevent their sending those goods into Germany.

While Lord Milner was making this speech the Swedish Government informed H.M. Government that she would like to obtain from the United Kingdom 100,000 tons of coal a month, freight being 15 to 20 pounds per ton.

Of Milner's faith we need only say that the man was legendary for his memory and acumen in regard to figures and statistics.

For all we know, this blatant example of English Oligarchical economical interference for the prolongation of the war is only the surface of the iceberg.

Galipoli

In regard to military blundering of a scale so great as to suggest foul play, there is the classic example of Galipoli. Churchill, who was the First Lord of the Admiralty, came up with the idea of hitting the "soft underbelly of Europe." This idea of his also played a role during the second war. From a military perspective, the notion of advancing northward from the south of Europe is absurd, because southern Europe has vast defensible mountain ranges, which have halted would-be conquerors since before Hannibal (247-183BC).

And so the British landed at Galipoli in European Turkey in April 1915, thereby committing half a million men for eight months during the key early period of the war, when the Germans had lost momentum and found themselves fighting a two-front war against a still relatively lively Russia. Germany always was the key to the war - the moment Germany was forced to capitulate, the war was over. Ostensibly, the goal was to capture Istanbul to make contact with the Russians - but that is so much balderdash. Turkey was no threat to the Allies, since the British were secure in Egypt and controlled the seas. The rocky, hilly Galipoli terrain gave a huge advantage to the defenders. The Galipoli campaign was always a lost cause.

It is conceivable that the men in charge of Britain - in particular Churchill - really were blundering idiots. Perhaps, considering their achievements, they were merely given to brief episodes of madness. Or they knew what they were doing, and sabotaged the Allied war effort. The reader can draw his own conclusions.

8.4 The Kingfish

Let us now look at Huey Pierce Long (August 30, 1893 - September 10, 1935), the illustrious Governor and Senator from Louisiana. Long, nicknamed the Kingfish, challenged the Wall Street gang and the Louisiana oligarchs, gave them a few good drubbings, and earned their wrath. With the 1936 presidential elections and the Second World War nearing, the Oligarchs took no chances and gave Huey a bullet to the gut.

I want to provide a detailed examination of the Kingfish, because: 1) I find him a fascinating character from the historical, personal, and even literary perspectives; 2) he achieved prominence in the crucial Great Depression/ interbellum period; 3) his activities tie in with many of the themes of this work.

The best sources on Long are: T. Harry Williams's masterful Pulitzer Prize winning 1969 biography *Huey Long*, and Huey's own two book-form writings - his 1933 autobiography *Every Man a King*, and his 1935 tongue-in-cheek plan of action *My First Days in the White House*.

Childhood

Huey, the seventh of nine surviving children, was born at a family farm in Winnfield, a small town in northern Louisiana. His mother was a genteel woman, and his father was a man of energy and respect of education. Born in a large, comfortable, but draughty log house, Huey grew up close to

his brothers Julius - who was older, and Earl - who was younger, and would succeed Huey's political machine though not his vision. Around the turn of the 20th century, Long Sr. prospered, and indeed, the Long clan was established and well-respected in Winn Parish. To get an idea of the exact extent of Long's wealth, observe that (Williams, Bantham 1970 edition, p.20) "Old Hu [Long Sr.] and his wife were proud that they had a big house, that they set a good table, and that they were financially independent." And (p.21) "In a richer parish, a plantation area, a family like the Longs would have occupied a lower position, would have been ranked in the middle class." The Longs were self-sufficient, but had little cash to spare.

The Longs were also proud of their intellectual interests. They read the Bible, Shakespeare, Dickens, Poe, and other classics, as well as a number of magazines and journals. Raised in such an atmosphere, Huey became highly literate, aware of ideas and their applications, extremely conversant in the nature and power of literary imagery, self-confident, and highly ambitious. At the same time, Winnfield was anything but a large cultural center. Thus, Huey would become both cultured and uncouth, equally at home among the rednecks and hicks out in the bush, at decadent New Orleans, and among the highbrows in DC and New York. After receiving a thorough home-schooling, Long Sr.'s children, including the girls, easily acquired college degrees when they matured.

Old Hu had taken great cares in the political education of his children. Winnfield had been a bastion of the Populist movement of the late 19th century. The Populist anti-corporate sentiments, and, one suspects, Jesus's opinions on money-lenders and their likes, sunk deeply into Huey. The South was, at that time, still very much a caste society, and the aristocrats considered Huey a hick - to his annoyance, amusement, and political benefit.

The young Huey was regarded as (p.24) "intelligent, "bright," extremely active, and always interesting" - and also "belligerent, ornery, ..., disputatious, officious, bossy, a show-off." Indeed, Long revelled in attention and could never stand to be the second of anybody (including Franklin Delano Roosevelt). As a small child, Huey was a dynamo of energy and unbounded curiosity. When advised to whip some sense into him, his mother replied that she would (p. 25) "have to whip him to death to stop him." At the same time, Huey was averse to physical violence, and always avoided fights. This is an important point, because later many would compare Huey to Mussolini and Hitler. We will discuss this point at length, but it suffices to note that whereas the fascist dictators were boorish and glorified violence, Huey was of the polar opposite mould. Some would claim that Huey was a coward - but the notion is absurd in reference to a man who repeatedly went up against Standard Oil - and often won. Earl Long, on the other hand, enjoyed fighting, and often interceded on the behalf of his older brother. Williams interprets Huey's mentality as follows: (p.27) "Why should anyone be fool enough to fight when he can get what he wants without doing it?"

Nevertheless, at the age of fifteen, Huey got into a fight with another boy over a girl. After ten rounds of clobbering, the two combatants could barely stand, and the fight was declared a draw. The girl broke up with both of them, and Huey learned an important lesson about letting his feelings get the best of him.

In regard to our analysis of education, it is worth noting that (p. 31) "[Huey] was, in fact, for his time and place, an exceptionally well-read man." He scoured the town for books, once with a wheelbarrow. Apart from the classics mentioned above, Huey read a multi-volume *History of the World* (Ridpath's), popular 19th century romanticists like Dumas and Walter Scott, some poets, including Longfellow, and, notably, biographies of Julius Caesar and Napoleon. Long possessed a photographic memory and memorized whole passages from his favorite books.

The book he liked the best was *The Count of Monte Cristo* (Dumas, 1844), whose honourable protagonist avenged himself on his enemies by allowing them to fall prey to their own venality. Said Huey the senator, (p. 33) "That man in that book knew how to hate and until you learn how to hate you'll never get anywhere in this world."

Huey's school only became "accredited" in 1906, when Huey was in grade six. Never particularly enthusiastic about school, Huey decided not to waste his time, and skipped a grade to go straight to

high school. Just as he was finishing the last eleventh grade, it was decided that there would be a grade twelve. Huey protested and was expelled. Luckily for Huey, the Rockefeller GEB had not yet come to its fore, and (p. 35) "Most of the Winnfield faculty disregarded the niceties of educational procedure whenever the rules stood in the way of education."

Characteristically, Huey eagerly participated in stage plays and debates. In 1909, he barged into a debate competition and won himself a scholarship to LSU (Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge), which, for financial reasons, he had to let lapse. The episode imparted a love of LSU into Huey, and as Governor he would make the university a major one.

Another curious aspect of Huey's education was his family's love for singing. Huey enjoyed the ruckus, and would use musical pieces in his political activity.

Huey enjoyed church activities and attended every Sunday, but he was not entirely enamoured with his mother's ambition of making him a priest.

Already as a young man, Huey had developed a political philosophy. He was vaguely pro-capitalist, but vehemently anti-Big Business and anti-monopolist. He was anti-socialist, but for the Populist notion of restraining Big Business. His ideas and sentiments were eminently American, and, in the light of two centuries of academic and political economic madness and deliberate fraud, notably sane and constructive. Writes Williams, (p.45) "[Huey] would always believe [in the above convictions], and he would never cease his efforts to lift the small and the poor to a better life." Let us state here one of other main theses of this section - namely, that Huey was never a demagogue and an opportunist, but rather, he was a popular leader who drew political power from the people, not because he swindled and manipulated them, though he was a master speaker and able propagandist, but because he really helped the poor and the downtrodden. The Kingfish was about as much as the proponents of representative "democracy" or "republicanism" can ask for - a strong, astute, and benevolent *elected* leader.

One further critical point, which ties with *Monte Cristo*, Caesar, and Napoleon - from his environment and parents, Huey took a deeply personal view of politics. He fought to win, and he never forgot his friends and his enemies. This mentality helped transform him into a master politician, who won more friends than enemies - though his enemies tended to be very powerful.

Youth

Having curtailed his grade schooling, Huey decided to become a travelling salesman. He would see the world, make a buck, and learn to push people's buttons. And so Huey got a job in the (p.49) "selling racket" in 1910, and went off to see the world and peddle "Cottolene." He travelled around Louisiana. In Shreveport, Huey met Rose McConnell, whom he would marry two and a half years thereafter.

The salesman gig was always a temporary one. From an early age, Huey had intended to go into politics. Already in high school he talked about becoming governor, senator, and president. At the age of 17 he was already a relatively mature man who knew what he wanted in life, and had a coherent strategy for pursuing his goals. One encounters this personality trait in the biographies of other highly successful individuals, for example George Carlin, who was the premier American comedian of the (second half of the) 20th century, and Ernest Hemingway, who went to see the Great War in Italy at the age of 17.

While Huey peddled stuff, his brother Julius, by then an established lawyer, suggested that Huey take law at Tulane, which he himself had attended. The idea stuck. But before entering Tulane, Huey found himself in Texas and Arkansas, and spent a few nights on park benches. His brother George, a dentist in Oklahoma, bailed him out, and gave him money to enrol at the University of Oklahoma. Huey gambled the money away and got another job. His brother bailed him out again. In April 1913, Huey finally married Rose. In early 1914, out of a job, Huey followed Julius's advice and went down to New Orleans to take law at Tulane, at Julius's expense. Over his four years as a salesman, Huey had developed his "gift of gab," and had acquired a thorough knowledge of the geography, demographics, and psychology of Louisiana. Also of import was the network of contacts,

which Huey, with his clinical memory, had begun to develop.

Bereft of a high-school diploma, Huey was not even qualified to obtain a degree - at most he could hope for a certification. So he enrolled for a few lectures as a "special" student, and spent a year preparing for the bar exam. (p. 77) "He later claimed that he studied from sixteen to twenty hours a day, and he did not exaggerate much." After studying until after midnight, he would put himself to sleep with a "half gallon of beer."

Notably - and this is an important technique - after reading a book, Huey would have his wife type his summary of the book's contents.

Another important point is that Huey went well beyond the prescribed curriculum, and made sure to develop a rounded understanding of law in general.

Huey was mesmerized by the French/Louisianan inheritance law, which stipulated the break-up of property among all of a man's surviving heirs as a means of preventing the centralization of wealth. It is interesting that the Venetian oligarch fought against this principle by forcing their younger sons to stay celibate.

Though he enjoyed his time in Tulane, by May 1911, Huey ran out of money and therefore time, and had to send Rose to her mother, and cram for the bar exam.

For various reasons, Huey could not legally take the exam in New Orleans, though he wanted to. According to his story, he went straight to Chief Justice Frank Monroe of the supreme court, and asked him to help out a poor young married man. The judge agreed to waive the various requirements in the event of Huey passing the exam. The moral of this story - whether the story is true or invented - is that access to powerful people, coupled with the ability to influence them, can open many doors. To put it another way, working hard at following other people's orders, though instilled in us from infancy, does not necessarily lead to a positive outcome. This is not to say that one should cheat and manipulate others, but that one should stand up for oneself, particularly in the face of ridiculous rules.

On May 15, 1911, Huey took his exam and became a lawyer at the age of 21.

Lawyer

Huey returned to Winnfield, and joined his brother Julius's established practice. He had a tough time early on, and resorted to salesman gigs to make ends meet.

In part because of his non-existent reputation, and in part because of his convictions, Huey ended up catering to the legal needs of the Negro population, and various cases which no other lawyer would touch on account of low chances of winning or low chances of obtaining payment. Often, Huey incurred losses in pursuing his cases. For example, (p. 85) "In one [case] he represented a woman who was sued for back rent. He lost the case, and later the woman's sewing machine was sold at auction to satisfy the judgement. Huey bought it for eight dollars and returned it to her." Though he undoubtedly made use of such anecdotes for political purposes, it is unfair to say that Huey was a mercenary. The man had a strong streak of Christian generosity in him. At the same time, Huey had to make a living - and so he took cases in the new field of worker compensation. A good compensation could be hefty. At a time of poor worker safety laws, Huey was more of a defender of worker rights than an ambulance chaser. Characteristically, Huey's first compensations case involved a dead Negro worker whose brothers (p. 86) "ain't got no money to even bury our brother."

During his practice, Huey developed his technique of hitting big targets. Said he, (p. 90) "Huey Long don't take out after topwaters but after the big fish." This is a standard strategy of warfare and politics - large targets attract publicity, and bringing them down can often win the war.

Huey famously claimed that he had never taken a case against a poor man. In Williams's view, the claim was (p. 93) "true."

In 1918, Huey decided to run for railroad commissioner, and to become a town lawyer. He moved to Shreveport. A month after arriving there, Huey celebrated the birth of his second child, Russell,

who would become a United States Senator some years later.

In 1920, Julius also moved to Shreveport, and formed a partnership with his brother. The arrangement did not last, because of Huey's overbearing personality.

The railroad commissioner job was a calculated step in the Kingfish's political career. The important political posts in Louisiana had age requirements, and the railroad commissioner gig - which had no age restriction - gave the 24 year old Huey the opportunity to achieve political prominence, the ultimate goal always being the governorship, which would become open in 1923, after Huey's 30th birthday.

In 1921, Huey undertook the first battle of his legendary crusade against Rockefeller's Standard Oil on behalf of a minor Louisiana oil company. Note that the early American oil industry centred around Pennsylvania and Ohio, whence Rockefeller built his empire. Afterwards came Louisiana, which, around 1920, sported the most modern refinery in the world. The Texas and Alaska oil fields were developed later in the 20th century. California was already an oil power by 1921.

Huey's successes in his war with Standard won him prominence and popularity - among the people, that is. Big Business and the Louisiana aristocracy positively loathed the man.

Railroad Commissioner

For Huey, (p. 112) politics was "the sport of kings." Huey knew the score from the start. In a bizarre anecdote, he related a 1916 incident involving a man Huey called "Faust." Down at Baton Rouge to see the legislature for the first time,

(p. 113) he met an older man named Faust, whom he did not otherwise identify, who revealed to him what the hidden power was - it was the great business interests and particularly the Standard Oil Company. But the people could change the situation, Huey argued. Yes, agreed Faust, but they could not be aroused. A leader who tried to stir them would be hired over by the interests, Faust said. "Or," he concluded, smiling at Huey, "they will sniff you out if they can."

During that visit to Baton Rouge, Huey made sure to create some noise along the lines he subsequently perfected - he raved against the concentration of wealth, the power of the corporations, and Big Business's ability to buy politicians. He would capitalize on these issues - which were real - throughout his career.

Huey avoided the World War I draft by asking the board to classify him as Class IV - man with dependants. The reality is that Huey was a young struggling lawyer with a family, and he had no intention of going to France to die for the benefit of J.P. Morgan and his cronies - who, whether Huey realized it or not - had dragged the US into the war. And Huey was no fool. Writes Williams, (p. 121) "Huey's skepticism about the nature of the war was a direct result of his continuing study of a subject that had interested him for years - maldistribution of wealth. If a few rich men dominated the economy, he seemed to reason, then they must be running the government and directing everything that it did." Which was the case.

The Railroad Commission, created in 1898, had the power to regulate the practices of railroads, steamboats and other vessels, telephone and telegraph companies, and pipelines. Though potentially a powerful executive force, in 1918 the Commission was very weak. Huey's arrival revitalized the organization. Before the election for the post came, already in 1916 Huey began to develop a trans-state political organization. A decade later, the seeds of Huey's effort would give him the governorship; in 1918, he won the Railroad Commissioner post.

Huey also used this first political campaign of his life to test and develop his campaign techniques.

With his Model-T Ford, he would criss-cross the state, speaking numerous times per day. His chief weapons were his spectacular oratory ability and his boundless energy, which allowed him to brave through onerous schedules the better for the wear.

Having acquired a measure of control over the pipelines, Huey was always going to hit at Standard Oil. Until then, Huey decided to meddle in the 1919 gubernatorial election, on the behalf of the Progressive (party-member) John Parker (1863-1939, Governor 1920-1924). In return, Huey asked for more state control (meaning Huey control) over the pipelines. Parker, who had a grudge against Standard, readily agreed. With a little - but, at that point, anything but decisive - help by Huey, Parker won the race.

Parker was a well-meaning man, but also an aristocrat, and his governorship can be qualified as ambitious but tepid and timorous. Huey's over-ambitious pipeline bill was too much for Parker, who supported a weaker bill, to the annoyance of Huey. The men broke over the issue. On another issue (severance tax), Parker actually told the Standard Oil people (p. 147) "You gentlemen can write [the bill]." Naturally, Huey raised hell over the scandal. And again naturally, this brought an effort to impeach him - which was exactly what Huey wanted. The effort failed and Huey got great publicity. He won further attention by forcing a telephone& telegraph company (a subsidiary of the Morgan-dominated AT&T cartel) to rescind a rate hike in 1921. Similar campaigns won him additional acclaim.

In 1923, Huey, duly on course, entered the gubernatorial race on the day of his 30th birthday. Though considered an outsider, he would mount a decent challenge in what was really a practice run. Huey described his strategy in the following words: (p. 190) "In every parish there is a boss, usually the sheriff. He has forty per cent of the votes, forty per cent are opposed to him, and twenty per cent are in-between. I'm going into every parish and cuss out the boss. That gives me forty per cent of the votes to begin with, and I'll hoss trade 'em out of the in-betweens." True to his stated *modus operandi*, Huey travelled across the state and duly ravaged the local minor chieftains. His long-term strategy, likely, was to avoid bargaining with the local powers-that-be. The goal was to get into power - once there, he would use his influence to replace the local bosses with his own people, or force the existing powers to join his camp. Moreover, this was really the only strategy open to Huey - because the local overlords tended to be wealthy and aristocratic, and Huey stood no chance of winning their support. So entrenched was the old regime power structure, that people were surprised that Huey even bothered to run. Certainly no one else had attempted to do what he was doing without the blessing of at least some quarters of Big Business and the aristocrats.

Louisiana of Huey's era was developed by Southern standards (the South had still not fully recovered from the Civil War and the subsequent quasi-colonization by the North), but behind the Northern states. It was rural but rapidly urbanizing. It was socially primitive, in the sense that the poor in Louisiana were many and really dirt poor. It was a heterogeneous state, featuring Francophone Catholic Cajuns to the south, populist-minded white protestants to the north, a hefty column of blacks, and the cosmopolitan New Orleans, which had been one of the greatest American cities in the 19th century. The Louisianians tended to be realistic-minded, and interested in politics.

Louisiana had the second-worst literacy levels in the United States, and a decrepit educational system. We have inveighed against the type of system of indoctrination that we have now, but a basic literacy program is something utterly essential in a place and time, in which cheap books can be easily procured, and yet remain unavailable to a bulk of the population.

One of the main weapons of the semi-feudal Louisiana oligarchy was the New Orleans "Old Regular" political machine. That "Ring" was old, entrenched, and powerful, and would become one of Huey's bitterest enemies. Never one to shy away from a (political) fight, Huey nearly destroyed the Ring by 1935.

Huey's 1923 opponents - Henry L. Fuqua (1865-1926, Governor 1924-1926) and Hewitt Bouanchaud (1877-1950) - had ample campaign funds. Without patrician patronage, Huey worked on the cheap, financed by his family and certain friends, including O.K. Allen (1882-1936, Governor 1932-1936),

who would become Huey's lifelong political henchman and ally. Certain private businessmen also helped Huey, out of gratitude for his handling of their court cases, out of admiration, or in an effort to control him.

In 1923, Huey could and did manage to mount a decent campaign with a relatively limited budget. His star rose in the period between the introduction of the radio and the introduction of the television. People were still intensely local and politically-minded. Louisiana being a comparatively small state, Huey could make himself heard in its every corner armed only with a car and a boundless ambition. Television, mass urbanization, and constant migration have changed everything - though even today it should be possible to mount local campaigns. The Internet may also change the playing field, though, unfortunately, oligarchical interests are taking great pains to take over the likes of Twitter and Facebook. Moreover, back in the 1920s, setting up one's own newspaper and sending out newsletters and circulars was doable - and Huey did it - while in, say, the 1970s, setting up one's own major TV station was nigh impossible. Today people can bypass TV and the control of the press via the Internet - it is still an uneven battle, but at least there is some freedom of action. Huey's Louisiana blitz was successful, though he still had to learn a thing or two. His network expanded and his oratory improved.

On the day of the election there was heavy rain. Huey carried northern Louisiana and did better than anyone (except, likely, he himself) had expected. He claimed that the rain had cost him the governorship - because his poor farmer supporters had been unable to get to the polling booths on account of the mud. Huey's excuse was half-joke, half-truth.

Henry Fuqua, a Baton Rouge businessman, won the race. He would die of natural causes in 1926. His successor was Oramel H. Simpson (1870-1932, Governor 1926-1928), an established Louisiana politician. Huey, whose campaign never really ceased, spent his time improving his political machine. In 1926, he helped senator Joseph E. Ransdell (1858-1954) get re-elected. Ransdell was a patrician, but he needed Huey, and Huey hated Ransdell's opponent sufficiently to aid Ransdell, who would, if nothing else, owe a debt of gratitude to the aspiring Kingfish.

The 1927 election was a memorable one. Having gotten a taste of Huey, the state powers threw their strength behind Simpson - and later behind one Riley Joe Wilson (1871-1946), the flood commissioner. The great Mississippi flood of the summer of 1927 added great pathos and momentum to the occasion. Three quarters of a million people - something like a third of the population of the state - became homeless. History was in the making.

This time around Huey had solid financial backing. His projected road-building efforts had attracted the respective business interests. His family, having done well in the 1920s boom, the brothers grown up, delivered thousands of dollars. The largest contributor was a New Orleans businessman of shady connections, Bob Maestri (1889-1974, Mayor of New Orleans 1936-1946), who had the opposition of the New Orleans ring, and needed political allies. In politics, one takes them as one finds them - but only to a degree. Huey had managed to find other allies in New Orleans, meaning that his loss there would not be great enough to doom the campaign.

In 1927, Huey had already developed his memorable slogan "Every Man a King, But No One Wears a Crown." What the slogan meant should be fairly clear - public works, social programs, the curbing of Big Business power, the suppression of the oligarchy, and in the long run, hopefully, a gradual and temperate redistribution of wealth.

Huey had also grown into a mesmerizing speaker. Impressively, from our perspective in an age of teleprompters, he used no notes of any kind - he would get on the "stump" - on some days 3-4 times, his longer speeches extending for two hours - and gab - and people would listen. He dressed better than he did four years earlier, gesticulated with more control, and could take the pulse of a crowd after the first few minutes of his speech. Huey had blossomed into a magnetic political figure. He promised to build bridges, roads, schools and hospitals - and the people believed him. In January 1928, Huey won the governorship with a bigger lead than any previous candidate.

Governor

Though now governor, Huey had only a tenuous hold of Louisiana. The state House was generally against him, as was the oligarchy. His early years in power were thus characterized by bitter political intrigue, and his own efforts in pursuing the projects he had promised. Huey's political war is interesting, but involved and largely tangential. In general, he strengthened his own machine, gradually took over the State House, and by 1932 had Louisiana more or less in his pocket. But before then, he had to go through one major scare - the impeachment.

Huey was a political realist, aware of the principle, which Quigley mentioned in the previous chapter - namely, that the basis of political power is the ability to satisfy the real needs of people. Therefore Huey often hired individuals who were frankly opposed to him politically, because he thought that they knew their jobs. They would tell him that they would serve under him on the condition that he gave them a political *carte blanche* - to which Huey would agree. At the same time, Huey used political patronage to great effect, and would award important posts to his intimates, trade posts for favors, or create new posts to fill with his own people.

To raise money for his projects, Huey decided to print bonds. Those had to pass the House, and early on, that was trouble. Huey was aware of the obvious - namely, that money is only a tool and a political fiction, and that credit for the purposes of useful production - particularly of infrastructure - will always redeem itself in the long run. The state oligarchical powers, however, 1) liked the status quo and hated the idea of giving any power to the underclass; 2) detested Huey and opposed him on principle; 3) hated the idea of giving Huey's government any money and power; 4) were afraid of debt - the bankers with their national central banks may be able to print their stuff, but if a state falls into debt, it may end up having to tax its oligarchy.

In their strategy, approach, and outlook, the oligarchs shot themselves in the foot. They thought that they could control Huey - and they were wrong. Moreover, their blind opposition played into the hands of Huey, who could gain popular support by lambasting their efforts to sabotage his eminently sensible projects. Had they given a few concessions, the Louisiana patricians could have, if not controlled, at least appeased Huey - and more importantly, his backing. Instead, they radicalised the population and ultimately surrendered the state to the Kingfish. The last point was well understood by Roosevelt. The smart oligarchy must make concessions when the power structure of society demands it, or risk utter obliteration.

Huey's first major program was to be that of road-building. In 1928, Louisiana had (p. 318), according to optimistic figures, 296 miles of concrete roads, 35 miles of asphalt roads, and 5,728 miles of gravel roads. The Highway Commission under Huey put the figures at a combined 96 miles of completed concrete-asphalt roads, with 24 more miles under construction. In the era of what Germany invented but America made its symbol, the automobile, those figures were a disgrace.

Now, the traditional - and ill-founded - manner of building roads in Louisiana was - pay-as-you-build, the money coming from license and gasoline taxes. How well this system worked, we have already seen. Huey wanted to sell state bonds, build the roads now, and pay them over time. This is a chicken and egg problem - to collect gasoline taxes, one must have cars, which need roads. Huey's approach was the modern approach, and the correct approach, and would be adopted in the future by both Roosevelt and Eisenhower, whose combined presidencies (along, one supposes, with the Truman interregnum) marked the height of America's prosperity in the 20th century.

As the reader probably realizes, the Huey method became doubly relevant after the balloon popped in 1929, and remains relevant during today's crisis, which is furthermore complicated by the derivative clog of the credit system.

Huey decided to ask for a small amount (\$30 million) of bonds at first. The resulting roads he would use to whip up public support for his program.

Another notable Huey effort was his literary program. A few days after gaining office, Huey proposed a \$750,000 free-books-for-children bond issue. To get the money, Huey proposed to raise the

severance tax (a tax on the extraction of natural resources, i.e. a tax on Big Business). Of course, this got him into another battle with Standard Oil.

Follows an anecdote:

(p. 326-327) ... When Huey went to New Orleans to appear before the bankers, he found himself facing some embarrassed men. They finally told him, after much hemming and hawing, that they did not think Board of Liquidation loans were any longer legal [because of a suit against Huey's 'free-books,' for which he was seeking short term funding]. That refusal struck him with dismay. But in a moment he recovered his audacity. Rising, he said that he would be guided by their decision. Board of Liquidation loans were illegal - but the state already owed almost a million dollars of such loans and if they were illegal, the state was not going to repay them. He waited, but none of the bankers spoke. He walked slowly from the room, but no one came after him.

He went to a nearby restaurant and sat down at a table. He was sure that his bluff had not worked. When a waiter came up, he ordered a sandwich. At this moment one of the bankers entered. "Governor," he said, "Let's stop this talk where it is. We voted to make you the loan."

"When can I have it?" Huey asked. "Right now," assured the banker. Huey's exultant mood returned. Just then the waiter came with the sandwich. "Take back the sandwich," Huey commanded. "Fry me a steak."

Sometime after acquiring the governorship, Huey adopted the moniker "Kingfish." When on the phone, he would open with "This is the Kingfish." The nickname stuck.

Another notable efforts of Huey's was his construction of the new, modern Governor Mansion and Louisiana State Capitol buildings. The two edifices replaced old-fashioned, largely decrepit relics. The State Capitol building in particular was among the tallest and proudest in America in its time, a symbol of Huey's vision of Louisiana, and remains in use today. A life-sized statue of Huey was erected in front of the building after the murder.

Though he made his brother Earl his henchman, Huey was not excessively close to his family, and in particular avoided giving family members patronage so as not to attract unnecessary accusations of corruption.

Huey likely had an affair with his secretary. But it was his obsession with politics, more than anything else, that drove him apart from his wife. The two never formally separated, but Huey was not what one would call a great family man. He felt - justifiably, as history would show - oppressed by time.

Though he had gone to the church as a child, Huey had no time for religion as governor. As further evidence that he was no demagogue, consider the following, in regard to smear attacks on the Democratic 1928 Catholic presidential candidate Smith: (p. 344) "I have no patience with two-bit ministers who are injecting religion into this campaign; and we are going to find out if this is a free country and whether right or bigotry is the stronger." Later, Huey would say something the lines of "I don't need any preacher to tell me what's written in the Bible."

Huey's first year had gone well. The effort and the success began to get into his head, and he began to think himself invincible. The harder they fall! And Huey almost fell into the abyss, when the impeachment hit him.

The calamity came in March 1929. Huey proposed to raise the taxes on refining petroleum. The Louisiana patricians, by now aroused to the threat which Huey posed, decided that was the last straw. Governor Long would have to go. Some charges were trumped up, and the impeachment pro-

cess began. Huey was (p.383) "shaken to the core." For a brief while, he fell into a state of "mental paralysis." Soon enough, he picked himself up, and counter-attacked. He said that his impeachers were agents of Standard Oil (which was not literally true, though Standard certainly backed the effort against him), and that he would fight them to the last. Circulars carrying the message went to every corner of Louisiana.

In the end, Huey got out the fix with the famous "Round Robins." Those were documents signed by state senators who declared themselves against the impeachment. Huey coaxed, intimidated, and bribed enough senators to render the impeachment proceedings - which needed a two-thirds majority - irrelevant. The process collapsed. Of course, Huey's opponents had engaged in a similar effort (though without a "Round Robin"), replete with bribery - but they were not good enough. The episode affected Huey. He became more ruthless and more unforgiving. He never forgot the men who had helped him out, and nor did he forget those who had tried to impeach him.

The failure of the impeachment signalled to all that Huey was the master of the state not only in name but in reality. He rode the momentum of his success, and accelerated his program. He built bridges, which New Orleans and swampy Louisiana sorely needed. He passed the roads bonds bills, and set up literacy programs. He built hospitals, and turned LSU from a "third-rate" college into a state-of-the-art public university. Or, as Huey put it:

(p. 518) Frederick the Great was "the greatest sonofabitch who ever lived," Senator Huey Long volunteered to some Washington reporters one day in 1935. He then related an episode in the life of the Prussian ruler. Frederick had decided to seize the Austrian capital Vienna. His ministers were horrified. They told him that he could not take the city, for if he did he would shock world opinion. But "Old Fred" was not deterred. "The hell I can't," he said. "My soldiers will take Vienna and my professors at Heidelberg will explain the reasons why." The Kingfish of Louisiana paused to observe the effect of his story. "Hell," he chortled, "I've got a university down in Louisiana that cost me \$15,000,000, that can tell you why I do like I do."

In reality, Huey was returning the favor that LSU had bestowed on him years ago, in the form of the debating award scholarship, and, moreover, he was giving his people access to college education. Apart from that, Huey enjoyed having his own football team and music band.

In 1930, Huey ran against Ransdell for the senatorship. The time had come for a move to Washington. Louisiana would remain his fiefdom, but the greater stage beckoned him. Huey turned the senatorial election into a vote of support for his programs - and won. One bizarre development prevented him from going to Washington in April 1931, when his term began - he had fallen out with his lieutenant-governor, Paul Cyr (1878-1946) - and the moment Huey left the state, Cyr would assume power as acting governor. And so Huey stuck to his post until early 1932.

But before he could depart, Huey had to entrench his position in Louisiana. To do this, he nominated his pal and henchman O.K. Allen for governor in 1931, and won the race for him. Earl, who would later become governor on three occasions, was not entirely happy. Of O.K. Allen the Governor, it is said that one time he was signing Huey's bills in his office, and the wind blew a piece of paper from the outside onto Allen's desk, and O.K. got his pen and signed the piece of paper.

In his four years as governor, during the Great Depression, Huey had managed to accomplish

(p. 574) ...the construction of roads and bridges, an increase in the facilities of the charity hospitals in New Orleans and Shreveport, the improvements and humanizing of services in state hospitals for victims of mental disorders and epilepsy, the expansion of Louisiana State University and the creation of its medical school, the founding of night schools for illiterates, the furnishing of free books to school children, the enlargement of the port of New Orleans, the bringing on natural gas to New Orleans, the construction of one of the largest airports in the country at New Orleans, and the erection of the new capitol.

Under the Kingfish, the state had built 1,583 miles of concrete roads, 718 of asphalt roads, and 2,816 miles of gravel roads. It had constructed 111 bridges, many of them major. Huey's improvement of the Charity Hospital in New Orleans had increased the institution's capacity from 1600 to 3800 beds, and had reduced its death rate by 30%. The governor also improved the conditions at Angola, the great penitentiary, today the largest in the United States.

All of this had been accomplished very efficiently - (p. 579) "Of the 24 states that kept records of combined [per-capita government cost], Louisiana was third from the lowest, bettered only by Virginia and Oklahoma, neither of which supported such an extensive road, educational, or welfare program."

Moreover, the taxes in Louisiana rose only by an annual average of 2.2%, while the average increases in all other states were 4.7%.

The efforts had vastly increased the Louisiana state debt - from \$11 million to over \$100 million - but the roads and the hospitals would pay for those millions in time. The question is, what is more important - the imaginary numbers on the bankers' ledges - or the well-being of the people? The objection that Huey's efforts meant that some other state somewhere else would be unable to build stuff, was aptly answered by the Great Depression, during which ignorant - or malicious - politicians everywhere tried to "balance their budgets," and the factories stood empty, and nobody built anything.

Senator

(p. 582) On the morning of January 25, before he went to the Senate, Huey had received reporters in his suite. He was clad only in violent pink pajamas and was smoking a cigar. ... One of the reporters asked how their host should be addressed, as governor or senator? Huey leaned back in his chair and puffed at his cigar. "They call me Kingfish down there," he said.

During his first day at the Senate, Huey oversaw discussion over a bill for the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which would lend (taxpayer) money to business concerns in the skids. As the reader can see, TARP is an old thing indeed - certainly much older than a mere 80 years. Huey voted for an amendment proposing that the salaries of officials in corporations which borrowed from the RFC should be capped. The bill failed.

True to his colors, Huey allied with the progressive elements of the Senate - both democrats and republicans (Huey, as a southerner, was a democrat). From the moment he found his feet, Huey propounded his favorite ideas - share the wealth, curb the power of Big Business, create infrastructure projects, and so on. He became increasingly vocal and dominant as he imposed his personality on the Senate. In the meanwhile, he overlooked things in Louisiana, and created the genesis of his planned presidential campaign, by setting up the nation-wide "Share Our Wealth" organization.

Said Huey on April 4,

(p. 586) The Senate was considering a message from the President [Hoover] on the necessity of economizing on the costs of government and balancing the budget. Huey contemptuously ignored the message and the remarks of his colleagues on it. If this Congress did not enact legislation to provide for a redistribution of wealth, he warned, there would be no need to worry about a deficit. The country would face a much larger and more dangerous problem - revolution. "You want to enforce the law, you want to balance the budget?" he asked acidly. "I tell you that if in any country I live in, despite every physical and intellectual effort I could put forth, I should see my children starving and my wife starving, its laws against robbing and against stealing... would not amount to any more to me than they would to any other man, when it came to facing the time of starvation." The wealthy classes were complaining that the effort of the progressives

to secure higher income and inheritance taxes was a "soak the rich" campaign. "It is no campaign to soak the rich," he cried. "It is a campaign to save the rich. It is a campaign the success of which they will wish for when it is too late."

How, he asked at the climax of his speech, could senators be concerned with a balanced budget when they saw what was happening to the old dream of America as a land of free men? "This great and grand dream of America that all men are created free and equal, and endowed with the inalienable right of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness," he thundered, "this great dream of America, this great light, and this great hope, have almost gone out of sight in this day and time, and everybody knows it; and there is a mere candle flicker here and yonder to take the place of what the great dream of America was supposed to be."

Huey's speech merits attention, because it is as vital today as it was in 1932. The same process is taking place. The threat of revolution was real in the 1930s, and is becoming real in our own time. And should a revolution occur, it will not be a joyous singing revolution of patriots and "socialists" - more likely, it will be a fascist revolution replete with a demagogic dictator, maybe a military man, maybe a banker puppet.

The speech, which even the most radical progressives would not have dared make, turned Huey into a celebrity. From then, his star would only rise higher.

One of Huey's more amusing achievements was his 1932 campaign in support of the re-election of Senator Hattie Caraway (1878-1950, Senator 1931-1945) of Arkansas, who had succeeded her husband's seat upon the latter's death. Huey went through Arkansas like "a circus hitched to a tornado," replete with Huey's newest trick (first employed two years earlier in a pre-determined race) - sound trucks; and lo and behold, Caraway carried the race having been counted out of it. Of course, the real winner was Huey. He supported Caraway for a number of reasons: he liked her, since she shared his views; he enjoyed helping the "underdog"; which also helped his image; in the event of victory, Caraway would become a faithful ally in the Senate; he could test his techniques and his influence away from home in a safe Southern state. The play was a complete success. Caraway was the first woman ever elected to Senate.

Apart from Caraway, Huey picked a man of his - John Overton (1875-1948, Senator 1933-1948) - for the second Louisiana senatorial position, when the post came up for grabs.

After the Caraway campaign, Huey repeated the exercise in a somewhat grander fashion, by supporting Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Here Huey's motives were utterly different. He wanted to take sides, and Roosevelt's side was the only one available. Huey met FDR on Sunday, October 9, 1932. Huey's opinion of FDR was: (p. 632) "I like him. He's not a strong man, but he means well. But by God, I feel sorry for him. He's got even more sonsofbitches in his family than I got in mine."

Huey used the opportunity to test his popularity in the northwest. In North Dakota, he found out, people liked him. Things were looking up for the 1936 elections. But 1936 was a long time away. Roosevelt was elected in November, and Huey met him again in December. After the meeting, Huey was less enthusiastic than the previous time. Roosevelt had politely listened to the Kingfish's proposals, and had replied "Fine! Fine!" Huey began to have second thoughts. In time, undoubtedly due to a personality clash - Huey could not stand to be in Roosevelt's shadow, and FDR was worried about Huey's great political potential - great enough to threaten FDR's re-election - the two men would split.

Curiously, Huey opposed the famous Glass-Steagall banking bill - not because he disagreed with its contents, but because he thought the bill did not go far enough. Huey wanted to (p. 652) "prohibit a national bank from establishing a branch bank anywhere except in the town where it was already located." He cried out against the big banks, and followed his opening salvo with a four and a half

hour filibuster. On the morrow, Huey resumed his performance. The circus went on for a week. In the end, Huey managed to restrict the opening of branches to states, which allowed the opening of such branches. At the time there were only 9 such states - of course, the banks quickly took care of that problem, and now we have "Too Big to Fail."

It should be realized that Long was not *against* the Glass-Steagall bill - he merely used the opportunity to shift the spotlight to himself, and moreover, he was right in claiming that Glass-Steagall alone was not enough. Then as now, Glass-Steagall (separation of investment and check-deposit banking) was an absolutely necessary measure for getting out of the crisis, but not a sufficient one. In fact, in the end Huey voted with the majority for passing the bill.

Huey also fought for concessions to the veterans of World War I - he may not have fought in the war, but he appreciated the sacrifices of those who did. Of course, it can be claimed that Huey merely wanted the veteran vote - but then, one could make such a claim for any popular political manoeuvre.

FDR's move in providing *federal* jobs in the states angered Huey, because it cut into Huey's political patronage. It was one of the issues precipitating the break between the President and the Kingfish. Huey complained that Roosevelt had "lied to him" in regard to the de-centralization of wealth scheme.

In the end, Roosevelt was the one to initiate the break. He had said, after Huey supported him at the Chicago Democratic Convention, that (p. 672) "It's all very well for us to laugh over Huey. But actually we have to remember all the time that he really is one of the two most dangerous men in the country." The other man was General Douglas MacArthur.

And so, in 1933, a combined federal government-banker assault struck Huey. The Morgan-dominated newspapers ravaged him, and FDR tried to smash his patronage by supplanting it with federal counterparts. A suit was brought against Huey's allied fellow senator Overton, preventing him from assuming his seat. (p. 673) "[The smearing campaign] was one of the "most ferocious" assaults on a politician in American history, one writer claimed." Huey enjoyed the notoriety. He was used to it, and thought that any press is good press. Besides, Huey had created his own publicity machine, which tirelessly mailed newsletters and circulars. His "Share Our Wealth" organization was expanding rapidly. By 1935, it had nearly 5 million members - out of a population of about 125-130 million. Accounting for the proportion of children and blacks, and of people who were not officially members, but were sympathetic to the movement, this is an immense figure. It means that Huey, after a nation-wide campaign, would certainly have affected the presidential elections in 1936. He even stood the chance of winning - if not in 1936, then perhaps in 1940.

The Kingfish was popular among the blacks. He expressly invited blacks to his organization (though in segregated clubs), to the annoyance of the southern farmers. In the words of a black New York minister, (p. 736) "I address him as a man, and he addresses me as a man." Indeed, "The color question never comes up." Huey was also popular among the immigrants in New Orleans. One commented that (p. 737) "Huey must have liked people. He made these people feel important, and somebody should have."

On the prospect of a Ku Klux Klan leader visiting Louisiana, where the Klan had supporters, Huey said: (p. 738) "Quote me as saying that that Imperial bastard will never set foot in Louisiana, and that when I call him a sonofabitch I am not using profanity, but am referring to the circumstances of his birth." Huey added that should he step inside his state, the KKK leader would leave with "his toes turned up." The man chose not to go to Louisiana.

At the same time, Huey was ostensibly pro-segregation and favored leaving the question of whether negroes should vote to the separate states. This is an uncomplimentary position, but anything else would have been political suicide. Huey's poverty relief programs benefited the blacks - judge a man by what he does, not what he says. Speaking of which,

(p. 739) He felt a genuine sympathy for the material plight of the Negro. "Now, just a word about the poor Negroes," he said while he was governor. "They're here. They've got to be cared for. ... The poor Negroes have got to live, too." ... When a reporter asked him in 1935 how he would treat Negroes as President he answered: "Treat them just the same as anybody else, give them an opportunity to make a living." He added that Negroes should have "a chance to work and to make a living, and to get an education." The Negroes of Louisiana shared in the benefits of the Long program, such as the free schoolbooks, the enlarged facilities at the state hospitals, the public health services. Indeed, because they were poorer than the whites, they benefited more from the program. A homestead-exemption law exempted 77% of the homes of white people from taxation but 95% of the homes of Negroes. Huey realized the racial implications of his program. As one of his leaders explained his reasoning: "You can't help poor white people without helping Negroes. It has to be that way."

The privileges that Huey wanted to extend to Negroes might seem small to later generations, but for his time they were large, almost revolutionary, far more than any other Southern politician was willing to give. ... "I have been able to do a hell of a lot of things down there because I am Huey Long," he said once. "A lot of guys would have been murdered politically for what I've been able to do quietly for the niggers."

The black press in the South was universally pro-Long.

More revealing of Negro opinion, and moving in their simple eloquence, are the statements of Negroes who were young persons in Huey's time and who although they live in an era when Negroes enjoy greater rights than he dreamed of, yet think of him as one who prepared the way for that era. A man who acted as a chauffeur for state officials: "There was not a finer man. Nothing wrong with him. He always treated me fine." A laboring man: "He was fair to colored people, good to all poor people. He walked the land like Jesus Christ and left nothing undone." A schoolteacher: "We felt that he had no prejudices. He gave the Negroes and all poor people hope."

Huey was for the poor regardless of gender or race - and that is always the point - and he meant what he said - and, of course, he got crucified.

The New Deal elicited support from Huey, who, naturally, thought the program good but insufficient. This did not propitiate FDR, who regarded Huey as an enemy. Huey's own plan is elaborated in his book *My First Days in the White House*.

Unwilling to become isolated, Huey intended (perhaps metaphorically) to form a coalition government, with FDR as Secretary of the Navy, and Herbert Hoover as Secretary of Commerce. He would put fellow progressive senators in various posts. Notably, Huey's preferred Secretary of War was General Smedley Butler, the two-time Medal of Honor recipient and author of *War is a Racket*, which railed against the bankers in a tone comparable to Huey's.

Huey's main goal was the limiting of annual income for any one man to \$500,000, and of the inheritance received by any one man to \$1,000,000. Total wealth would be limited to \$5 million, to fall to \$2 million. Those were sizeable sums at the time, more than enough to allow a man to live in luxury and idleness for the duration of his natural life. It can not be stressed enough that this is not "communism." A man of the red persuasion would have wanted - in theory - to take *all* the money away. Nor is the idea really 'socialism.' If anything, it comes from the Bible - Hebraic Law. It is not stealing Rockefeller's honestly earned stuff - it is paying his workers what they really worked for. It is a democratic idea; it is common sense.

Moreover, Huey did not intend to simply give the money away to the people (though he did intend to set up a minimum annual income level of \$2,500 - so everyone would have enough to live). He intended to use the money to build up America - to pay the debt, to build the nation's roads and hospitals and universities, to provide adequate affordable housing for everybody; airports, dams,

canals - the works. He intended to do exactly what FDR, Eisenhower, and to an extent Kennedy and LBJ did imperfectly. Moreover, Huey could potentially have had the backing - from the common people - to do the job.

Naturally, one of Huey's main goals was the nationalization of the Federal Reserve in order to give the state the power of issuing credit. He expected a confrontation with the bankers. The tactic he had in mind amounted to convincing the bankers that the public would skin them alive if they did not comply - i.e. Huey intended to use the power of the state, in his capacity as the representative of the people, to pursue the people's interests. A radical, he certainly was. Moreover, Huey wanted to cajole the bankers and industrialists into presiding over his Share the Wealth projects true to their traditional role of masters of finance and industry. In other words, Huey wanted to reward them with prestige and public admirations - two potent tonics.

To get an idea of what Huey was not, observe that his patrician opponents called him a communist - some compared him to Lenin and Trotsky - and the communists (p. 798) called him a fascist. In fact, Huey was described as "fascist," or "demagogue" left and right. In reality, his power rested squarely on his popular support. Huey got where he got, because the people elected him - again and again and again and again. Hitler may have won one election, but that was it for him (though, to be fair, there were some interesting referendums in the Nazi era). Mussolini was never elected. Moreover, Hitler and Mussolini relied on secret police squads, while Huey did what he did in the open. Not only is the comparison between the Kingfish and the Duce and the Fuhrer utterly vapid, it is a piece of demagoguery in itself. Huey was not a fascist - he was elected, he was anti-war, and he was anti-corporate. He was not a dictator - he was a popular leader who aroused the sleeping "sheeple" (as Bill Cooper, who also got shot, called us) - and the bankers and their patrician cronies did not like that.

After some setbacks in 1933 and early 1934, Huey decided to secure Louisiana once and forever. That he did, with great zeal and some vengeance.

He increased the frequency and vehemence of his attacks on Roosevelt. On June 12, 1935, Huey conducted a fifteen hour filibuster. By then, he was regarded by many as the greatest orator in the nation. Huey's efforts, and the popularity of Share Our Wealth, forced Roosevelt's "turn to the left," though the turn did not last.

To be fair to Roosevelt, (p. 887) in late 1935, representatives of certain large banks and corporations approached Huey and offered to finance his efforts to dislodge FDR from the White House. They really hated FDR, and wanted to use Huey the way they had used Teddy Roosevelt when they got Woodrow Wilson elected.

By 1935, the Kingfish was at the height of his power and popularity. He had become too much of a threat.

Assassination

It became increasingly clear that Huey Long had to die. He had become too strong, and he had angered too many powerful people - Rockefeller, J.P. Morgan, the entire Louisiana oligarchy, FDR, and everyone with and behind them. Huey himself knew his time was running out. He became more frenetic and grimmer, and everywhere he went, a pack of bodyguards followed him.

On August 9, 1935, Huey told the Senate that he had uncovered a plot to murder him. Williams would find that Huey's claim that the conspirators had drawn lots for the privilege of slaying the Kingfish had been true, though the draw did not take place where Huey thought it had taken place. The conspirators also universally felt that they had Roosevelt's backing.

(p. 883) But another anti[-Long] leader related that there was a plot, one that Huey

and even the directors of the conference did not know of. "All the stories about the DeSoto conference are wrong," he claimed. "The real truth is that there were three rooms. The meeting I'm talking about was not the one reported in [Huey's transcript]. At this meeting there were five men." They had drawn straws to see which one of them would shoot Huey and much to his regret he had not got the short straw. "We would all have killed him," he said with relish.

But there is more to the story.

The inevitable happened on September 8, 1935. One Dr. Carl Weiss (1906-1935) approached Huey as the latter walked in the Capitol that he had built. Weiss reached to hit Huey, shots were fired, and a bullet found its way into Huey's stomach. Huey stumbled out of the building and found people to drive him to the nearest hospital. On the way he talked to himself - "I wonder why they shot me"... Back at the Capitol, Weiss had been filled with lead.

One of the first to arrive at the hospital was Dr. Arthur Vidrine, the superintendent of Charity Hospital in New Orleans. The man had been visiting the legislative session at the Capitol, and became the doctor in charge. Vidrine cut Huey, and, it was found later, made a subtle mistake. Initially, the operation was considered a success - yet Huey kept wilting. At six minutes after four on the morning of September 10, 1935, Huey died.

Weiss's young wife, the mother of his recently born child, could not fathom the man's motives for the alleged murder. He was young, healthy, successful, and the provider of a family. The day before, he had been (p. 911) "normal and happy." During the night, the doctor had gone out to a sick call - never to return. Whom had he met, and who had made the call? Leaving home, Weiss had taken a gun with him, which was found in the Capitol with two empty chambers.

Another version of the events claimed that one of the guards had shot Huey by mistake. The trauma had sent the man to a mental hospital.

Yet another version claimed that Weiss had struck Huey over an argument, and that the guards, in their zeal, had shot Huey. Some claimed that a guard had shot Huey deliberately, had then gone to Weiss's car, and had brought the doctor's gun upstairs. Weiss's gun was found a half hour after the tragedy occurred.

Williams felt that Weiss had done the dirty deed. He felt that Weiss was a mentally unstable fanatic.

So what really happened? I wondered for a long time, and decided that the oligarchs had bought one of the bodyguards. Nothing else made sense. Weiss certainly did not look the type.

It turned out that the truth was subtler. At some time after 2000, a web page entitled "Mardi Gras Secrets" appeared online. It has since vanished, but can be accessed via Internet archive sites.⁴

The document's introduction:

Mardi Gras Secrets by Mimi L. Eustis

This is a story of information given by my father Samuel Todd Churchill on his deathbed, concerning the secrets in the founding of The Mistick Krewe of Comus also called The Mystick Krewe of Comusa secret New Orleans Mardi Gras society established in 1857. In all fairness to my father, in case he took any blood oaths of secrecy, the information he revealed was done under heavy medication while dying of a very painful lung cancer disease inflicted upon him by years of heavy cigarette smoking. However, in all fairness to myself, I am not under any oaths of secrecy to any secret organizations. In fact, the information revealed by my father was contained for many years in a box in the attic. I never really intended to make this information public until very recently. It is the secret code numbers that he talked about that caused me to go to the attic and take out the tape recordings and my notes.

⁴For example here: <http://web.archive.org/web/20100110221653/http://www.mardigrassecrets.com/>, accessed December 10, 2011. Also - thanks to Henry Makow for mentioning the source.

When my father came back from the doctor with the news, he was dying of lung cancer and informed me of such, for some reason he told me to notice the date and time of his announcement. It was the 13th day of the 3rd month of the year, and it was exactly 3:00 PM. He made no further explanation. Today, I was informed by my doctor that I had 3 months to a maximum of 13 months to live as I was dying of breast cancer. I looked at the clock on the doctor's wall. It was exactly 3:00 PM. The numbers 3 and 13 began vibrating inside my brain. The tape recordings of my father's revelations and the secret code numbers that he revealed began to spark my memory of my father's dying revelations of the code numbers 3 and 13. And it's today I've decided to open these old attic boxes of secrets to the public.

My conversations with my father after he announced to me that he was dying of lung cancer began innocently enough. It started with him revealing some of his early sexual escapades. However, as he became more and more in pain and received more heavy medication, he began to reveal more details that are intimate. He would lapse in and out of consciousness and begin to talk in a subconscious state. It's then I decided to secretly place a tape recorder under his bed. His sexual revelations went from ordinary heterosexual affairs to his secret homosexual encounters. He tied the homosexual incidents to his membership into a secret elitist organization he labeled as Chapter 322 - the Brotherhood of Death. I discovered my father was a cross dresser and in order to proceed into higher stages in the secret organization, it was necessary for him to engage in sexual activities with certain male blood elitist members of Chapter 322.

It should be noted that I not only listened to the secret recordings of my father's deathbed revelations but also made extensive notes. Even though my father lapsed in and out of consciousness and talked in a subconscious state, his memory of names and dates can only be described as extraordinary and phenomenal. The following is a compilation of the recordings plus the notes.

Chapter 322 is Skull and Bones or a branch thereof.

Eustis explains that in 1857, a group of men, including 13 (a charged esoteric number) men from New Orleans, formed a secret society called "The Mystick Krewe of Comus." Some members were: S.M. Todd, L.D. Addison, J.H. Pope, Frank Shaw Jr., Joseph Ellison, and William P. Ellison. The men were agents of the banking powers, and wanted a front for Skull and Bones, which Eustis identifies as a branch of the Illuminati, and for the Rothschild faction of London.

Writes Eustis,

Before the Civil War, on a per capita basis, New Orleans was the wealthiest city in America. Drawn by the rich cotton and sugar plantations, abundant trade and thriving port, Americans came seeking their fortunes. From the city's earliest days, New Orleans had close ties to the money centers of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, London and Paris. The House of Rothschild's English bankers began living full time in New Orleans in the early 1800s. In 1857, Judah Benjamin was an agent of the House of Rothschild living in New Orleans. His job was to fund the Confederacy and help foster a devastating Civil War. Judah Benjamin started in the Confederate government as Attorney General and later became Secretary of State. Judah Benjamin also became head of the Confederate intelligence and was a key player in the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

The three secret founders of the Mystick Krewe of Comus were Albert Pike, Judah Benjamin and John Slidell.

Albert Pike (1809-1891) is a notorious figure and a legend in conspiracy circles. He was a Southern general during the Civil War, and the head of American Masonry afterwards. Judah Benjamin (1811-1884) undoubtedly was a key British agent and instigator of the Civil War. Slidell (1793-1871) was a senator from Louisiana before the war and an influential Confederate diplomat during the war. After the war, Slidell and Benjamin retired in England.

Eustis related her views on the Lincoln assassination. She claims that after Booth murdered Lincoln, the body of one Captain James William Boyd was pushed forward as the body of John Wilkes Booth (who was a Mason and the rest of it). "Admiral G.W. Baird was set-up to identify the body of Captain James William Boyd as the body of John Wilkes Booth. After Captain James William Boyd was killed in Garrett's barn his - Captain James William Boyd's body was taken aboard the Montauk at the naval yard in Washington next to the Saugus. Lieut. W. Crowinshield called Admiral G. W. Baird on board the Montauk to falsify the identity of the body of Capt. James William Boyd as the body of John Wilkes Booth. After a farcical-fictitious inquest aboard the Montauk to falsify identification of Captain James William Boyd's body as that of John Wilkes Booth, Colonel Lafayette Baker and paid off deputies, dumped Captain James William Boyd's body into an Arsenal Prison sinkhole used to dump dead horses."

Could it have been done? It is fair to say that, yes. Did it really happen that way? The reader can decide for himself.

Furthermore, "My father Samuel Todd Churchill said that Caleb Cushing participated in the Killing of the King ritual by poisoning with arsenic United States President William Henry Harrison on April 4, 1841. Caleb Cushing was also involved in poisoning by arsenic of United States President Zachary Taylor on July 5, 1850." The second statement checks with Michael Parenti's theory mentioned above and found in *History as Mystery*.

And finally, Huey:

My father Samuel Todd Churchill had much to say about the assassination of U.S. Senator Huey P. Long - the Kingfish. My father claimed that there were many players in the Illuminati-Skull and Bones-New World Order-plans to murder and eliminate Huey Long's Share the Wealth Program. My father stated that to understand the hidden mystery behind the assassination of Huey P. Long, one must first start with the creation of Skull and Bones at the Tulane University School of Medicine. My father stated repeatedly on his deathbed that Huey Long did not die from the gunshot wound but from the hands of a New World Order-Illuminati-Rhodes scholar - Dr. Arthur Vidrine.

The Skull and Bones Society was established in secret at Tulane University in New Orleans in October 1907. Dr. Isadore Dyer was one of the founding members. Dr. Isadore Dyer was a graduate of Yale University and was a member of the Berzellus secret society at Yale. This Brezellus secret society is a sister Yale member of Chapter 322-Skull and Bones-the Brotherhood of Death. The Skull and Bones Society at Tulane University states that one man from each class 1907-1908-1909-1910 had been selected, and their identity would be kept secret until the tenth anniversary of the founding of the organization. As a matter of record, the identity of the other members of Skull and Bones has never been revealed. A key player of this Tulane University Skull and Bones chapter was Dr. Rudolph Matas. All the doctors involved in the founding of the Tulane University Skull and Bones were secret members of the New Orleans Mystick Krewe of Comus. They had all pledge themselves to blood oaths of secrecy and were committed to the Illuminati's plan for a New World Order. Dr. Rudolph Matas was to play a very special role in the Huey P. Long assassination.

Dr. Rudolph Matas in his capacity as a professor at Tulane University had contact and supervision over Huey P. Long's alleged assassin Dr. Carl Austin Weiss and Dr. Carl Weiss's future wife, Yvonne Pavy. Dr. Carl Austin Weiss was selected by doctor Rudolph Matas to travel and to study in Paris, France and Austria. Dr. Carl Weiss spoke fluent French and German. Through Dr. Rudolph Matas Dr. Carl Weiss was incorporated secretly into the cell of the Illuminati. Dr. Rudolph Matas also selected Yvonne Pavy, the future wife of Doctor Carl Austin Weiss, to also travel to Paris, France to unknowingly meet members of the Illuminati stationed in Paris. This is a part of the Illuminati

stage of drama. Dr. Rudolph Matas as an Illuminati head could steer and manipulate the lives of people. The power of the Illuminati to influence and bring about potential marriages and sexual relations is part of their mode of operandi. Moreover, as my father Samuel Todd Churchill stated doctors and the medical profession were always needed to play various roles in the assassinations of U.S. political leaders.

My father Samuel Churchill Todd stated that Dr. Carl Austin Weiss was ordered to go to the state capitol of Baton Rouge by his Illuminati-Skull and Bones handlers with the following instructions; Dr. Carl Austin Weiss was ordered to strike Huey Long in the face with his fist. My father emphasized again it was like a stage play or drama. His controller director Illuminati Skull and Bones ordered Dr. Carl Austin Weiss to perform a function. Dr. Carl Austin Weiss had to perform this function or suffer the consequences of death to his newly born baby.

My father Samuel Churchill Todd stated that Huey Long's bodyguard Murphy Roden was a spy for J. Edgar Hoover and had orders to shoot Huey Long and Dr. Carl Austin Weiss after Weiss had struck Long in the face. My father stated it was no accident that over 60 bullets were pumped into the body of Dr. Carl Austin Weiss.

U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had reached level code 33. Franklin Delano Roosevelt participated and conspired with 33rd level J. Edgar Hoover to perform and complete the ritual "killing of the king-Kingfish-U.S. Senator Huey P. Long. Both Franklin D. Roosevelt and J. Edgar Hoover by their participation and completion of the killing of the kingfish U.S. Senator Huey P. Long were made secretly Kings of the Mystick Krewe of Comus. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was King of Comus in 1937. J. Edgar Hoover became a secret King of the Mystick Krewe of Comus later. When J. Edgar Hoover came down to New Orleans to act out his reign as King of Comus, he - J. Edgar Hoover was involved in a sexual revelry of homosexuality and cross-dressing with various elitist bloodline members of the Mystick Krewe of Comus.

Obviously, either 1) the document is genuine, or 2) some well-read conspiracy researcher constructed an elaborate hoax.

How much of this can we check?

We have seen that the Illuminati did exist, Skull and Bones does exist and is likely a branch of the Illuminati, and that both groups are adept at manipulating people and gaining power.

Vidrine was a cadre of Tulane and Oxford, and was a Rhodes Scholar. Because of his loyalty, Vidrine was Huey's choice for the position of superintendent of Louisiana State University Medical School. Did Vidrine make a mistake on purpose?

Weiss's son has looked into the matter, and has defended his father. "Weiss was shot on the spot by Long's bodyguards. One argument made in that program [TV show, on which Weiss's son appeared] revolves around the ballistics evidence. Long died from either a .38 caliber or a .45 caliber bullet consistent with the bodyguard's ammunition, while Dr. Weiss actually owned a .32 caliber gun which was not seen by anyone at the scene at the time of the confrontation."⁵ The doctor's parents also maintained that their son was innocent.

But there is more. Recent entries into the Who killed Huey Long? literature effectively exonerate Weiss. (emphasis mine)

Controversy, mystery still surround the death of Huey P. Long

Robert Travis Scott, *The Times-Picayune*, September 08, 2010⁶

... "I don't believe that he fired a fatal shot or indeed that he carried a gun into the state Capitol that night," Carl Weiss Jr. said of his father during a Baton Rouge symposium recently. "I don't think my father was a bad apple."

...

Huey Long's life insurance policy made the news in 1985. Prompted by the publicity

⁵http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carl_Weiss, Dec 10, 2011.

⁶http://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2010/09/controversy_mystery_still_surr.html, Dec 11, 2011

surrounding the 50th anniversary of Long's shooting, MONY Life Insurance Co. released a report filed by its Bureau of Investigation on Nov. 9, 1936, to look into the cause of the senator's death. ... Probing the immediate cause of death, the report came to startling conclusions: "There is no doubt that Weiss attacked Long, but there is considerable doubt that Weiss ever fired a gun. ... There is no doubt that his death was accidental, but **the consensus of more informed opinion is that he was killed by his own guard and not by Weiss.**"

...

In 1986, Louisiana political analyst and public relations consultant Ed Reed offered a blockbuster interpretation with his book, "Requiem for a Kingfish: The Strange and Unexplained Death of Huey Long."

The traditional view of the shooting was that a single bullet from Weiss' gun ran through Long's abdomen. Using hospital and FBI records and interviews, Reed focused on the theory that at least two bullets were fired into Long's body. He examined the medical procedures in the Our Lady of the Lake Hospital operating room, which during the surgery was crowded with Long's political allies and doctors arriving from New Orleans and elsewhere to assist with the emergency care.

Reed provides evidence that Long's urine was checked repeatedly, contrary to the popularized notion that the lead doctor, Coleman Vidrine, had failed to check for fatal signs of urinary bleeding. But more importantly, Reed says **the doctors that night pulled a bullet out of Long's body and did not report it. A second bullet was left in the body, he claimed.**

The most significant evidence presented for this theory is a story related by Merle Welsh, the funeral director who served as mortician for both Weiss and Long. In an interview with Reed 50 years after the incident, Welsh said one of the operating room doctors came to the funeral home late at night, reopened Long's sutures and probed the corpse until he pulled out a bullet. Reed tracked down the funeral home assistant who claimed to have the bullet on a key ring as a memento.

Soon after the release of Reed's book, the writer Zinman also interviewed Welsh and heard essentially the same story but said the mortician, then in his 80s, was clearly losing his memory.

Reed backed up his two-shots theory with several references. If true, his version of events suggests that someone other than Weiss may have fired a shot or two into Long. A bodyguard? An unidentified assassin? Reed couldn't say for sure, but he concluded that **the official theory of the shooting "must now be relegated to that graveyard of hoaxes, frauds and fairy tales."**

Also of interest is the following:

Long's alleged assassin wasn't armed⁷

Jim Beam, *Lake Charles American Press*, 8/15/99

BATON ROUGE – Dr. Carl Weiss, the man who allegedly gunned down U.S. Sen. Huey P. Long in 1935, threw a punch and hit the controversial former Louisiana governor on the lip, but Weiss was unarmed at the time, according to Dr. Donald A. Pavy of New Iberia.

Pavy is the author of "Accident and Deception: The Huey Long Shooting," which is published by Cajun Publishing of New Iberia. The book concludes that Long was accidentally shot by one of his own bodyguards, probably Joe Messina. Pavy's work joins others that dispute the official findings in the killing of Long on the night of Sept. 8, 1935.

Dr. Pavy is the nephew of Judge Benjamin Henry Pavy, one of the leading anti-Long

⁷http://www.louisiana101.com/ideashuey_story1.html, Dec 11, 2011.

political figures during Long's heyday. The judge's daughter and Dr. Pavy's first cousin, Yvonne, was married to Dr. Carl Austin Weiss, the alleged assassin of Long.

Weiss was in the Capitol corridor where Long was shot, but Pavy says he was only there to confront Long about how unfairly he treated others.

"... After the third very rough rebuff, Weiss, frustrated, lost his composure, screamed at Long and hit him on the lip. A scuffle occurred and Weiss was hit by bodyguard Elliot Coleman," Dr. Pavy said. "One bodyguard, probably Messina (a nervous type), always close and often in the rear of Huey, pulled his gun, which hung up in the holster and misfired, striking Huey in the back"

Pavy isn't the first writer to blame a bodyguard for Huey Long's death. Ed Reed, author of "Requiem for a Kingfish: The Strange and Unexplained Death of Huey Long" in 1986, said Murphy Roden, who was trained to react immediately, fired at Weiss at close range and the bullet struck Long, "possibly even passing through Weiss' body before hitting Long."

Reed insists Weiss was armed when he went to the Capitol that night, but had no plans to shoot Long. In any case, Reed said, Weiss never got close enough to shoot before he was gunned down by Long's bodyguards.

Pavy insists Weiss had no gun with him in the capitol. He said it was retrieved from Weiss' car and placed there after the shooting, "but only after crime photos had been taken." Dr. Tom Ed Weiss, Carl Weiss' brother, said he saw his brother's car in front of the capitol and a gun in a sock in the glove pocket. The car had been moved later, was ransacked and the gun was missing, he said.

...

Dr. Pavy reprints an affidavit from Francis C. Grevemberg, who was superintendent of State Police under the late Gov. Robert F. Kennon, 1952-1956. Grevemberg related how the shooting of Long came up during a conversation among four troopers accompanying Grevemberg on a casino raid.

Grevemberg said the troopers told how Weiss' gun had been taken from his car after the shooting.

"And then I made a mistake," Grevemberg said. "I said, 'It appears to me that all of the actions following the shooting were a conspiracy to cover up the accidental death of Sen. Long and the killing of Dr. Weiss.'"

"After I made that unfortunate statement, the bodyguards became very quiet."

...

Pavy said he also spoke to members of the Murphy Roden family, who said they understand Roden accidentally shot Long, and the son of Vernon McGee, a reporter who was an eyewitness to the shooting.

To summarize:

- 1) The evidence indicates that Weiss was a patsy rather than a killer. Eye-witness accounts claim that Weiss had no gun. Furthermore, one has to gravely doubt the notion that a young family man would go on a suicide mission on his own. At the same time, someone probably pulled some strings on Weiss in order to get him to hit Huey. I urge the reader to think of the 1932 Lindbergh baby kidnapping. Senator Charles August Lindbergh (1859-1924, the baby's grandfather) had been one of the most vociferous American high-profile critics of banking power of the 20th century.
- 2) If Weiss did not shoot Huey, then one of the guards did - perhaps incidentally, but more likely deliberately. The two key suspects are Joe Messina - Huey's long time personal bodyguard - and Murphy Roden. Of the two, Roden is the likely culprit, though Messina may also have been involved.
- 3) The evidence against Vidrine is extremely damning. Coupled with his convenient appearance at the hospital and his Rhodes Scholar status, I think we have enough to condemn the man.

What of Hoover and Roosevelt? Hoover was indeed an avid Mason, and he was a cross-dresser,

and he was a homosexual. This is more or less common knowledge by now. Moreover, Hoover was a thug and he did use his FBI to massacre, say, the Black Panthers. This was established by the Senate Church Committee in the 1970s, and is official history. It should be understood that 1) the FBI is not exactly evil - but it could be used for evil by its leader; 2) the Black Panthers were demolished not because they were "Marxist" or black, but because they managed to organize one of the underclasses of America. Many JFK murder researchers have fingered Hoover as one of the participants (perhaps indirect) of the assassination. The man Hoover was a basket case, an extremely sinister personality, and much more dirt will emerge on him as the years pass.

Roosevelt is a strange character. What we do know is that: he was a serious Mason; he was very close to the 120 Broadway banker gang, which financed both Hitler and the Bolsheviks (see next section); his V.P. during World War II (succeeded in January 1945 by Truman) was Henry A. Wallace, a Mason and an all-round occultist fanatic; he filled his cabinet with a gaggle of Skull and Bones / Wall Street / intelligence services operatives - Henry L. Stimson, John J. McCloy, Robert A. Lovett, Harvey H. Bundy, etc. Tarpley, who is something of an expert of Roosevelt, as well as a great admirer of the man, claims that Roosevelt was a swell fellow and that he was blackmailed into inviting the Wall Street operatives into his cabinet. But more on FDR in the next section.

Eustis also wrote that

Huey Long's Brother George Shannon "Shan" Long assisted the assassination of U.S. Senator Huey P. Long. George Shannon Long was a member of Tulsa Lodge #425 and a 32 degree. George S. Long as the brother of slain Huey Long assured that no autopsy would take place. George S. Long also played a key role in dumping tons of cement over Huey Long's coffin. This would make it almost impossible to exhume Huey Long's body at a later date. George S. Long also played a key role in manipulating and mind controlling Huey Long's son Russell Billiu Long. George S. Long was also able to guide Russell Long into the U.S. Senate as a puppet of his father's killers - Standard Oil - John D. Rockefeller. George S. Long became a U.S. Representative from Louisiana 8th District, 1953-58. George S. Long died in office in 1958 in the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

What can we verify? From Wikipedia's page on Shan:⁸

[Shan] was a Baptist, Mason, Shriner, and member of the Kiwanis Club [another large semi-secret society].

...

Bill Dodd [(1909-1991), notable Louisiana politician] said... "George Shannon Long was as phony as a three-dollar bill, and most everyone but George knew he was a bag of wind. But on paper or before a group of strangers, his speeches were superimpressive. Earl once told me that 'Shan' [short for "Shannon"] was 'a ship without a rudder, he's like a child who doesn't know right from wrong. He's a congenital thief.' And I believe Earl was right. George Long was smart, and he could have, with his several gifts, been the greatest of the Longs. But he had a screw or two loose and couldn't pull it all together."

...Once the commissioner of administrator, J.H. Rester, showed Dodd, who was acting governor while Earl Long was out of state, that George Long "had purchased building materials and charged them to the state, yet had used the materials to construct a private dwelling for himself. He had a lot of other stuff that he said showed Dr. Long to be a crook and thief.

There is one more angle to the Huey Long story - the smearing campaign which followed Huey's demise. The core of that campaign was Robert Penn Warren's (1905-1989) novel *All the King's Men* (1946). The novel is, essentially, a fictionalized account of Huey's life. It propounds the idea that Huey was a demagogue and that Weiss was the murderer. Stylistically, the work is an inferior

⁸http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_S._Long, Dec 11, 2011.

attempt at emulating Raymond Chandler's hard-boiled detective stories.

What strikes one is that 1) Robert Penn Warren was a Rhodes Scholar, and that 2) his novel received the Pulitzer. Moreover, the 1949 motion picture adaptation of the novel - which I have seen, and which - I think fairly, despite my obvious bias - I found to be poor cinema - won the Academy Award. A second, star-studded adaptation was released in 2006. I have not been able to make myself watch this second smear job. As the memory of Huey has faded, Warren's fictionalized account *has overshadowed the real story*. Indeed, I only turned to examining Huey *after* reading Warren's book. Curiously enough, Warren studied in Italy under Mussolini with a Guggenheim fellowship. Vanderbilt University has a "Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities."

Another notable smear job is the 1995 Turner Network Television hundred-minute piece *Kingfish*. It portrays Huey as an utter degenerate opportunist.

There has been a deliberate design of destroying Huey's memory - replete with our Rhodes Scholar friends.

So, yes - the Oligarchs murdered Huey, and they made the murder look like a classic "lone nut" affair. They then proceeded to destroy the memory of the man. He is now out of the history books, except as an example of the danger of "American fascism." Warren's despicable hackjob is considered classic American literature. That is how much they hated the man - and well they did, for Long had them figured out and was coming after them.

Huey Long's last words were (Williams, p. 920) "God, don't let me die. I have so much to do."

Overview and Conclusions

The Long story is a high tragedy, a classic example of history trumping fiction in even the dramatic sense. In regard to the themes of this book, Huey's life carries the following lessons:

1) The education of a person must start at home. Have the child read serious things at an early age, discuss politics with it, let it play with its siblings, let it explore, teach it to sing and to love music, help it find its feet.

2) Popular leaders do appear, and they can rally the people behind them, and they will be labelled "demagogues" and killed. Huey knew exactly what he was doing and what was going to happen to him, but he could not stray from the road before him. A similar fate befell Martin Luther King, who, shortly before dying, said that he knew what was coming, but would not stray. And so Huey and MLK (and to a certain extent the Kennedy brothers) have become martyrs. Their work has been largely destroyed. The people must realize that though messiahs do appear, the messiahs end up on the cross. No lone man, no matter how great, can save the people - they must save themselves.

3) Huey's political acumen also shows how the master "man of the people" politician must operate - he must be eloquent, daring and energetic. He must be realistic and know how to distribute political patronage, and how to use legal channels and popular power against his opponents. He must be highly aware of the power of the media, and use it appropriately. He must be a good man, but one who can hate that which is hateful.

4) The policies of Huey Long also show that the Great Depression need never have been as rough as it was. Then as now, the way out was clear - but the people had to demand responsibility from their leaders. Public infrastructure projects based on *public* credit work. Huey's long term ambition of installing the wealth-cap was most sensible, and is important in regard to the second great problem of economics - how to distribute the stuff that has been produced.

5) Huey's demise shows the obvious - that strong popular leaders will *always* be subject to assassination attempts. The problem here is that great leaders tend to be lone men. They can try to create a decentralized organization, which will survive their deaths - but nevertheless, without its leader, who is its soul, an organization is not the same. This, of course, is the ancient good king / bad king problem.

We should learn these lessons. Furthermore, I feel that it is important that people remember their heroes. And the heroes of America are not the Woodrow Wilsons and the J. Edgar Hoovers, but Huey Long and his likes. The people of American had no champion as great as Huey Long during the 20th century. The Kennedy brothers - Jack and Bobby - experienced a change of heart after 1962, and did what they could, and were slaughtered in semi-ritualistic fashion. But Huey was true from the beginning.

8.5 Wall Street and FDR

Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1882-1945, President 1933-1945) was by far the most popular American President of the 20th century, and the man who ostensibly carried the United States through the Great Depression and the Second World War. The only president to serve more than two terms, Roosevelt occupied the White House between March 4, 1933 and April 12, 1945. Credited with propounding the New Deal, and being the American Commander in Chief during the war, Roosevelt has been much reviled by certain "far-right" quarters, in particular by those enamoured with the "free-market," and has been an untouchable darling of the left for more than a half-century, not the least because of his support for "communist" Russia.

A great man and an interesting man; and what else can be said about him?

Of signal importance to understanding FDR is Antony Sutton's 1975 work *Wall Street and FDR*. Sutton wrote from a libertarian/ free-market loving perspective, but, at that, he was an extraordinarily honest and perceptive historian, and his work deserves respect.

Sutton's thesis (Ch.1): "This book portrays Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a Wall Street financier who, during his first term as President of the United States, reflected the objectives of financial elements concentrated in the New York business establishment." Above this statement lies the following quote:

The real truth of the matter is, as you and I know, that a financial element in the larger centers has owned the Government ever since the days of Andrew Jackson - and I am not wholly excepting the Administration of W.W. The country is going through a repetition of Jackson's fight with the Bank of the United States - only on a far bigger and broader basis.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to Col. Edward Mandell House, November 21, 1933, *F.D.R.: His Personal Letters* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce 1950), p. 373.

Colonel House, as we have seen, was the controller of Woodrow Wilson ("W.W."), and a key player at the Paris Peace Conference and in the founding of the CFR and the League of Nations.

Roosevelt was an aristocrat through and through. His was one of the oldest families in New York. The bloodline was ancient, and went to the Huguenots - and from thence to Rome! - on the Delano side. FDR's parents were, of course, cousins (6-th removed). His maternal grandfather, Warren Delano II, had made shiploads of cash with the 19th century China opium trade. Many of FDR's Delano cousins were bankers and industrialists. FDR's "Uncle Fred" (Frederic Adrian Delano) was a Federal Reserve board member, and - get this! - chairman of the League of Nations International Committee on opium production. Teddy Roosevelt (1858-1919, President 1901 -1909), the notorious imperialist and American president, was FDR's cousin. One Roosevelt branch had been into investment banking since the 18th century.

Franklin (Ch. 1) "shared common ancestry with one third of his predecessors in the White House." The young FDR enjoyed a princely upbringing. He went through Groton and Harvard. In college, like some of his fellow presidents, he was a "C" student. In 1902, Franklin met Eleanor Roosevelt, who was already a Roosevelt before she became his wife, and who was the niece of Teddy. Franklin

and Eleanor would marry in 1905. They were fifth cousins. The woman was a basket case in her own right, but we have no space for her.

Franklin passed the bar in 1907, and got a job with Carter Ledyard & Milburn, a top Wall Street firm serving Morgan interests. He joined the Freemasons in 1911.

Eleanor, who was not the greatest or most eager lover in the world, bore Franklin six children. By 1918, FDR had seduced his wife's private secretary, Lucy. The marriage almost disintegrated. Lucy and FDR stayed in touch for the duration of the latter's life. Indeed, Lucy was at Franklin's death-bed in 1945.

Roosevelt's son Elliot (1910-1990) has claimed that Franklin also had an affair with his (FDR's) own secretary, Marguerite LeHand.

FDR's political career began in 1910, when, on the weight of his name, he became a New York State Senator. For supporting Wilson in 1912, Roosevelt was made Secretary of the Navy in 1913. Thus, during the Great War he served in the same position as had his World War II English counterpart Winston Churchill.

In 1919, FDR was hit by a political scandal. This was the "Newport sex scandal," which (Wikipedia) "arose in 1919 from the United States Navy's investigation of illicit sexual behavior on the part of Navy personnel in Newport, Rhode Island. It targeted homosexual contacts between Navy personnel and the civilian population. Initially it attracted little public notice, but eventually the investigation - its methods and use of enlisted personnel - and the trial attracted national news coverage and provoked a Congressional investigation that ended with Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels and Assistant Secretary of the Navy - future President of the United States - Franklin D. Roosevelt being rebuked by a Congressional committee." Franklin's behaviour was deemed "reprehensible." Roosevelt claimed that the verdict was a Republican attack on him.

FDR resigned from the Navy and ran as Vice-President. By then, Wilson was universally reviled and the Democratic candidate was doomed. The Republican candidate Warren Harding (1865-1923, President 1921-1923) demolished his opponent Cox in one of the greatest landslides in the history of America's presidential elections.

In August 1921, while vacationing in Canada, FDR was crippled by paralytic illness. He was paralysed from the waist down for the rest of his life. The condition was kept secret.

Roosevelt is famous for repealing the prohibition, but his heavy drinking has been a well-kept secret. The man was a dedicated drunkard.⁹

Roosevelt's crucial Wall Street stint occurred in the 1920s. His credentials were:

(Sutton, Ch. 1) To be specific, Franklin D. Roosevelt was, at one time or another during the 1920s, a vice president of the Fidelity & Deposit Company (120 Broadway); the president of an industry trade association, the American Construction Council (28 West 44th Street); a partner in Roosevelt & O'Connor (120 Broadway); a partner in Marvin, Hooker & Roosevelt (52 Wall Street); the president of United European Investors, Ltd. (7 Pine Street); a director of International Germanic Trust, Inc. (in the Standard Oil Building at 26 Broadway); a director of Consolidated Automatic Merchandising Corporation, a paper organization; a trustee of Georgia Warm Springs Foundation (120 Broadway); a director of American Investigation Corporation (37-39 Pine Street); a director of Sanitary Postage Service Corporation (285 Madison Avenue); the chairman of the General Trust Company (15 Broad Street); a director of Photomaton (551 Fifth Avenue); a director of Mantacal Oil Corporation (Rock Springs, Wyoming); and an incorporator of the Federal International Investment Trust.

⁹For example, see Modern Drunkard's Magazine article on FDR, available here: http://www.drunkard.com/issues/06_06/06_06_fdr_portrait.html, accessed on Dec 21, 2011.

That's pure Wall Street. FDR was a full-fledged - though perhaps not core - member of the New York banking fraternity.

In general, "right-winger" lovers of the free-market loud Herbert Hoover (President 1929-1932) as an honest free-marketeer, and denounce FDR as an evil "socialist." But then we have the "left-wingers," who say that Hoover was a free-market fanatic (or, in Sutton's words, (Ch.8) "some kind of unreconstructed laissez faire Neanderthal"), while FDR was a true man of the people. In reality,

...we shall find it not surprising that the Wall Street groups that supported Al Smith and Herbert Hoover, both with strong ties to the financial community, also supported Franklin D. Roosevelt. In fact, at the political crossroads in 1932, when the choice was between Herbert Hoover and FDR, Wall Street chose Roosevelt and dropped Hoover.

My impression of Hoover is that he was an honest man, who was for balanced budgets and an "efficiently" ran economy. The bankers had him elected, because his ideology was fitting for their purposes, and because they thought they could control him - which they did. Hoover was an engineer and an intellectual, and neither a politician (until 1929) nor a businessman. His administration was dominated by banking interests - Henry L. Stimson was his Secretary of State, Andrew Mellon was his Secretary of the Treasury, and Robert P. Lamont (J.P. Morgan's man) was his Secretary of Commerce.

Hoover was controlled by the bankers; FDR, it seems, was part and parcel of the banking band.

Two men close to FDR were John Raskob and Bernard Baruch. Raskob (1879-1950) was a DuPont and GM man. In 1929, just before the crash, he explained that "Americans could become wealthy by investing \$15 [about a week's average income] per month in common stocks." After 1935, Raskob was Roosevelt opponent.

Bernie Baruch (1870-1965) was a big-time banker. During the Great War, he was Wilson's man in charge of industry - an immensely powerful position. During the second war, Baruch filled a similar position behind the scenes. He felt that the lords of industry and finance ought to decide what is going to be made, and the public has to shut up and "work or fight [presumably fight the Nazis, not Bernie]."

In 1944, FDR spent a month as Baruch's guest.

Another important influence on Roosevelt was Louis Howe (1871-1936), Franklin's intimate friend and "other 'I'." Howe was a weak boy and went to a seminary for girls as a child. Since his family lost everything in the 1873 crash, Howe never went to college. As a reporter, he met Roosevelt in 1911 and joined his staff soon thereafter. The two became inseparable. During the presidency, he was Secretary to the President (nowadays the position is White House Chief of Staff).

And so, in early 1921, FDR hit 120 Broadway, where he presided over Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland - the fourth largest bond insurance company in the United States. Franklin was hired for his connections, because, as a New York aristocrat with Washington experience, he knew everyone who was anyone. Naturally, FDR used his network to secure contracts for his firm.

In 1922, FDR was one of the key founders of United European Investors, Ltd., a banker front created for the looting of Germany. And loot they did. (Ch.3) "This terrifying monetary inflation and the ultimate collapse of the German mark in 1923 ruined the German middle class and benefited three groups: a few German big businessmen, a few foreign businessmen who were in a position to gain advantage from the inflation, and the rising Hitler movement. As president of United European Investors, Ltd., Franklin D. Roosevelt was among those foreign businessmen who took advantage of Germany's misery for their own gain." There are more details, but it suffices to note that UEI was a serious banker operation with links to top German bankers, including Warburg. FDR's partners, Roberts and Gould, were under investigation for criminal activities.

After that, the banker boys rebuilt Germany. Instrumental in the process was the Young Plan. Writes Sutton (Ch. 3):

The 1928 Committee of Experts on the Young Plan comprised, on the American side, Owen D. Young and J.P. Morgan, with Thomas N. Perkins and Thomas W. Lamont as alternates. On the German side the members were Hjalmar Schacht and A. Voegler, with C. Melchior and L. Kastl as alternates.

Schacht was the "financial genie" of Hitler.

Another major bank in which FDR was involved, was the International Germanic Trust Company, founded in 1927. He was a director for two months, before quitting, having decided that the venture was not to his taste.

There were a few other ventures, listed in Sutton's book.

In 1928, Roosevelt was elected Governor of New York, a post which he held for four years as a stepping stone toward the presidency. He resigned from most of his directorships and began to rail against the bankers, etc. But one has to ask - are we going to listen to FDR's political speeches, which had to appeal to the people, or are we going to form our opinion based on what he did? In his actions, in the 1920s, FDR was a consummate banker and banker's man. In Sutton's summary:

(Ch. 5) We have described Franklin D. Roosevelt's seven-year career on "the Street" that ended with his election as Governor of New York in 1928. This description was taken from FDR's own letter files. To avoid possible misinterpretation, portions of these letters were reproduced verbatim and at length. On the basis of these letters, there is no question that FDR used political influence almost exclusively to gain bonding business while vice president of Fidelity & Deposit Co.; that significant and questionable international financial and political links surface in the case of United European Investors and International Germanic Trust; and that his intimate associates ranged from Owen D. Young, president of General Electric, a member of the élitist financial establishment, to men described by an agent of the Proudfoot Agency as a "band of crooks."

Sutton's interpretation of these facts is that FDR wanted to use the power of government to help out his banker buddies. In other words, the goal was to use government regulation to set up giant industrial-banking cartels and monopolies. This modus operandi has been called "crony capitalism," "corporate socialism," and, in the extreme case, by Mussolini's definition, fascism.

Thus, the natural question always is, was the New Deal a crony capitalist adventure?

The National Recovery Administration, which was the epitome of the New Deal, was modelled after Bernard Baruch's 1918 War Industries Board. The Board was a high-level coordinating committee, which aimed to standardize and streamline the American industrial system, as well as to force prices for government contracts, and to prevent strikes. It was highly successful. The men who carried influence with the board made vast sums of money.

FDR's NRA had similar duties. It fixed certain prices, coordinate certain industries, and forced minimum wages at certain places. These were useful moves. Socialists tend to glorify FDR's doings, and free-marketeers deplore them. One can offer the thesis that FDR had a dual goal: 1) to let blow off some popular steam by giving people a pittance to live on, jobs, and leadership; and 2) to centralize and cartelize the American economy to the benefit of his powerful backers. FDR likely realized that maximum work hours meant that more people would be hired; combined with minimum wages, that meant that more people would buy the corporations' products, the deflationary spiral would stop, and the economy - along with profits - would get going again. Fixing prices guaranteed an income for the relevant industries. Needless to say, prices fixed below the "market" level were backed by taxpayer subsidies. Industrialists not privy to FDR's inner circle likely misread his intentions.

In regard to deflation (which means falling prices and increasing value of the currency - one dollar can buy more), one of FDR's first acts was to cut the value of the dollar by nearly a good half, by raising gold prices from \$20 to \$35 - after having confiscated (or rather, tried to confiscate) all private gold in the United States, of course. Foreign trade had been tied to the gold exchange (though that collapsed in 1931-33). So, roughly speaking, if \$36 bought you two French suits before the devaluation, you could only buy one suit after the devaluation - since both times a suit cost about one ounce of gold. So US products became cheaper, foreign demand for them increased, more jobs were created, etc.

Moreover, America had a World War II to win - and so it had to start making stuff in preparation for the action. It is hard to say if FDR knew that the war was coming before about 1936. The men behind him, however, surely knew - since they were planning the conflict. Note that there always was a certain amount of opportunism in their actions.

I stress again that minimum wage laws, maximum working time laws, and so on, were necessary. Cronyism and backroom-dealing are deplorable, but the important thing was to get America to work again, without installing a total dictatorship. Note that the bankers are generally weary of outright dictatorship, which is why they stick to pseudo-democracy. In an outright dictatorship, the dictator may get ideas and slip out of control. The problem with (pseudo-)democracy is that it does give the people certain levers of power. But "democracy" is the lesser evil, since it is easier to control crowds than it is to control individuals. From the popular perspective, there was more opportunity for action under an FDR than under a Hitler.

The head of the NRA was Hugh Johnson, a disciple of Baruch. Johnson was a fan of the Duce's Italian model.

Another FDR action worth examining was his takeover of the Federal Reserve. In effect, he forced the Fed to yield cheap credit for infrastructure and industrial development. Some (e.g. Tarpley) say that FDR used his power as President to wrest the Fed away from the bankers. But what if he could do what he did because he was pals with the bankers? The Fed people got theirs - the war and the New Deal accumulated serious debt, which, over time, was duly paid to the Fed and its owners. What FDR should have done was - nationalize of the Fed, and acquire on the behalf of the government the power to control the national money supply.

One clear-cut connection between FDR and the Fed can be found in James P. Warburg, who was the son of Fed Founding Father Paul Warburg, and a financial advisor to FDR. Being a Warburg, James knew all the big honchos. In 1950, he would famously say (quote available even on Wikipedia) "We shall have world government, whether or not we like it. The question is only whether world government will be achieved by consent or by conquest."

FDR's first Secretary of the Treasury was William H. Woodin, who was in charge of the New York Fed between 1927 and 1932. Woodin died at the end of 1933, and due to his poor health, the acting head of the Treasury in 1933 was none other than Dean Acheson the member of the various secret organizations.

In Chapter 8 of his work, Sutton shows that the bankers funded Roosevelt's gubernatorial and presidential campaigns. Moreover, they had also funded Hoover's 1928 campaign. In 1932, they simply quit supporting Hoover, because he rejected their economic plan, which Roosevelt accepted. In particular, Baruch was a major contributor to Roosevelt's 1932 campaign.

The blueprint for the New Deal was Gerard Swope's so-called "Swope Plan." Swope (1872-1957) was the president of GE between 1922 and 1939, and later between 1942 until 1944. General Electric was a major Morgan fief. So we have a top Morgan man design the New Deal - is it too much to expect that J.P. and his colleagues may have intended to benefit from the project? The same Morgan, who, as Quigley explained, financed leftist organizations?

This sheds light on another point - the attempted "fascist" coups against FDR, and the support proffered to Huey on the part of certain powerful financial-industrial interests. Most likely, factions

which were not part of the Morgan and Rockefeller cartels did not understand FDR and were not enamoured with the idea of Morgan benefiting at their expense.

As Sutton puts it,

(Ch. 9) The peak of the Roosevelt National Recovery Administration consisted of the president of the largest electrical corporation, the chairman of the largest oil company, and the representative of the most prominent financial speculator in the United States. In brief, the administration of NRA was a reflection of the New York financial establishment and its pecuniary interests. Further, as we have seen, since the plan itself originated in Wall Street, the presence of businessmen in the administration of NRA cannot be explained on the basis of their experience and administrative ability. NRA was a creature of Wall Street implemented by Wall Streeters.

One has to condemn Sutton for accusing these great men of acting on mercenary motives.

Speaking of fascism, it is worth pointing out that Hitler was a great admirer of FDR's New Deal. This is thoroughly documented in Chapter 11 of Russell's *Renegade History of the United States*.

And speaking of fascist coups, let us look at the bizarre Butler Affair.

In late 1934, some people offered General Smedley Butler (1881-1940) - the man who had inveighed against the bankers - a bag of money and a small army of thugs to carry out a fascist coup. Butler fingered J.P. Morgan and said that Hugh S. Johnson was to become the figurehead dictator. But there was more. In Butler's own words, the plotters wanted to "support the president [FDR]" and to "sustain him when others assault him." From Butler's testimony, found in Chapter 10 of Sutton's work:

I said, "What do you want to do with it when you get it up?"

"Well," he said, "we want to support the President."

...

I said, "The idea of this great group of soldiers, then, is to sort of frighten him, is it?"

"No, no, no; not to frighten him. This is to sustain him when others assault him."

I said, "Well I do not know about that. How would the President explain it?"

He said: "He will not necessarily have to explain it, because we are going to help him out. Now, did it ever occur to you that the President is overworked? We might have an Assistant President, somebody to take the blame; and if things do not work out, he can drop him."

The story was suppressed after a minor initial leak to the press.

I find the story rather strange. Butler's sympathies were well-known, and I do not see how anyone could have expected him to lead a fascist putsch. Perhaps the plot was a publicity stunt for the benefit of FDR? But then, why suppress the story? Perhaps the plotters were bunglers? It is hard to form a concrete opinion on the issue.

In the end, the NRA - because it was too weak on the great projects side, and perhaps too crony on the crony capitalist side - failed, another wave of depression hit America, and only the total integration of the economy during the war, plus the great necessity for production, lifted the United States out of the mire. The American industrial boom during World War II also answered the question of whether centralized planning works - of course it works. Whether it is desirable is another question. And to answer that - in principle, central planning is not that great, because it does hamper creativity. The great problem with central planning is that 1) it concentrates too much power in too few hands, and 2) it explicitly tells people what to do rather than letting them find their own productive niches in society. In this sense, the American "market economy" did (and to a degree, still does) possess great advantages. Ideally, the state should provide the conditions which would give people

the opportunity to realize themselves. Where applicable and practicable, there should be regulation, and there should be protection of vital industries. But, ultimately, the people should figure out what they want to do at the lower, "grassroots" levels, with some guidance from the older, sager, more politically experienced elements of society.

FDR's second New Deal - the Works Progress Administration - was more ambitious and more successful - though still, in the long view, a failure. It created great projects of infrastructure and benefited America immensely. The bankers and the industrialists also got theirs - the Fed got a hefty dose of government debt (though not nearly as much as would be imagined), and Big Business enjoyed the taxpayer funded infrastructure. The people got jobs and a general improvement of the country. If only they had thought of all of this earlier.

It is also important to realize that FDR had to do something along the lines of WPA, because of Huey's systematic agitation. The "Share Our Wealth" organization had grown powerful. The people were restless. Something had to be done. The man in charge of the WPA was Harry Hopkins, who would later be FDR's envoy to first Churchill and then Stalin. Major Jordan claimed Hopkins gave away nuclear secrets to the Soviets. Defenders of Hopkins have said that whatever he did, was done with the idea of beating the Nazis.

It is conceivable that Roosevelt had a change of heart after 1936, when he saw that the WPA worked, and, bolstered by popular support, really wanted to help the people.

Some aspects of the NRA/WPA are ambiguous in nature. Take the "leaf-raking" high-wage jobs.¹⁰ The problem with those jobs was threefold: 1) they were not that productive; 2) they actually hampered mass employment, since they were always temporary jobs - and yet people resigned from full-time lower-wage productive jobs to get on the gravy train; and 3) rather than print money after the Lincoln model to pay for the jobs, FDR borrowed money from the bankers. Even Keynes, whose program also called for borrowing money from the bankers, inveighed against FDR's leaf-raking policies.

Another problem with the high-wage policy - and the reader surely can not accuse me of reactionary sentiments - is that, in light of the deflation - which, in effect, raised wages - the real problem America faced was unemployment more than low wages (though the latter has been a persistent problem since the Robber Barons gained sway). The people had to be put back to work - and that could be done in two ways (including a mixed policy): by either (a) unclogging the credit and trade channels to promote employment in the private sector, or (b) a communist-type "5 year plan" central planning effort, which is what happened on account of the war. Providing temporary federal jobs *without* fixing the underlying problems was, fundamentally, a losing strategy - and that is, to a degree, what FDR and his crew did.

At the same time, the *productive* New Deal federal jobs were excellent (though relatively puny in respect to the overall unemployment figures), and the high-wage *permanent* useful jobs were also good.

Moreover, in light of the thesis on central planning propounded a few paragraphs above, FDR's efforts leaned a bit too heavily in the direction of precisely central planning. His 1933 legislations tended to hamper small business with over-regulation (regulate Standard, not mom&pop), and caused a stock market slump. In general, the NRA should perhaps be regarded as a cartelizing gambit.

Apart from being a Mason and a Wall Streeter, Roosevelt was a member of the Knight of Pythias "fraternal order" (i.e. secret society). That order was founded in Washington D.C. in 1864 under a Congressional Charter. It has two thousand lodges worldwide and about 50,000 members as of 2003. The organization is quasi-Masonic, with oaths and degrees and the rest of it. The aim of the order is "universal peace." As we have seen, "universal peace" is a codename for something else.

¹⁰See William Engdahl's article *Some unconventional reflections on the Great Depression and the New Deal*, available for example here: http://www.engdahl.oilgeopolitics.net/History/New_Deal/new_deal.html, accessed Jan 30, 2012.

Other notable Knights of Pythias are: Hugo Black the legendary Supreme Court Justice; William Jennings Bryan; Robert Byrd the senator; Benjamin Cardozo the Supreme Court Justice; Warren G. Harding the president; Hubert Humphrey the vice-president under LBJ; Bob Jones, Sr. the prominent evangelist; John Ellis Martineau the governor of Arkansas; Richard Irvine Manning III the governor of South Carolina; William McKinley the president; Nelson A. Rockefeller the vice-president (under Ford); Charles Schumer the senator; Anthony Weiner the congressman; Louis Armstrong; and others.

Another difficult questions stems from Roosevelt's physical condition. He was a sick man and a cripple - but how sick was he? In general, it seems that his health rapidly deteriorated after 1943, which means that, whether FDR was "good" or "bad," during the crucial years of the war, the McCloy-Stimson-Bundy-Wallace-etc cabal was in charge of the war. Throughout the early part of the war, Roosevelt intermittently suffered from bouts of what appeared to be abdominal cancer-related symptoms. The man was a wreck. See the recent (2009) book *FDR's Deadly Secret*, written by Steven Lomazow, M.D., and Eric Fettman.

Apropos, Kennedy was another trainwreck of a man, though at least he was young and virile at the time of his presidency. Reagan had Alzheimer's.

Tarpley thinks that the British (and their allies in America) poisoned FDR. I doubt that, though it is conceivable. If Wall Street really hated FDR, as has been claimed, he - a relatively sick man already by the 1930s - would have been poisoned long before he got his New Deal programs going. Moreover, the bankers would not have backed his election, since his views were fairly clearly stated by 1932.

More can be said of FDR; but let us stop here. In summary, FDR was: 1) a pre-eminent American aristocrat; 2) a Wall Street man; 3) a ruthless politician; 4) possibly a puppet, particularly in the latter part of his presidency. His policies may have been well-meant, and did have some positive effect on the American society and economy, but also had a cartelizing effect, and were ultimately unsuccessful. The War rather than the New Deal got America out of the Depression.

For an informed pro-FDR version of the events, we can look forward to Tarpley's next book, due to be released in early 2012.

8.6 Wall Street Und Adolf

We have seen that Wall Street financed the Bolsheviks, and had domineering input in the FDR administration. Did they, along with the City of London, also manufacture Hitler and Mussolini? Of course they did! Two good sources on this subject are Antony Sutton's *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler* (1976), and Guido Giacomo Preparata's *Conjuring Hitler* (2005).

To understand why Hitler was chosen, one must consider five important components of the Fuhrer's psychological make-up, established by about 1923. First, Hitler was a talented speaker, who could be elevated into a world class demagogue with sufficient backing. Second, he had a liking for the Anglo-Americans, whom he considered the natural allies of his wonderful Aryan brethren. He deeply admired the English and wanted them to keep their Empire, and liked America and its efficiency. As noted before, Henry Ford was Adolf's idol, and FDR's New Deal received great praise from Berlin. Third, Adolf heartily hated the communists, and considered the "Slavs" inferior to the "Aryans" and the "Anglo-Saxons."

Fourth, Adolf was an avid jingoist. Fifth, he liked Malthusianism and eugenics.

A sixth point can be added, though I will not bother to pursue it in detail, because it is both too controversial and too tangential. Hitler disliked the Jews, but he did not want to massacre them. He was sold on the idea of Israel, and was perfectly willing to let the German Jews go there. It is critical to understand that the powerful Jews who were trying to create Israel at the time - Rothschild and

so on - wanted to somehow *get the European Jews to go to Israel*. Israel Shahak mentioned the latter fact, while, to my knowledge, David Irving has convincingly argued for the former thesis. The man behind the Holocaust likely was Martin Bormann (1900-1945?), Hitler's shadowy personal secretary and likely double-agent.

And so it was decided at some point, likely in the late 1920s, by which time Adolf had proved himself, to make Hitler a dictator, and to send him after Russia. Germany and Russia would annihilate each other to the benefit of the Anglo-Americans, and the New World Order would march ahead. This was the general plan, and it worked, with a number of hitches.

Adolf Hitler (20 April 1889-30 April 1945) was born in Austria in a run-of-the-mill family. His parents moved around when he was a child, stopping in Bavaria for a while. All of Adolf's siblings died. The loss affected him deeply. Hitler's relationship with his parents was of the classic neurotic problems-with-father affection-for-mother type. Hitler became something of a rebel, and got kicked out of a number of schools. Young and restless, Adolf made his way to Vienna, where he tried to become an artist, to find rejection on account of his lack of school credentials. A thorough lover of Germany (in part in reaction to his father's Hapsburg-Austrian patriotism), Hitler joined the Reich's armies during the Great War. During the war, Hitler proved that apart from being no fool, he was no coward. But he remained psychologically unstable and unsure, and after the war he drifted about, stunned by the carnage, perhaps shellshocked.

In Munich, in 1919, Hitler began to speak out here and there, and people listened, and he was recruited by a Captain Mayr (See Preparata, p.57). Sent to spy on the Deutsche Arbeiterpartei on Friday, September 12, 1919, Hitler impressed a party boss, and was recruited. (Preparata, p.58) A month later, "Alfred Rosenberg, and his master, Dietrich Eckart," heard Hitler's verbal virtuosity, and decided that "He's come." Eckart was a member of the occultist Masonic Thule Society, which was, in effect, the progenitor of the Nazi movement. Thule was a 1918 branch of another society, which had been founded in 1911. Thule drew on Blavatsky's blather - which explains why Adolf read the great Madame so diligently. DAP - which grew into the NSDAP (i.e. the "Nazis") - was a front for Thule. Conflicting opinions exist on whether Adolf joined Thule - but I think that, in light of his occult interests, it is safe to say that he did - or at least, was so influenced by Thule members, that he was as good as a member.

It should be understood that with Thule and the ancient German occult tradition, the Nazis were, as Preparata puts it, (p.131) "a religious sect fronted by a political outfit." Nazism was more than a political ideology - like Marxism, it was a full-blown religion with serious occult underpinnings, and like Marxism, it had a strong connection to London - in the case of Nazism, at least through the Blavatsky connection.

The Beer Hall Putsch came in November 1923, at the pinnacle of the hyperinflation, which had been caused by the banker boys and by France. Ostensibly a failure, the Putsch would grow into a myth. Jailed, Adolf (or a ghost-writer able to manipulate Adolf) wrote out the *Mein Kampf* manifesto. It said: occultism great, eugenics good, German jingoism great, Anglo-Saxons great, Jews bad, communists bad, French&Slavs puny, weak, and doomed. The London-New York axis had its boy. One has to consider it likely that certain forces had quietly promoted the appropriate ideas in appropriate potentially receptive circles, in the hope that a Hitler would spring. But the point is tangential - whatever his route of arrival, Hitler emerged as the perfect candidate for the leading role in the coming German national tragedy.

That was act one. Three more acts remained in the colossal drama of the Nazi rise and fall: Hitler's rise to power, the road to war, and the cataclysm of 1939-1945.

Writes Sutton in Chapter 1 of his book:

The contribution made by American capitalism to German war preparations before 1940

can only be described as phenomenal. It was certainly crucial to German military capabilities. For instance, in 1934 Germany produced domestically only 300,000 tons of natural petroleum products and less than 800,000 tons of synthetic gasoline; the balance was imported. Yet, ten years later in World War II, after transfer of the Standard Oil of New Jersey hydrogenation patents and technology to I. G. Farben (used to produce synthetic gasoline from coal), Germany produced about 6 1/2 million tons of oil of which 85 percent (5 1/2 million tons) was synthetic oil using the Standard Oil hydrogenation process. Moreover, the control of synthetic oil output in Germany was held by the I. G. Farben subsidiary, Braunkohle-Benzin A. G., and this Farben cartel itself was created in 1926 with Wall Street financial assistance.

There was that, and much more.

Having scavenged and looted Germany by 1924, acquiring some influence over the German economy, and strengthening their ties with certain high-level German industrialists and bankers, the Anglo-Americans decided to get to the business of preparing Germany for the coming war. Indeed, (Sutton, Ch. 1) "The post-World War II Kilgore Committee of the United States Senate heard detailed evidence from government officials to the effect that, "...when the Nazis came to power in 1933, they found that long strides had been made since 1918 in preparing Germany for war from an economic and industrial point of view."

And so, the Dawes and Young plans were put into effect.

(Sutton, Ch. 1) Between 1924 and 1931, under the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan, Germany paid out to the Allies about 86 billion marks in reparations. At the same time Germany borrowed abroad, mainly in the U.S., about 138 billion marks - thus making a net German payment of only three billion marks for reparations. Consequently, the burden of German monetary reparations to the Allies was actually carried by foreign subscribers to German bonds issued by Wall Street financial houses - at significant profits for themselves, of course. And, let it be noted, these firms were owned by the same financiers who periodically took off their banker hats and donned new ones to become "statesmen." As "statesmen" they formulated the Dawes and Young Plans to "solve" the "problem" of reparations. As bankers, they floated the loans. As Carroll Quigley points out,

It is worthy of note that this system was set up by the international bankers and that the subsequent lending of other people's money to Germany was very profitable to these bankers.

Thus was Germany's military-industrial capacity built. In 1929, the bankers manufactured (deliberately or by error) the Depression, which caused great destabilization everywhere, and particularly in Germany. As pointed out, economic crashes and lost wars create the conditions for revolutions. Germany was ripe for a revolution in 1933, and got one, along with Adolf.

Young (1874-1964) was GE's president (and thus a Morgan henchman) during the 1920s. He was a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. His successor and friend (protege?) at GE, Swope, was the formulator of FDR's NRA. Dawes (1865-1951) was Comptroller of the Currency under McKinley (1898-1901). He floated the first great American World War I loan to England along with Morgan. In 1925 he got a Noble Peace Prize. He was Coolidge's VP (1925-1928).

As pointed out in the FDR section, the men on the American side of the Young "Committee of Experts" were Morgan and Lamont (a Morgan man), and on the German side there was Hjalmar Schacht.

Schacht (1877-1970) was a German industrialist. His father loved America and had spent time in the States. Hjalmar started funding the NSDAP at the latest by 1930. Hitler made Schacht his Minister of Economics in 1934. Hjalmar was fired from that position in 1937, kept as President of the Reichsbank until 1939, and fully dumped by the regime in 1943. Gradually, he became disillusioned

with his Frankenstein, and flirted with anti-Nazi plots. The British saved him at Nuremberg, and he got himself a bank and banked away until he died. Schacht was a Freemason.

Another German "Expert" was Carl Melchior (1871-1933), who was a big time industrialist and banker, a German financial envoy to the League of Nations, a member of the Bank for International Settlements (the "central bankers' bank"), and a pal of John Maynard Keynes. The BIS, which still exists today, and which is even more secretive than Bilderberg, gave the international bankers (or rather, their representatives) - including Germans and Americans - an opportunity to meet and chat in Basel during the war.

Also an "Expert" was Albert Vögler (1877-1945), the head of Vereinigte Stahlwerke AG, which was in charge of, say, a third of Germany's steel. Fritz Thyssen (1873-1951), the great industrialist, who was Schacht's collaborator in bringing Hitler to power, was a chairman of Vereinigte. Another Dr. Frankenstein, Thyssen broke with the Nazis after the Night of Broken Glass, got thrown in jail, purportedly published a book in the States entitled *I Paid Hitler* in 1941, and was liberated by the Americans in 1945, to while away in Argentina.

Also,

(Sutton, Ch.1) The Young Plan was assertedly a device to occupy Germany with American capital and pledge German real assets for a gigantic mortgage held in the United States. It is noteworthy that German firms with U.S. affiliations evaded the Plan by the device of temporary foreign ownership. For instance, A.E.G. (German General Electric), affiliated with General Electric in the U.S., was sold to a Franco-Belgian holding company and evaded the conditions of the Young Plan. It should be noted in passing that Owen Young was the major financial backer for Franklin D. Roosevelt in the United European venture when FDR, as a budding Wall Street financier, endeavoured to take advantage of Germany's 1925 hyperinflation. The United European venture was a vehicle to speculate and to profit upon the imposition of the Dawes Plan, and is clear evidence of private financiers (including Franklin D. Roosevelt) using the power of the state to advance their own interests by manipulating foreign policy.

During the 1920s, the three great German cartels of German General Electric, Vereinigte Stahlwerke, and I.G. Farben (the engine of the Nazi military-industrial machine) received more than \$140 million in loans from the States, half coming from National City Bank - i.e. Morgan., and half from Dillon, Read & Co. In total, Wall Street financed the German reparations (and rebuilding) to the tune of at least \$826,400,000 dollars. Dillon, Read & Co., Harris, Forbes & Co., and City were the main players. Rockefeller's Chase acquired Harris & Forbes in 1930.

Writes Sutton, emphasis his, "the two cartels, I.G. Farben and Vereinigte Stahlwerke, produced 95 percent of German explosives in 1937-8 on the eve of World War II. *This production was from capacity built by American loans and to some extent by American technology.*"

The Americans built the Russians' capacity for tank production. Did they do the same favour for the Germans?

Moreover, American assistance to Nazi war efforts extended into other areas. The two largest tank producers in Hitler's Germany were Opel, a wholly owned subsidiary of General Motors (controlled by the J.P. Morgan firm), and the Ford A. G. subsidiary of the Ford Motor Company of Detroit. The Nazis granted tax-exempt status to Opel in 1936, to enable General Motors to expand its production facilities. General Motors obligingly reinvested the resulting profits into German industry. Henry Ford was decorated by the Nazis for his services to Naziism. Alcoa and Dow Chemical worked closely with Nazi industry with numerous transfers of their domestic U.S. technology. Bendix Aviation, in which the J.P. Morgan-controlled General Motors firm had a major stock interest,

supplied Siemens & Halske A. G. in Germany with data on automatic pilots and aircraft instruments. As late as 1940, in the "unofficial war," Bendix Aviation supplied complete technical data to Robert Bosch for aircraft and diesel engine starters and received royalty payments in return.

In sum,

(Sutton, end of Ch. 1) In brief, American companies associated with the Morgan-Rockefeller international investment bankers - not, it should be noted, the vast bulk of independent American industrialists - were intimately related to the growth of Nazi industry. It is important to note as we develop our story that General Motors, Ford, General Electric, DuPont and the handful of U.S. companies intimately involved with the development of Nazi Germany were - except for the Ford Motor Company controlled by the Wall Street elite - the J.P. Morgan firm, the Rockefeller Chase Bank and to a lesser extent the Warburg Manhattan bank.

For the full details, consult Sutton's book. Here I will only provide a few interesting factoids.

I.G.Farben, the top cartel of the Third Reich, a truly powerful organization, was formed in 1925. In Sutton's opinion, (Ch. 2) "Without the capital supplied by Wall Street, there would have been no I. G. Farben in the first place and almost certainly no Adolf Hitler and World War II."

For a full treatment on I.G. Farben, consult Joseph Borkin's classic *The Crime and Punishment of I.G. Farben* (1978). In the introduction of the book, he quotes an expert report to Ike presented at the end of the war, confirming Sutton's statement above. Sutton quotes the same document.

While Max Warburg was on the German board of IGF, his brother Paul of the Federal Reserve was on the board of the American subsidiary of IGF. Edsel Ford and Charles E. Mitchell of the New York Fed kept Paul company. Also on the board were: H.A. Metz, director of IGF Germany and the Bank of Manhattan, and Walter Teagle - New York Fed and Standard Oil. We have Ford, the Fed, and the Rockefeller gang. After the war got going, the American big shots, their job well done, resigned from the board.

Farben dished out 400,000 Marks to the Nazis just before their 1933 grab for power.

(Ch. 2) "In 1945 Dr. Oskar Loehr, deputy head of the I.G. "Tea Buro," confirmed that I. G. Farben and Standard Oil of New Jersey operated a "preconceived plan" to suppress development of the synthetic rubber industry in the United States, to the advantage of the German Wehrmacht and to the disadvantage of the United States in World War II." It should be understood that without the synthetic rubber and synthetic gasoline - both invented by Rockefeller's Standard and given to the Reich via Farben - Germany simply could not have fought the Second World War. The German lack of oil was notorious, and a key reason for the pushes toward Stalingrad (really Baku) and Suez (and the oil fields beyond).

The same "Poison" Ivy Lee who cleaned up the image of Rockefeller got to work on Farben after 1929. He was funded by the American IGF, and thus his Nazi propaganda was paid for by American money.

Most German IGF directors (sans Max Warburg, of course), and three German directors of the American IGF were found guilty at Nuremberg.

What about Morgan? He and his General Electric, having (Sutton, Ch. 3) "electrified the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s," decided to also aid Adolf. In Germany, GE had a powerful subsidiary - the Germany General Electric (GGE). In the 1920s, GGE obtained large loans from National City Bank. Young was on the boards of both GE and GGE. His successor Swope was also on the GGE board.

Under the influence of the Morgan crew, GGE gradually took over the German electrical industry. Of the great German electric firms, only Siemens & Halske managed to evade GGE control. Sutton tells that while there is no evidence that Siemens financed the Nazis, GGE helped Hitler "in substantial

ways.”

In short, roughly, Rockefeller was tied to Farben and Morgan was tied to GGE. Both companies were major backers of Hitler on the eve of his 1933 coup. Both Standard and GE passed patents to the Reich via Farben and GGE. Magically, GGE suffered only minor bombing during the war. On the other hand, Dresden and Hamburg were obliterated.

Apart from teaching the Nazis how to make synthetic fuel and rubber, Standard also told them about ethyl lead, a crucial component of high-quality aviation fuel, produced only in the US until 1935 (by which time it was fairly clear where Hitler was going). In 1935, Standard transferred the technology to the Nazis. The transfer occurred despite the protests of the US government. In 1938, the Nazis bought 500 tons of ethyl from the US, with the help of the Harriman bank. Standard owned Deutsche-Amerikanische Petroleum A.G. (DAPAG), whose boss was close to the Reich government until 1944.

Another player was International Telephone and Telegraph (ITT), by 1924 a part of the Morgan combine. The man in charge of ITT was Sosthenes Behn (1882-1957), an American tycoon. ITT doled money to Himmler (head of SS) even after the war started. ITT was also tied to the German and Nazi banking (and literal) baron Kurt von Schröder, a relative of whose operated a bank in London. Schröder was the Nazi man in Basel at the BIS. In 1936, a Rockefeller clan member (Avery) created a merged Rockefeller-Schroder (of the English branch) bank in New York. The Lorenz Company, an appendage of ITT, bought a quarter-share in Focke-Wolfe just before the war started. Focke-Wolfe was one of the two major Third Reich aircraft manufacturers, the other one being, of course, Messerschmitt.

Then there is Ford. Ford, whose portrait adorned Hitler's study. Why was that? Because Ford backed Adolf *from before the 1923 Munich putsch*. One reason certainly must have been Ford's anti-Semitism. In 1928, Ford merged his sizeable German holdings with Farben. In 1938, Adolf gave Henry the Grand Cross of the German Eagle - the highest Third Reich honor available to foreigners. Ford aided the Nazis even during the war - for example, his French subsidiary - with his express knowledge - made 20 trucks a day for the Wehrmacht. Note that this was not mere slave labor under occupation. The Nazis *paid* for the trucks - promptly, knowing they were Fords. Henry made *profits* from this business.

Dollfuss [head of French Ford] disclosed that profits from this German business were already 1.6 million francs, and net profits for 1941 were no less than 58,000,000 francs because the Germans paid promptly for Ford's output. On receipt of this news Edsel Ford cabled:

Delighted to hear you are making progress. Your letters most interesting. Fully realize great handicap you are working under. Hope you and family well.
Regards.
signed: Edsel Ford

The Americans avoided bombing Ford's stuff, but apparently forgot to coordinate with the British, who hit Ford's plant in Vichy France. The Vichy government *paid Ford 38 million francs as compensation*.

In short, Henry and Edsel were guilty of Nuremberg-level crimes, and did their part in manufacturing Hitler and the war.

So who financed Hitler before his acquisition of power? (Sutton, Ch.7) Krupp was funding Nazi-type groups as early as in 1919. By 1924, Thyssen, Vögler, and Schröder were paying their dues. In general, "The Hitler backers were not, by and large, firms of purely German origin, or representative

of German family business. Except for Thyssen and Kirdoff, in most cases they were the German multi-national firms i.e., I.G. Farben, A.E.G., DAPAG, etc. These multi-nationals had been built up by American loans in the 1920s, and in the early 1930s had American directors and heavy American financial participation.”

Another fan, and likely funder (though Sutton found only imperfect sources on the matter), of Adolf was Henri Deterding (1866-1939), the head honcho of Shell. Deterding was aware and in admiration of Hitler by 1921. Shell means the English and Dutch royal families, and Big Oil.

Thyssen was associated with the Harrimans. Indeed, it has been well documented that the Harrimans, with whom the father of George Bush I was closely associated, did business with the Nazis *during the war, up until 1942, when the US government stepped in*. Tarpley's biography of Bush I talks about this. Averell Harriman, of course, also did business with the Bolsheviks. During the war, Skull and Bones's Harriman was in charge of the Lend-Lease, and was close to both Churchill and FDR.

One utterly bizarre link between FDR and Hitler can be found in the mysterious character Ernst "Putzi" Hanfstaengl (1887-1975). Putzi, born in Munich, was the godson of Ernest II Saxe-Coburg-Gotha (1818-1893), who was the brother of Victoria's husband, and the grandson of Ernest Frederick the Illuminatus. Putzi, whose mother was an American, went to Harvard, where he met Walter Lippmann (the top Anglophile intellectual and propaganda expert) and John Reed (whose great achievement was making the Bolsheviks look good). He went to New York, where he often entertained FDR, whom he had befriended at Harvard. During the Great War, Putzi went back to Germany, and his New York firm was confiscated. In 1922 he heard Hitler speak. It was love at first sound. Soon enough, Putzi became a fan and an intimate of Adolf, and participated in the Munich Putsch. After Hitler's time in the slammer, during which Putzi kept Adolf's crew going, Putzi introduced Hitler to the Munich high society. After Adolf achieved power, Putzi kept a watch on him on FDR's behalf. At one point, Putzi blew a British double-agent who had penetrated the German high command. Tragically, Putzi fell off with Goebbels, and gradually drifted away from Adolf. What a sad story, what a tragic end to a great friendship! After a 1937 "practical joke" scared the living hell out of Putzi, he decided to bail the Third Reich, and - after some adventures - got back to the States with the help of Roosevelt. There, Putzi worked for FDR, spilling Nazi secrets. In 1944 he was handed over to the British, who deposited him in Germany after the war.

Surely, Putzi must have been an idiot savant rather than an agent or a puppet.

Throughout the Nazi reign, Wall Street was in contact with - or at least represented by - insiders of Hitler's inner circle, the so-called Keppler Circle. The circle came into being before 1933, and consisted of powerful supporters of Adolf. The members of the circle held directorships on the various Wall Street-related (some fully controlled) companies listed above. Then there is the BIS connection.

There are rumours to the effect that the Warburgs financed Hitler. That is highly likely.

During the war, Rockefeller and Morgan kept in touch with the Nazis via the non-German European branches of their banks, which stayed open.

The role of the British was left unexamined by Sutton. Preparata spends a good deal of pages to show that Montagu Norman (1871-1950, Governor of the Bank of England 1920-1944) (the British finance emperor during the Depression) was deeply involved in crashing the German economy to prepare Hitler's rise to power. We have already examined the influence of the Round Table circle (the Astors, Lothian, Brand, Halifax) in the so-called "appeasement." The British did their share in creating the war.

Then we have Edward VIII (1894-1972, King January-December 1936), who was the King of England (and the rest of the Commonwealth) for the better part of 1936, and who was an avowed admirer and friend of Hitler. He had come up with the Anglo-German Fellowship, active between 1935 and 1939.

The Fellowship aimed to "build up friendship between the United Kingdom and Germany." Members (Wikipedia): Frank Cyril Tiarks, Admiral Sir Barry Domvile, Prince von Bismarck, Governor of the Bank of England Montague Norman, Geoffrey Dawson editor of *The Times*. And also: "Sir Peter Agnew, 1st Baronet, Ernest Bennett, Sir Robert Bird, 2nd Baronet, Robert Tatton Bower, Douglas Douglas-Hamilton, the Marquess of Clydesdale, Robert Vaughan Gower, Thomas "Loel" Guinness, Norman Hulbert, Archibald James, Alfred Knox, John Macnamara, Sir Thomas Moore, 1st Baronet, Assheton Pownall, Frank Sanderson, Duncan Sandys, Admiral Murray Sueter, Charles Taylor and Ronald Tree. Members of the House of Lords to hold membership included Lord Brocket, Lords David and Malcolm Douglas-Hamilton, Lord Galloway, the Earl of Glasgow, Lord Londonderry, Lord Nuffield, Lord Redesdale, Lord Rennell and the Duke of Wellington."

The Soviets, isolated by the rest of the world, traded war materials for German military expertise, and shocked the world with the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, at which we will look from an interesting angle shortly. Notoriously, Soviet trains packed with raw materials rolled into Germany even as the Wehrmacht invaded Soviet Poland.

And what of that preposterous clown, the Duce? Here it goes:

The Guardian, 13 October 2009¹¹

Recruited by MI5: the name's Mussolini. Benito Mussolini

Documents reveal Italian dictator got start in politics in 1917 with help of 100 pound weekly wage from MI5

Archived documents have revealed that Mussolini got his start in politics in 1917 with the help of a 100 pound weekly wage from MI5.

For the British intelligence agency, it must have seemed like a good investment. Mussolini, then a 34-year-old journalist, was not just willing to ensure Italy continued to fight alongside the allies in the first world war by publishing propaganda in his paper. He was also willing to send in the boys to "persuade" peace protesters to stay at home.

Mussolini's payments were authorised by Sir Samuel Hoare, an MP and MI5's man in Rome, who ran a staff of 100 British intelligence officers in Italy at the time.

Cambridge historian Peter Martland, who discovered details of the deal struck with the future dictator, said: "Britain's least reliable ally in the war at the time was Italy after revolutionary Russia's pullout from the conflict. Mussolini was paid 100 pounds a week from the autumn of 1917 for at least a year to keep up the pro-war campaigning equivalent to about 6,000 pounds a week today."

...

His [Benito's] colonial ambitions in Africa brought him into contact with his old paymaster again in 1935. Now the British foreign secretary, Hoare signed the Hoare-Laval pact, which gave Italy control over Abyssinia.

This, of course, is only the tip of the iceberg. For example, in 1926, Thomas Lamont the Morgan man gave a loan of \$100 million to Benito's regime.

The conclusions are clear - Wall Street - meaning the Morgan-Rockefeller-Harriman-etc faction, plus Ford, along with their allies in Britain and various German interests, some of who acted for their own reasons - created Hitler out of thin air, and built up Germany, in order to provoke the Second World War, for reasons repeatedly elaborated above. There is more that can be said, but we lack the space.

¹¹<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/oct/13/benito-mussolini-recruited-mi5-italy>, Dec 13, 2011.

8.7 Some Notes on WWII

In addition to the various sources listed here, I highly recommend E.C. Knuth's excellent *The Empire and the City* (1945). Knuth's research follows the same lines we have been pursuing.

8.7.1 A Few Words on the Appeasement

The "appeasement" was the process of the unchaining of the German military beast by the British Wizards of Oz. The general mainstream view that the Western Europeans were well-meaning and tired of war, and that the Germans had a great big unstoppable army by 1938, is a specious one.

In reality, the Germans were practically defenceless in 1936, quite weak in 1938, and only moderately strong in 1939. They benefited from a great deal of good fortune, from superior training and generalship, but mostly from the seemingly insane, inept, and dilettante strategic behaviour of their opponents.

Take the re-militarization of the Rhine in March 1936. Guderian, Jodl, and Hitler himself are on the record stating that had the French called Hitler's bluff, the Wehrmacht would have folded. What made the move a success was: the explicit British backing, given by (the then foreign minister) Eden, who said that Britain would not interfere with a German re-occupation of the Rhine; and the French reticence to act, likely caused by pressure from London. At the time, France was in financial dire straits, and needed money from London and New York - meaning that the Anglo-American axis had Paris in its pocket.

Indeed, the French foreign secretary Flandin correctly pointed out to the British that France had a just *casus belli* in the German violation of Versailles and Locarno, added that Paris was willing to go to war, and criticized the British demands for restraint. Eden asked for more restraint. The French had right on their side because of Locarno, they had might on their side because of Germany's weakness, and they could and should have taken the necessary steps to protect themselves from a demagogue who had explicitly identified France as Germany's natural enemy. One suspects that the French did not even need a full mobilization - had they merely sent the garrisons of the Maginot Line over the Rhine, Hitler would have backed off - and without the Rhineland, he could not have carried out the rest of his half-baked plans.

Poland expressed support for France, and likely would have struck the Germans from the east in the event of a war.

One also has to wonder at the French ostensible ignorance of the standard British modus operandi - namely, invite disaster on the greatest current European power - which, in 1936, was France. In the face of Eden's clear mendacity, the French should have pursued their own interests. But they did not.

In England, the conspicuous appeasers Lothian and George Bernard Shaw defended the German action. And no surprise.

Bad as the Rhineland affair was, Munich (meaning the conference held there in September 1938) was the true triumph of British hypocrisy and French masochism. Munich was one of the great nadirs in world diplomacy.

Certain German generals thought that in threatening Czechoslovakia, Hitler had gone quite mad, and were prepared to try to oust him - but the British came through, as they had two years earlier. (See source below.)

Asked Chamberlain, why should we fight for those bums over there, what do we care about them, we don't even know them, et cetera: "How horrible, fantastic, incredible it is, that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas masks here, because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing." - this only a generation after the British had gone to war to defend Belgium, and a year before declaring war in defence of Poland. What hypocrisy! What vicious lying!

Of course, the British had told the French to expect no help in the event of a war.

Not that the French needed any help. They had their Czech allies. The craven Polish proto-fascist government had been bought off - but so what? Poland could not possibly go to war against France on the behalf of Germany - particularly when the Germans had outstanding claims on Polish East Prussia. One has to wonder at the insanity of the Poles and the French - having "repatriated" the Rhineland and the Sudetenland, Germany surely would have gone after Danzig and Alsace-Lorraine - those were Hitler's stated goals! Why did those fools wait until the Germans built up their forces; why did the French surrender the initiative to the Germans?

The notion that the Wehrmacht was a great force in 1938 is wholly wrong. In actuality¹², the Czech army was, if not superior, at least equal to the German army; and moreover, the Czechs had the advantage of the strategic defence in the fortified mountain passes of the Sudeten Mountains. The Czechoslovakian army had a million men in thirty-four first-rate divisions, plus a reasonable amount of good CKD tanks. The Germans had thirty-six divisions, only nineteen of them top-quality, and many not at full strength. The Soviets had expressed support for Czechoslovakia; the incomplete Siegfried line was manned by only five divisions against an overwhelming French force; the Germans had not even began to make the excellent Panzer IV model, and only had a few of the quick but otherwise unimpressive Panzer III tanks (37mm cannon). The Czech had hundreds of the medium CKD tanks (75mm cannon) - a type of tank that would have fared well on any front at any time during the war. In fact, after the Germans gobbled up Czechoslovakia in the spring of 1939, they took the CKDs, thus significantly improving their own armored forces!

Had a war broken out, Germany would have been defeated in a matter of weeks. It is far from certain that the Germans could have broken the Czechoslovakian defences, even if Czechoslovakia had stood alone. But what makes everything even worse is that betraying Czechoslovakia was not enough for the Westerners - they had to force Prague to kneel before Hitler, on the pretext of "avoiding annihilation" - this a few months before the Panzers rolled into the by-then defenceless Prague.

The British were vile hypocrites and liars and had a plan. But nothing can excuse the French betrayal of the Franco-Czechoslovakian alliance. Paris paid for its sins; and London watched over another holocaust of its making.

To top everything, the "Western" "Allies" carried on with the appeasement even during the war, with the so-called "Phony War." After March 15, 1939, it should have been clear to France that war was inevitable. Hitler had gone beyond repatriation into lebensraum. Poland with its German territories should have known it was on the hit-list; France, the "historical enemy" and occupier of Alsace-Lorraine should have expected the debacle - they should have known! And yet, Paris and Warsaw managed to yet again give the initiative to Hitler.

Despite all indications, the Poles were caught off-guard in September 1939. As Manstein correctly pointed out in his memoirs, the Polish command took neither an attacking posture, nor, as it should have, a defensive posture - but rather, stood in between. Its armies were caught off-balance and swiftly annihilated. (Manstein also said that, just prior to the war, the Germans had received reports to the effect that the British had demanded the adoption of an offensive-minded - meaning suicidal - formation from the Poles.)

The British, in the period of their change of heart, precipitated in no small part by the Molotov-Ribbentrop unholy alliance (which the British had tacitly caused, in view of their half-hearted August 1939 military delegation to Moscow), could still watch with some satisfaction as the buffer between the Reich and the Communist paradise vanished. And yet again there can be no excuse for the French high-command, which, instead of attacking the unfinished Siegfried line, stood and watched. The swift German victory in May 1940 has given the impression that the German forces were vastly superior to the French. Nothing could be further from the truth. As late as in May 1940, the French armor was superior to the German¹³; the French (in May 1940 combined with the Benelux countries,

¹²See, for example, this Quigley 1952 exchange of letters with a Jay Burke: http://www.carrollquigley.net/misc/Quigley_explains_how_Germany_conquered_Czechoslovakia.htm, Dec 13, 2011.

¹³See, for example, Quigley's *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 663; or any other source listing the comparative forces in '39-'40.

which were not in the war until Germany invaded them) had about as many infantry divisions as the Germans had; and the French airforce was poor, but the RAF was superior to the Luftwaffe. France's main problems were the incompetence of the French commanders, the fascist sympathies of the same, and the poltroonish lack of initiative repeatedly displayed by Paris. The French doctrine of tank use was utterly backward in its denial of the principle of the concentration of tanks. Madame Fate and her sister History are having a laugh somewhere, because Guderian had developed the advanced German tank doctrine after reading De Gaulle's thoughts on the subject in the mid-1930s. And yet, during the Fall of France, De Gaulle was a lowly colonel, while Guderian was a top German commander. Maxime Weygand (1867-1965), who took over the French army in late May 1940, ended up being a Vichyist. Petain (1856-1951), though not officially involved in the war until it was too late, was another *collabo*. Maurice Gamelin (1872-1958) showed some guts and went to jail, after having driven France into the ground. Of course, the Germans won so swiftly not only because of the French defeatism, but also thanks to the genius and daring displayed by Manstein, Hitler, Guderian, and Rommel. One wishes those bright men had dedicated their intelligence to nobler purposes. The French should have, of course, gone on the strategic offensive as early as possible in September 1939, while the bulk of the German forces was occupied with Poland. They could have even used a reverse-Schieffen, by going through Belgium - the English were already in the war, and the Belgians, though angry at the breach of their neutrality, surely would not have fought the French. But even over the Siegfried line, the French should have been able to force a breakthrough - and had they occupied the Ruhr area, which was Germany's industrial heartland, they could have forced a quick decision to the war. The Poles fell swiftly; that is true - but what would have the Russians done, had they seen Germany waver in the west?

Even the German generals - and they were as good as generals get - agreed with this assessment: "According to General Siegfried Westphal, German staff officer on the western front, if France had attacked in September 1939, German forces could not have held out for more than one or two weeks."¹⁴ One has to wonder if defeatists (or rather, dinosaur proponents of "defensive"/"static" warfare) like Gamelin and Petain had been deliberately installed in France prior to the war by the various banker-Masonic networks.

During the *Drôle de guerre*, the British were as exasperating as ever:

(*Tragedy & Hope*, p. 667

When some British Members of Parliament, led by Amery, put pressure on the government to drop bombs on German munition stores in the Black Forest, the air minister, sir H. Kingsley Wood, rejected the suggestion with asperity, declaring: "Are you aware it is private property? Why, you will be asking me to bomb Essen next!" Essen was the home of the Krupp munitions factories.

On the same page, Quigley mentions how even after the war commenced, French iron ore continued to flow into Germany through the Low Countries in return for German coal. *Drôle* indeed.

The insane behavior of the French suggests that the French top echelon were somehow controlled from the inside, via secret societies and blackmail. Or, perhaps, the men in charge of France proved lesser than the task before them.

In summary, the French could have unilaterally prevented World War II despite the malicious British interference. Had France neutralized Germany in 1936 or 1938, Stalin would never have conceived attacking a Europe that could potentially unite against him. The war would have been averted. Even in September 1939, the French, with a bit more daring and competence, could have forced an earlier resolution to the war. The important lesson is that, yes, beyond a doubt, World War II could have been averted. There is a certain element of inevitability of history, but by-and-large, revolutions and wars are messy affairs highly dependant on the actions and personalities of a few key players -

¹⁴http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maurice_Gamelin#Role_in_World_War_II, Dec 13, 2011.

and if enough people realize the nature of wars and revolutions, we will be able to spare ourselves great pain and suffering in the future. Today, in our nuclear age, as yet another Anglo-American rampage threatens peace on Earth, the lessons of history are more important than ever.

8.7.2 Red Symphony and the Unholy Alliance

In this subsection, let us look at the strange document *Red Symphony*, purportedly written by a "Dr. J. Landowsky."¹⁵ The piece deals with the origins of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. Though of questionable genuineness, the document ties with so many points of our research, that it merits looking at, with the provision that it is a "soft" source, and it is up to the reader to procure and read the original and make up his mind.

The ostensible story behind *Red Symphony* is as follows: In Russia, during the purges of the late 1930s, Dr. Landowsky was present at the interrogations of the notable Bolshevik Christian Rakovsky, who had fallen out of Stalin's favor. Rakovsky's revelations stunned Landowsky, who made sure to keep a private copy of the interrogations' record at great personal risk. During the war, a Spanish volunteer found the document on the body of the doctor near the Leningrad Front. The volunteer carried the papers home, where they were eventually published in Madrid, around 1949-1952, by the "well-known publisher Senor Don Mauricio Carlavilla." The work was first translated and published in English in 1968, and has remained generally unknown. Conspiracy researchers have rediscovered the piece in the last decade. The book has now been published in a number of languages.

So let us see what Landowsky heard, with two ideas in mind: first, the document, whether fraudulent or not, originates from around 1948, when the "Jewish/ Masonic/ banker conspiracy" version of history was fairly well-developed, but little coherent information existed in the public domain on such subjects as the Western build-up of Russia and Germany, on the Round Table group, on Skull & Bones, on the influence of the foundations, and so on; and second, we have seen that all sorts of shenanigans have been taking place in the last century, and that we should be extremely careful not to arbitrarily reject or accept a reasonable-looking document's veracity.

Christian Rakovsky (1873-1941) was a Bulgarian-born revolutionary, journalist, doctor, and Soviet diplomat. Born Krastyo ("Christian") Georgiev Stanchev, the man changed his name to Rakovsky to be cool and to be like his pals Trotsky & Co, who also sported pseudonyms. It is said that Rakovsky was a Jew, and that his real-real name was Chaim Rakover.

Born to a wealthy family in Ottoman Bulgaria, Rakovsky witnessed the 1878 Russo-Turkish war with childish admiration, and carried an infatuation with Russia for the rest of his life. Due to his parents' move across the Danube to Romania in 1880, Rakovsky would acquire a Romanian citizenship, and would become a polyglot and a citizen of the world. The man studied in Bulgaria, and was expelled from the gymnasium at Gabrovo in 1890 for inciting a riot. He developed a penchant for Marxism and published an underground newspaper. Rakovsky proceeded to Geneva - that notorious communist playground - and studied medicine at the University of Geneva. There, Rakovsky became close to the early and influential Russian Marxist Georgi Plekhanov (1856-1918). He met Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919), Pavel Axelrod (1850-1928) and Vera Zasulich (1849-1919). By 1892-93, Rakovsky was an active member of the pan-European communist underground. In 1893, he enrolled at the university of Berlin, and met Wilhelm Liebknecht (1826-1900). Expelled because of his socialist ties, Rakovsky criss-crossed Europe and studied in France and Switzerland. In 1896, he attended the Second International's London Congress.

In 1899-1900, Rakovsky served in the Romanian army (under a draft). Having married a Russian woman, he moved to St. Petersburg, where he worked with his fellow communists. Lenin was initially hostile to Rakovsky.

His wife died in 1902, and the Russians kicked him out. Rakovsky went to France, where he eked a

¹⁵I found the reference in an article by Henry Makow.

living as a doctor, and was denied naturalization. In 1904, he settled at his father's sizeable estate in Romania. Trotsky stayed with him for a while in 1913. He kept up his journalistic and medicinal work, making the occasional trip to Bulgaria.

In 1907, the Romanians decided to follow the good sense of the rest of Europe, and expelled Rakovsky. He returned in 1909 and 1911, was arrested, went to Istanbul, was arrested and kicked out, stayed in Sofia for a while, and finally returned to Romania, when the Romanian government buckled to pressure by Georges Clemenceau (1841-1929, PM 1906-1909, 1917-1920), who was in turn appealed to by Jean Jaurès (1859-1914).

Rakovsky continued in the same vein. As the war progressed, he travelled to Italy, and welcomed the equally bizarre character of Parvus to Bucharest, thus arousing suspicions of being in the employ of the German intelligence. After some adventures in the mid-war years, Rakovsky found himself in Petrograd in the spring of 1917. He joined the Bolsheviks around December. He was a Trotskyist and a proponent of the "World Revolution," and held high positions in the nascent Soviet government. During the Civil War, Rakovsky bagged Odessa and had himself a brief purge. For the duration of 1919, Rakovsky was the de-facto boss of the Ukraine. In the 1920s, he was a top-level Soviet diplomat. In particular, he was the Soviet ambassador to France between 1925 and 1927. As Stalin rose to power, the Trotskyite faction suffered. The French eventually banned Rakovsky from their country, because of his vocal support for the "World Revolution." The Romanians had apropos sentenced him to death in absentia. In 1927, Rakovsky was kicked out of the Comintern, and sent to the province. After trying to escape the USSR, Rakovsky was shipped to Siberia. In 1934, he surrendered to Stalin, and was allowed back in Moscow. In 1935, he served as the Soviet Ambassador to Japan. The purges hit Rakovsky badly, and he found himself in a show trial in 1938. While his co-defendants were executed, Rakovsky was spared and sentenced to hard labour. After the Nazis invaded the USSR in 1941, Rakovsky was summarily shot.

Rakovsky was a Mason.

This was a man of extreme intelligence and extensive connections, of whom nothing would be too surprising. He had someone's backing and served someone's goals - whose backing?, and what were the goals?

Let us proceed: - *Red Symphony* opens with a lot of small talk, marked by debates on the Marxist dialectic, between Rakovsky and his interrogator. I will focus on the more interesting statements pertaining to the character and the goals of various players mentioned in the work. In general, the text follows Rakovsky's conversation with his ward, and - where it is not obvious that I am editorializing - I insert my own comments in brackets.

The questioning took place in January 1938.

Accused of being a spy for Hitler, Rakovsky said "We are not spies of Hitler, we hate Hitler as you can hate him, as Stalin can hate him; perhaps even more so, but this is a very complex question." Rakovsky's crew had had contacts with the German intelligence after Trotsky's fall (January 1928) but before Hitler's acquisition of power (early 1933).

In reference to Lenin's dealings with the German high-command, Rakovsky said "And if for the triumph of Communism defeatism can be justified, then he who considers that Communism has been destroyed by the bonapartism of Stalin and that he betrayed it, has the same right as Lenin to become a defeatist." Note again that Stalin was essentially a nationalist and a strong-man type of leader, while the Trotskyists were internationalists and proponents of World Revolution.

Rakovsky said that his people did not desire the destruction of the Stalinist state, because they currently had no chance of attaining power in the wreckage. Though not really Communist in Rakovsky's opinion, "the USSR continues to preserve its Communistic form and dogma; this is formal and not real Communism." As such, the USSR at least offered prospects for the future: "the disappearance of Stalin will allow us to transform his formal Communism into a real one. One hour would suffice for us." The interrogator observed that, indeed, "nobody destroys that which he wants to inherit."

In speaking of his backers ("them"), Rakovsky said that he could only tell the interrogator what he *thought* they wanted to do, and could not possibly know their real goals. In relation to Hitler's plans, insisting that the short-term Nazi attack on the USSR was not inevitable, Rakovsky observed that:

The re-armament of Hitler and the assistance he received at the present time from the Versailles nations (take good note of this) - were received by him during a special period, when we could still have become the heirs of Stalin in the case of his defeat, when the opposition still existed.

Rakovsky felt that "the USSR exists thanks to the mistakes of its enemies." He explained that "With Marxism you get the same results as with the ancient esoteric religions. Their adherents had to know only that which was the most elementary and crude, insofar as by this one provoked their faith, i.e. that which is absolutely essential, both in religion and in the work of revolution." In reality, "Marxism, before being a philosophical, economic and political system, is a conspiracy for the revolution." In his view, Marx's axiomatic proposition was: "contradictions plus time equal Communism." The real Marx was not the "scientist," but the conspirator.

Said Rakovsky,

Marx deceives for tactical reasons about the origin of the contradictions in Capitalism, but not about their obvious reality. Marx knew how they were created, how they became more acute and how things went towards general anarchy in Capitalistic production, which came before the triumph of the Communist revolution ... He knew it would happen because he knew those who created the contradictions.

(Of course he knew them - that's why he was in London.) In general, Rakovsky's thesis was that Marx's official writings were just mumbo-jumbo meant to confuse, and that his real job and goals were those of the conspirator.

For some reason, noted Rakovsky, Marx avoided the subject of money:

In the question of money Marx is a reactionary; to one's immense surprise he was one; bear in mind the "five-pointed star" like the Soviet one, which shines all over Europe, the star composed of the five Rothschild brothers with their banks, who possess colossal accumulations of wealth, the greatest ever known ... And so this fact, so colossal that it misled the imagination of the people of that epoch, passes unnoticed with Marx. Something strange ... Is that not so? It is possible that from this strange blindness of Marx there arises a phenomenon which is common to all future social revolutions. It is this: we can all confirm that when the masses take possession of a city or a country, then they always seem struck by a sort of superstitious fear of the banks and bankers. One had killed Kings, generals, bishops, policemen, priests and other representatives of the hated privileged classes; one robbed and burnt palaces, churches and even centres of science, but though the revolutions were economic-social, the lives of the bankers were respected, and as a result the magnificent buildings of the banks remained untouched ... According to my information, before I had been arrested, this continues even now ... In Spain ... Don't you know it? As you ask me, so tell me now: Do you not find all this very strange? Think, the police ... I do not know, have you paid attention to the strange similarity which exists between the financial International and the proletarian International. I would say that one is the other side of the other, and the back side is the proletarian one as being more modern than the financial.

Moreover,

Finances in their apogee - as an aim in themselves, the financial International - deny and do not recognise anything national, they do not recognize the State; and therefore it is anarchical and would be absolutely anarchical if it - the denier of any national State - were not itself, by necessity, a State in its own basic essence. The State as such is only

power. And money is exclusively power. This communistic super-state, which we are creating already during a whole century, and the scheme of which is the International of Marx. Analyse it and you will see its essence. The scheme of the International and its prototype of the USSR - that is also pure power. The basic similarity between the two creations is absolute. It is something fatalistic, inevitable, since the personalities of the authors of both was identical. The financier is just as international as the Communist. Both, with the help of differing pretexts and differing means, struggle with the national bourgeois State and deny it.

Rakovsky then explained how "they" took over the power of producing money around the time of the French revolution, and how that power allows them to control states, and so on. In general, "Banks, the stock exchanges and the whole world financial system - is a gigantic machine for the purpose of bringing about unnatural scandals." And moreover, "the Capitalistic system of production is determined by finance."

So it is and so it was even before Marx and Engels, that finances were the most powerful instrument of revolution and the Comintern was nothing but a toy in their hands. But neither Marx nor Engels will disclose or explain this. On the contrary, making use of their talent as scientists, they had to camouflage truth for a second time in the interests of the revolution. And that both of them did.

In Rakovsky's opinion, Trotsky (who had a limousine while impecunious in New York), like Marx and Engels, was in on the game. The real revolutionaries, you see, were always the bankers. Their goal was absolute power. In the old days, absolute power was impossible on account of technological backwardness - today, however...

Asked who "they" were, Rakovsky replied "You are so naive that you think that if I knew who "They" are, I would be here as a prisoner? ...since he who is acquainted with them would not be put into a position in which he would be obliged to report on them." "[T]hey give political or financial positions only to intermediaries. Obviously to persons who are trustworthy and loyal, which can be guaranteed a thousand ways [meaning blackmail]."

Said Rakovsky, "You know that according to the unwritten history known only to us, the founder of the First Communist International is indicated, of course secretly, as being Weishaupt." Moreover, "What is not known are the relations between Weishaupt and his followers with the first of the Rothschilds." And the Frankfurt bankers "the Rothschilds were not the treasurers, but the chiefs of that first secret Communism..."

Indeed, "This opinion is based on that wellknown fact that Marx and the highest chiefs of the First International - already the open one - and among them Herzen and Heine, were controlled by Baron Lionel Rothschild." War was revolutionary - "Since that time [1789] every war was a giant step towards Communism." Moreover, as Rakovsky explains - and this is a crucial point - the puny communist nihilists and brainwash jobs could not provoke wars - but the bankers could.

Rakovsky tells a little story of the interrogator:

...listen to a small story: "They" isolated the Tsar diplomatically for the Russo-Japanese War, and the United States financed Japan; speaking precisely, this was done by Jacob Schiff, the head of the bank of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., which is the successor of the House of Rothschild, whence Schiff originated. He had such power that he achieved that States which had colonial possessions in Asia supported the creation of the Japanese Empire which was inclined towards xenophobia; and Europe already feels the effects of this xenophobia. From the prisoner-of-war camps there came to Petrograd the best fighters, trained as revolutionary agents; they were sent there from America with the permission of Japan, obtained through the persons who had financed it. The Russo-Japanese War, thanks to the organized defeat of the Tsar's army, called forth the revolution of 1905, which, though it was premature, but was very nearly successful; even if it did not win, it still created the required political conditions for the victory of 1917.

(Our findings confirm these statements.) Moreover, Trotsky gained significantly from the events of 1905. On his rise:

How and why there rises the unknown Trotzky, gaining power by one move greater than that which the oldest and most influential revolutionaries had? Very simple: he marries. Together with him there arrives in Russia his wife - Sedova. Do you know who she is? She is associated with Zhivotovsky, linked with the bankers Warburg, partners and relatives of Jacob Schiff, i.e. of that financial group which, as I had said, had also financed the revolution of 1905. Here is the reason why Trotzky, in one move, moves to the top of the revolutionary list.

Rakovsky identified Kerensky the Mason as a collaborator of "them" and of Trotsky - though not of Lenin. He explained that the bankers, including Schiff and Warburg, financed the October revolution. Lenin was controlled through his wife Krupskaya.

"Masonry" (in Russia) was also subject to "them." The Masons were duped into thinking that they were working for a republic of the French type. In general, "the freemasons have to die at the hands of the revolution which has been brought about with their co-operation." (This is why Masonry often receives a purge after a revolution. Usually, after some time the recruitment of new dupes commences.) Rakovsky was a Mason and saw through the scam.

The Trotskyite faction, explained Rakovsky, protested the signing of Brest-Litovsk, and wanted to aid the German communist revolution. Rakovsky stated that the Kaplan assassination attempt on Lenin (August 30, 1918) was staged by Trotsky in an effort to open the way to World Revolution. Trotsky's agent, in the opinion of Rakovsky, was the strange O'Reilly (really Rosenblum), the top British spy we met earlier, and who was, says Rakovsky, "a man of 'them.'" Rakovsky continued, to say that after Trotsky became the head of the Red Army, his faction rejected the conspiratorial/assassination method. After Trotsky seized the Red Army, continued Rakovsky, he was allowed a few quick victories to gain prestige. "They" betrayed the Whites. After the Civil War, someone quietly killed Lenin. (As Eustis pointed out, "they" like to use doctors to do their dirty work; this is also notable in light of the notorious Stalin doctor plot, which must have been real.) On the *Cui bono?* principle, Rakovsky thought that Stalin had arranged the murder. Ironically, Trotsky, who had his hands on a letter by Lenin condemning Stalin, got sick at the crucial moment and could not act. As Stalin gained power, the Trotskyite faction found it necessary to ally with him. In the end, Stalin, the nationalist and bonapartist, prevailed.

Rakovsky identified the notorious Versailles war guilt treaty as a precondition for "revolution." (Quigley and many others have stated that the war guilt clause was the key first step to World War II).

To do to Stalin what they did to the Tsar, "they" had decided to arm Germany and send it after Russia. Though their goal had been to communize Germany, they decided to settle on Hitler as a second best. In particular, one of the Warburgs financed Adolf at a crucial moment in 1929.

"They" had something of a dilemma. They did not want to smash Russia if they could control it through Trotsky; barring that, they would unleash Hitler. They also toyed with the idea of creating a war between the "bourgeois" states, and for that they wanted to ensure a temporary peace between Stalin and Hitler.

Adolf had also annoyed the banker boys by nationalizing the power of money production, and of producing credit. (This is the famous Lautenbach-Woytinski model, which the Nazis did adopt to great effect. On this model, the nation-state dumps the bankers, incurring a hit of prestige on the international stage, and proceeds to operate on the basis of its own resources. In 1930, a nation rich in coal, iron, expertise, and infrastructure - all of which Germany had in great degrees - was really a rich nation, and could afford to trade its surplus high-technology goods to the minor powers and the otherwise ostracised nations for crucial raw materials. Adolf did not particularly care about what the world thought of his manners; he was only interested in what the world thought of his power - and so he opted for the Lautenbach model.) Unemployment rapidly fell, though living standards hardly rose, since Hitler was channelling his efforts into military production. Adolf had been a bit lucky -

having no gold, he had dumped the gold standard, and opted for straight state-backed fiat. Hitler's economic "discovery" spelt the doom for Germany - that much was certain. What really scared the bankers was the notion that Adolf would eventually turn his industry toward peaceful production, and the world would marvel at the German opulence that would result. (The economic depression scam only works if no countries innocently avoid the depressions via sane economic policies. This is one of the major reasons, other than oil, for the recent annihilation of Iraq and Libya.)

Furthermore, "the need for the destruction of nationalism is alone worth a war in Europe." Another goal was the destruction of Christianity. Had Stalin made a pact with Christianity (which he did once the war started), so great would have his power become, that he would have been considered unapproachable, and consigned to destruction along with his fellow co-"discoverer" Adolf. Since Stalin was, in 1938, still anti-Christian, the possibility existed of a "temporary and objective" collaboration with him.

The goal was:

We shall simplify. Insofar as the object is missing for which the German military might had been created - to give us power in the USSR - the aim now is to bring about an advance on the fronts and to direct the Hitlerist advance not towards the East, but the West.

Hitler and Stalin both being Bonapartists, they had a common ground on which an alliance could be established. (Hence the secret clause for the partitioning of Europe in Molotov-Ribbentrop.) After the proposed partition of Poland, "the democracies will declare war only on one aggressor, and that will be Hitler."

In regard to the US,

America did not enter a war formerly and never will do so if it is not attacked. Its rulers can arrange that they will be attacked, if that will suit them. Of that I can assure you. In those cases when provocation was not successful and the enemy did not react to it, aggression was invented. In their first international war, the war against Spain, of the defeat of which they were sure, they invented an aggression, or, more correctly, "They" invented it. In 1914 provocation was successful.

After explaining all this, Rakovsky explicitly proposed the partitioning of Poland pact. Rakovsky's expectations of the negotiations were:

I wanted to say that with Hitler one must play a clean game concerning the concrete and most immediate questions. It is necessary to shew him that the game is not played in order to provoke him into war on two fronts. For example, it is possible to promise him and to prove at the most suitable moment that our mobilization will be limited to a small number of forces, required for the invasion of Poland, and that these forces will not be great. According to our real plan we shall have to place our main forces to meet the possible Anglo French attack. Stalin will have to be generous with the preliminary supplies which Hitler will demand, chiefly oil. That is what has come to my mind for the moment.

The ultimate goal, at the exhaustion of all participating armies, was: "There is only one aim, one single aim: the triumph of Communism; it is not Moscow which will impose its will on the democracies, but New York, not the "Comintern," but the "Capintern" on Wall Street."

Rakovsky's bait to Stalin was, in essence, not the promise of security against Hitler, but the promise of: 1) time for preparation; 2) the prospect of the emaciation of the Western states. The idea was, if I interpret it correctly, to set a temporary truce between Adolf and Joe; to throw Adolf westward while Joe built up; and then to pit the two together in a titanic battle, at the end of which Adolf would be annihilated. Needless to say, "they" hoped that Stalin would fall, too. That was always the catch. If Stalin refused to go with the plan, Germany would be armed and sent after him, and

after he was done, the Allies would crush Germany and remove Hitler, just like they had done in World War I.

Impressed by this torrent of reality, the interrogator asked Rakovsky to get one of "them" to somehow send a sign confirming "their" existence on behalf of Rakovsky. Picking up this thread, Rakovsky mentioned that he knew from Trotsky - who knew "them" - that Rathenau was one of "them." Through Rapallo, for which he paid with his life, Rathenau had broken the blockade on the USSR. As "their" institutions and agents, Rakovsky pointed to:

As an institutions - the Bank of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of Wall Street; to this bank belong the families of Schiff, Warburg, Loeb and Kuhn; I say families in order to point out several names, since they are all connected among themselves by marriages; then Baruch, Frankfurter, Altschul, Cohen, Benjamin, Strauss, Steinhardt, Blom, Rosenman, Lippmann, Lehman, Dreifus, Lamont, Rothschild, Lord, Mandel Morgenthau, Ezekiel, Lasky. I think that that will be enough names;

(That's the Jewish conspiracy again; and the highest level there are Jewish bankers who obviously are a part of the conspiracy. One wonders why Rakovsky (or whoever wrote the document) failed to finger Rockefeller and Morgan. Some have said that Rocky and J.P. were Rothschild agents - all right, but then, whose agents were the Rothschilds? It all gets complicated.)

Finally, Rakovsky asked the interrogator to contact Joseph Davis, the American ambassador to Moscow.

On Roosevelt:

Take note of the following: In that year 1929, the first year of the American revolution, in February Trotsky leaves Russia; the crash takes place in October ... The financing of Hitler is agreed in July, 1929. You think that all this was by chance? The four years of the rule of Hoover were used for the preparation of the seizure of power in the United States and the USSR; there by means of a financial revolution, and here with the help of war and the defeat which was to follow. Could some good novel with great imagination be more obvious to you? You can understand that the execution of the plan on such a scale requires a special man, who can direct the executive power in the United States, who has been predetermined to be the organizing and deciding force. That man was Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt. And permit me to say that this two-sexed being is not simply irony. He had to avoid any possible Delilah.

... I do not know if he is one of "Them," or is only subject to "Them." ... I think that he was conscious of his mission, but cannot assert whether he obeyed under duress of blackmail or he was one of those who rule; it is true that he carried out his mission, realized all the actions which had been assigned to him accurately.

To Davis, Rakovsky suggested that Stalin made the following offer: "ideologically and economically Russia and America want the destruction of European Colonial Imperialism." This by "neutrality." Interesting and presaging was the following exchange:

G: [Interrogator] But if Hitler achieves a quick victory and if he, like Napoleon, mobilizes the whole of Europe against the USSR?

R: You reject the power factor, a greater one. Is it not natural that America, imitating Stalin, would on its part help the democratic States? If one were to coordinate "against the hands of the clock" the help to both groups of fighters, then thus there will be assured without failure a permanent extension of the war.

G. - And Japan?

R. - Is not China enough for them? Let Stalin guarantee them his non-intervention. The Japanese are very fond of suicide, but after all not to such an extent as to be capable of simultaneously attacking China and the USSR. Any more objections?

The conditions to be put before Stalin would be along the lines of:

The first condition will be the ending of the executions of the Communists, that means the Trotzkyists, as you call them. Then, of course, they will demand the establishment of several zones of influence, as I had mentioned. The boundaries which will have to divide the formal Communism from the real one. That is the most important condition. There will be mutual concessions for mutual help for a time, while the plan lasts, being carried out. You will see for example the paradoxical phenomenon that a whole crowd of people, enemies of Stalin, will help him, no they will not necessarily be proletarians, nor will they be professional spies. There will appear influential persons at all levels of society, even very high ones, who will help the Stalinist formal Communism when it becomes if not real, then at least objective Communism. Have you understood me?

(The purges ended in the summer of 1938. Rakovsky himself was tried in March. The division of the Western and Soviet spheres of worldwide influence was accomplished during the war, particularly at Yalta in 1945. The CFR had written plans on the subject. The West did indeed piously aid Stalin, whose forces, in turn, bore the brunt of the war.)

And finally,

Do you not see that already? In Moscow there is Communism: in New York Capitalism. It is all the same as a thesis and anti-thesis. Analyze both. Moscow is subjective Communism, but Capitalism objective - State Capitalism. New York: Capitalism subjective, but Communism objective. A personal synthesis, truth: the Financial International, the Capitalist-Communist one. "They."

How much of this can we verify empirically, how much can we rationalize, and what conclusions do we draw?

It is a matter of documented historical fact that: There was a terrific clash between Trotsky and Stalin, with the former, a revolutionary from New York, demanding aggressive World Revolution, and the latter reverting to the Russian autocratic tradition; the USSR had indeed, despite professing communism, reverted to the old Tsarist model replete with something like a new landed aristocracy; the "Versailles" nations did build up Hitler; Marxism is alike the esoteric religions; Marx was a protege of the London "capitalists"; the bankers did intend to set up neo-feudalism; they did and do control the nations' money supply; Illuminism and Communism are near identical in ideology and organization; the Illuminati were tied to the Rothschilds; Schiff did fund the Japanese in 1905, and did provoke the St. Petersburg revolution; Sidney "Reilly" was up to no good in Russia in 1918 and the Bolsheviks implicated him in the Lenin assassination attempt; Trotsky did stand to gain from Lenin's death; Lenin did blast Stalin in his last testament; the Versailles war guilt clause was a key trigger for WWII; the Warburgs were on the boards of Farben, which financed Hitler; Stalin did make a pact with Christianity and to this day remains the most popular Russian leader since at least Alexander II (Stalin's attitude to Christianity is discussed, for example, in Alexander Werth's *Russia at War* (1964)); FDR had strong ties to Wall Street and the East Coast Establishment; nationalism was not the same after WWII; the "Allies" did hand over half of Europe to Stalin, and aided the USSR after the war; people like Harriman, Rockefeller, and Armand Hammer did establish connections with Russia, which, in all likelihood, led to the 1989-1991 soft coup; judging by what befell Russia in the 1990s, "Jewish" elements were used by "them" to interfere with Russia's internal affairs; and Norman Dodd - an eminently credible witness - did state, explicitly, that in the 1950s "they" were already working on the synthesis of the USSR and the West. That synthesis was evidently attempted in the 1990s - and it did not quite succeed. Dodd's testimony is fascinating, because it came *after* 1949, explicitly confirming a key piece of evidence proposed in *Red Symphony*. Also impressive is the fact that Rakovsky somehow survived the 1938 purge, even as his comrades fell. He must have done something truly spectacular for Stalin - and the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact fits the bill. Moreover, the moment the pact went void, so did Rakovsky's insurance - and he, the thorn in the sole of all of Europe, was finally shot. It all fits.

Supposing the document is genuine, what can we take from it? First, all the pieces of the puzzle mentioned above fit as arranged. Moreover, we obtain a fairly good approximation of "their" - and remember that there always existed multiple factions, or splits within "their" main faction - of "their" plans. Namely: the banker boys, from their safe island bases in London and New York (America really is something like a vast island; and Manhattan is a small island, and Banker Central), had tried to take over Russia and Germany in the wane of the Great War. They had intended, it seems, to influence the "Communist" governments by remote control via their trained agents of the kind of Trotsky, Rakovsky, and Parvus. The plan, which appears quite mad except that they really attempted something like it, failed. In Russia, Stalin, drawing on the instinctive Russian Tsarist tradition, managed to succeed Lenin. Moreover, Stalin's efforts at crushing the Trotskyists, it turns out, were not mere repressive measures in the hands of a mad despot, but were, to a great degree, genuine acts of self-defence against truly pernicious alien elements.

Hitler's adoption of the Lautenbach measures must really have frightened the bankers, and explains the ultimate Western betrayal and destruction of Hitler, who repeatedly, and even at the height of his strength, pleaded the Western Allies for peace.

The goading of Hitler westward was done with the idea of provoking a Second World War as a ploy of finishing off nationalism and setting up the bipolar "Cold War" model, which would culminate in the synthesis, which was attempted, with limited success, in 1991, and is being attempted again today with the winter of 2011-2012 color coup against Putin, who is something between a bonapartist and a true popular leader. Many conspiracy researchers tend to assume that the USSR was always controlled and always inherently evil. In reality, Trotsky and his gangsters were controlled, and, to an extent, so were Gorbachev and Yeltsin, but Stalin and Putin definitely *were not* controlled. They may have been aided, bullied, tricked, and goaded; they may be unpleasant personalities in many ways; but they were *not* "their" agents or full-fledged dupes. Moreover, the post-1930 USSR was more a twisted expression of old Russia than anything else - as such, it sought to fulfil the natural Russian national interests, and was "communist" mostly in name. After WWII, the Soviets were meek compared to the Americans - this is a matter of elementary fact, and I beg my American readers to be realistic, and to realize that the problem is not really with the American people (though they have gone along with the madness far too easily), but rather the maddog American ruling super-hierarchy. During the 1945-1989 period, the people in Eastern Europe were not "slaves" - the "socialistic republics" were rather repressive, but they also fulfilled many of the duties of the nation-states, and provided decent health-care, education, and employment to the people.

This is not to say that "communism" is good. Rather, the point is that the Eastern European regimes were more despotic than they were "communist," and that they had a fair degree of autonomy and responsibility, and managed to realize their duties to a reasonable extent. Remember that the Warsaw pact was always under siege by the truly terrific assembled power of the industrialized West. The USSR never managed to industrialize properly, because it had to keep producing weapons for genuine purposes of self-defence. The bankers, conniving swine that they were, used the Soviet military might to spawn the wars in Korea and Vietnam, and to maintain the myth of the Soviet bogeyman. Note that while the Soviet threat to the West was largely invented, the Western threat to the Warsaw Pact was real. Those are the realities of power. The West was incomparably stronger than the Soviet Bloc. The bankers may have instigated another war, except for the emergence of the nukes, of which the USSR needed some to appear dangerous, but which also rendered World Wars useless for practical purposes.

Going back to World War II, the coherent plan for the war seems to have been - use the Nazi-Soviet pact to send Hitler west to punish France, have him conquer all of Europe, then pit him against the USSR, and squash him between the Red Army and the Anglo-American combine. Also force Japan into attacking the US to draw the latter into the war; then smash Japan and gain a foothold in East Asia. In other words, "their" plan worked out as intended, likely with a few hitches along the way. One suspects that the Nazis were not expected to conquer France as quickly as they

did, and that the near-collapse of the USSR was never intended. After the war, the Anglo-Americans could contain the USSR inside their Bonn-Rome-Tel-Aviv-Tokyo axis, behind which stood London and New York, and could deal with Russia and China (where they also installed clinically insane "communists") at their leisure. Soviet Russia - though in reality always on the defensive - would provide the unifying existential enemy and the excuse for wars. Hence NATO, for example. All the developments since 1945 point toward a plan along those general lines.

And one has to stress that, as Quigley pointed out, the real powers were *ideologically disconnected* from either Nazism or Communism. They would use the Nazis and the Communists as they saw fit; they could even implement a fascist or communist regime here or there; but in reality - and they seem ever more aware of this fact today - faux democracy is the surest safeguard against bonapartism, which is a real threat to the perfidious Oligarchy. Nazism and Communism are worth examining in their function as the driving ideologies of certain individuals and groups - but the Anglo-American top echelon of the last century operates on the principles of power and on an ideology of power - they have their own ideology - they do not need the half-baked stuff of Mussolini or Lenin, whom they invested into power.

At the same time, lower ranking oligarchical elements naturally gravitated toward the fascist viewpoint, because of the fascists' willingness to co-operate with industrial interests, and the fascists' anti-unionist views.

It should also be admitted that the Corporate One-World Empire, for which the bankers and the technocrats push, is thoroughly fascist.

One more point in regard to the Warburg connection. Antony Sutton mentioned another strange document - a book entitled *The Financial Sources of National Socialism* written by a "Sydney Warburg," printed in the Netherlands in 1933. Franz von Papen (1879-1968) thought the book was accurate. Sutton notes that (*Wall St. & Hitler*, Ch. 10) "Some of the information in the book is now common knowledge - although only part was generally known in the early 1930s. It is extraordinary to note that the unknown author had access to information that only surfaced many years later..." The book had been instantly and heavily suppressed, both in the West and in Germany (since the Nazis wanted to avoid embarrassment). Sutton had managed to obtain a copy. The document has since surfaced and is available online under the title *Hitler's Secret Backers*. It says that:

Rockefeller (Junior) (1874-1960) and a "Carter" - likely John Ridgely Carter (1862-1944), a Morgan man (married to Alice Morgan) - sent "Sydney Warburg" - likely James Paul Warburg (1896-1969), who was Paul Warburg's son and FDR's financial adviser, to finance Adolf. The narrator ("Warburg") went to Germany three times - in 1929, in 1931, and around early 1933. The first time he dished out \$10 million, the second time \$15 million, the last time \$7 million. On all three occasions, the Nazis desperately needed the funds, and having received money, they put it to great use. A representative of Shell was also in on the plan.

The explicitly provided reason for the financing of Hitler was Anglo-American antagonism toward France's handling of the dual issues of the economic crisis and the German reparations. The narrator says (Ch.1) "Wall Street had never been very happy about the Treaty of Versailles, which had been constructed along Wilson's guidelines. This treaty had been formally turned down because France was favored in it for no reason. That was the feeling in 1920, in 1929 it had grown into open hostility." This is extremely interesting, inasmuch as Versailles was composed with plenty of input from the Round Table and the proto-CFR American group, and has been identified as one of the core causes of World War II. Quigley thought that (*T&H* pp.268-269) "...the peace settlements were made by an organization which was chaotic and by a procedure which was fraudulent." This was not deliberate, but the result of "weakness and ignorance." Wilson (and those behind him) were blamed for single-mindedly pursuing their ideological goals, mainly the League of Nations. To get the League, Wilson gave too many concessions to Clemenceau and Lloyd George, and particularly to the former. As a result, the French gained too much influence on the continent, which made them a major target of British foreign policy after 1922. During the financial crisis around 1931, there was a lot of moving around of gold, and the French with their policies incurred the wrath of

the Anglo-American axis. As a result, apart from the other factors, animosity toward France was a strong motivation for the creation of Hitler by Wall Street.

This is the justification listed by the narrator; for himself, he loathed Hitler, but in the end simply followed the orders of the top figures of Wall Street. Moreover, the narrator, though an insider, was likely not aware of the full picture, or did not want to reveal the extent of his understanding.

That the "Sidney Warburg" account is substantially true, one can gather from: 1) the suppression of the work; 2) the accuracy and scope of the work, which clearly must have been written from an insider; 3) the subsequent confirmations of certain relevant facts mentioned by the narrator. The document is likely genuine. Besides, as we have seen, it has been verified that Rockefeller-Morgan & the Round Table funded and aided Hitler; and the Anglo-American antagonism of France fits both with the classic British *modus operandi* and with the British sabotage of France in the pre-war years and in 1940.

"Warburg" also mentions that Hitler was willing to temporarily work with Stalin in order to crush France. Made in 1933, the prediction famously came true.

Another interesting point is "Warburg's" claim that the men in charge of the financial world in New York were incompetents. Quigley made the same point in regard to the Round Tablers. Were Rockefeller and Lothian and the rest of them bunglers, or did they pursue non-obvious goals? I lean toward the latter view, though it is very hard to tell. They could have been bunglers - why not? What, in my opinion, is certain, is that there was a very great degree of improvisation in the behaviour of the men at the top. They followed general, sometimes shifting objectives, and adapted to situations as they arose. Because of their power, they could often turn disaster into profit. As they themselves say, "Never let a good crisis go to waste."

8.7.3 The English Plan to "Invade" Norway and "Aid" Finland

Two little known and confusing developments in early 1940 were: 1) The proposed British invasion of Norway; and 2) the British noises for the support of the Finns in their defence against the Red Army.

The second issue is extremely confusing, in light of Churchill's subsequent attempt to ally with Stalin, and in light of the insanity of the notion of Britain waging war against both Germany and the Soviet Russia. Obviously, the British did not mind seeing the Russians bleed, but they would never have waged war on the USSR in 1940.

On the other hand, the British invasion of Norway would have been a good idea, because 1) Norway was generally pro-British; 2) Norway held the key to resources that could be vital for Germany. What is strange is not that British considered occupying Norway, but that the British failed to capture Narvik.

So what happened? F. William Engdahl has an excellent paper on the topic - *Halford MacKinder's Necessary War*.¹⁶

As we have seen, Germany was dependant on Swedish iron. The only route from the Swedish mines to the German steel mills that was open during winter went through Narvik in Norway. Therefore, while both parties had a strong interest in capturing Narvik, the Germans were perfectly willing to work with a neutral Norway - meaning that, on the balance, the British stood to benefit from taking over Oslo.

Writes Engdahl,

This peculiarity of political geography and the relation it defined between neutral Sweden and the Third Reich, set the stage for England's first so-called battle of the war. That battle was at the time viewed as an utter fiasco, as a failed British attempt to pre-empt control of Narvik from the Germans, in order to cripple Germany's war-making ability.

¹⁶<http://www.engdahl.oilgeopolitics.net/History/MacKinder/mackinder.html>, Dec 17, 2011.

In reality, Britain's Norway venture in April 1940 was quite something else. Britain's subsequent defeat in Norway, paradoxically, served two vital objectives for British grand strategy. It assured uninterrupted supply of Swedish iron ore to the steel mills of the Ruhr for the duration of the German war effort. This was essential from the standpoint of the overriding Round Table strategy of forcing a war of mutual annihilation between Germany and Russia.

A deliberately bungled British invasion of Norway also provided the convenient pretext for the Round Table to dump the no longer useful Neville Chamberlain as Prime Minister, and to bring Churchill in, to run the conduct of the actual war, and the crucial task of winning America to the project.

When the war started, Chamberlain reluctantly allowed Winston into his government. The British and the French then proceeded to interestedly look on as the Wehrmacht and the Red Army ate Poland. That the Allies declared war on Germany but not Russia over Poland is illustrative. They could hardly have been expected to declare war on both the great military powers of Europe; but then, they did not even bother to defend Poland in the first place. The whole affair was a farce, except that millions of people suffered as a result, and the French were not nearly as clever as they thought themselves to be.

As far as Churchill goes, he knew what he wanted from the start. He wanted the Russians and the Germans to kill each other for the benefit of Britain. As Engdahl notes,

In early October, Churchill had told an astonished Joseph Kennedy, U.S. Ambassador to Britain, that the Russians were justified in taking eastern Poland, arguing that it was, "really Russian territory."

Surely this is some of Winston's famous wit - because by the same logic, Gdansk, over which Britain had declared war on Germany, was really German territory. But the Bulldog's hypocrisy stands as given. And moreover, Churchill famously remarked in 1919 that:

I do not understand this squeamishness about the use of gas. We have definitely adopted the position at the Peace Conference of arguing in favour of the retention of gas as a permanent method of warfare. It is sheer affectation to lacerate a man with the poisonous fragment of a bursting shell and to boggle at making his eyes water by means of lachrymatory gas. I am strongly in favour of using poisoned gas against uncivilised tribes. The moral effect should be so good that the loss of life should be reduced to a minimum. It is not necessary to use only the most deadly gases: gases can be used which cause great inconvenience and would spread a lively terror and yet would leave no serious permanent effects on most of those affected ... We cannot, in any circumstances acquiesce to the non-utilisation of any weapons which are available to procure a speedy termination of the disorder which prevails on the frontier.

Note that, allegedly, the British did gas Kurds and Iraqis in 1920. Some argue that the British did not use gas - for practical reasons rather than for moral qualms. Whatever the case, this is the kind of person Churchill was, and worse.

In late 1939 (30 November), Stalin embarked on a border correction exercise in Finland. The Finns had a small but elite army used to terrible winter conditions, and the best fortified line in the world. The Soviet superiority in numbers and materiel was not enough to secure a quick victory. Stalin's Red Army only broke through after some brutal fighting in early January. A peace, arranged in part by Germany, whose second route to the Swedish ore went through Finland, was signed on March 12. The Soviet terms were generous, and consequently the Finns showed restraint when they had the upper hand in 1941.

During this war, the freedom-loving British heartily cheered for Finland in yet another show of utter hypocrisy. The British were never going to declare a war on Russia while they were at war with

Germany.

The Soviet incursion into Finland meant that Hitler could not count on his secondary iron ore route - and so he had to secure the first. Enter the Bulldog.

Some weeks before the second Soviet assault on Finland, Churchill began an aggressive, and highly public campaign for a British "support" operation to Finland, in which his troops were to pass over Norway and northern Sweden. Churchill never seriously intended to land British soldiers in Finland, or to go to war for Finland, and thus provoke Russia. His stated intent, expressed in private cabinet discussions, was to use Finland as pretext to launch an invasion of Norway, "en route" to Finland.

Churchill then made sure to let everybody know of his intentions, by loudly discussing his plans wherever he went - Oslo, Paris. Quisling the Nazi (1887-1945), the Commander of the Order of the British Empire, and the admirer of Bolsheviks, was one of those who delivered the news to the Germans. Hitler, who was a decisive man, realized he would have to act.

That was Churchill's intent. He was no novice in matters of security or intelligence. "If they [the Germans] did invade Norway," he stated in a Cabinet meeting in January 1940, "I would be glad. They would be involved in a serious commitment."

French Prime Minister, Paul Reynaud, wrote years later in his memoirs, "Churchill came to Paris April 5, and at last the British government resolved that the minefields in Norwegian territorial waters would after all be laid. The operation was, however, postponed until April 7, so that Hitler could learn of it and prepare his counter-move." Reynaud continued, "One of the aims of the enterprise was, according to the definition of General Gamelin, to entrap the opponent, by provoking him into making a landing in Norway."

Again, one has to wonder if a man of Churchill's stature made great mistakes in grand strategy. To make sure the Germans got the message, Winston ordered the illegal boarding of a German ship (the *Altmark*) in Norwegian (neutral) waters on 16 February 1940. Hitler decided to speed-up the invasion planning on the 19th.

In late March, Churchill announced that Britain would not honor "pro-German" neutrality, and sent his nephew to Norway to spread rumours of an imminent British invasion. Hitler decided to act and did so on April 9. Churchill opined "that the German occupation, "should not be on terms unfavorable to us," insisting that England was, "in a far better position than we had been to date." Churchill heroically sent one motley brigade to succour Narvik after it was captured by the Germans. His "bungling" landed him the prime ministership at the expense of Chamberlain, who, after yet another fiasco, found himself thoroughly discredited. To cap the farce, the Round Tablers staged a final ludicrous scene. Their *Times* lambasted Chamberlain, and finally, on May 7-8, Leo Amery (of the Round Table) got up in the Parliament, and, in effect, told Chamberlain to go to hell. A couple of days later, Churchill became Prime Minister. His bellicosity and his American ties (his mother was an American and he had been FDR's fellow naval minister during the Great War) made Churchill the perfect candidate for running the war on the British side.

It is worth noting that Chamberlain may have genuinely wanted to continue with the appeasement. The Round Tablers, whose group overlapped with Chamberlain's, decided they had had about enough in March 1939 with the second round of Czechoslovakia. Quigley attributed to the Round Tablers motivations gentler than those I am willing to give them. To be fair, there was a schism in the group over the policy of appeasement, especially by 1939. Lothian had gone from a convinced appeaser to a dedicated warmonger. His conversion feels far too easy and calculated for my taste. He spent the last year of his life trying to get the States into the war. By early 1940, a major subset of the Milner group wanted to fight a war with Germany.

8.7.4 Debacle and Miracle at Dunkirk

The insane Hitlerian obsession with Anglophilia can be best illustrated by his titanic blunder at Dunkirk. The sickness of Anglophilia was deep-seated in the Third Reich. Even the anti-Nazi cabal, led by the Rhodes Scholar Helmuth von Moltke (1907-1945), was pro-British. Tragically, the von Moltke group failed to see the British design, and uselessly sought London's support during the war.

It is fairly clear that the Anglo-American conspirators wanted the Germans to bulldoze France. One doubts, however, that they anticipated the rapidity of the German victory in May-June 1940. The plan concocted by Manstein (hit through the Ardennes rather than through Belgium), approved by Hitler, and executed by Guderian and Rommel, surprised everybody, not the least the German general staff, who pathetically kept trying to halt their racing columns at the hour of victory.

By late May, the campaign was all but decided, and the Germans had cornered the British expeditionary force - some ten divisions amounting to about 350,000 men - at Dunkirk on the Atlantic coast. Note that this was *the* British army. Without those troops, Britain would have had little more than militia to defend its coast, and, lacking an experienced core, would have had a tough time training and expanding a new army.

So as Guderian stood there near the beaches, ready to go, itching to send his tanks in to mop up the British, what did Hitler do? He ordered a halt. Why? To show his good will to the British with the idea of signing an armistice. This was pure lunacy. One does not throw away one's chips in order to bargain - quite the contrary. Hitler should have captured the British army, and then offered a generous peace. Instead, having totally miscalculated the British intentions, he shot himself in the foot. Off sailed the Brits to regroup at their home base. A few weeks after manifesting genius in backing Manstein's plan, Hitler committed a decisive blunder, perhaps one that ultimately cost him the war.

For themselves, the British took the gift, declined Hitler's peace offers (though Halifax and Chamberlain were in favor of an armistice), and continued along with their designs.

It is worth noting here that 1) the Germans did not reconfigure their industry for total war until 1943, when it was already too late; and 2) the German munition stocks were very low in 1939-early 1940 - had the Allies shown some grit and some guts, they might have been able to win a war of attrition fairly rapidly. But they committed gaffe after gaffe (for example, the French failed to destroy the civilian gas pumps, which the Germans used to refuel their tanks). Hitler had genius, and he had helping hands from strange quarters, but he also had diabolical luck.

In truth, the French industrialists and bankers were not entirely averse to a co-habitation with Germany. The May 17th cabinet, constructed only a week after the invasion, was full of defeatists and fascist sympathizers. One could probably build a decent case around the argument that the French war effort was deliberately sabotaged even from within.

Before the kind British could manage to offer France sorely needed air support, the French had collapsed, and the British had decided to look after themselves. They did, however, blow up a few French ships out of fear of the prospect of a merger of the French, Italian, and German navies. This happened *after* the Germans had failed to ask the new Vichy government for its ships, and resulted in about 1300 French deaths.

8.7.5 Hitler Loses His Head and Bombs London

Having subdued France, and faced with a recalcitrant Britain, Hitler had to do something about the Albion. Manstein thought that even given Dunkirk, an all out effort could have stood a chance at capturing the main British isle. Had Hitler smashed the British at Dunkirk, and obtained Vichy's naval cooperation, his chances would have been great. But he, immersed in his idiotic race theories,

never really wanted to fight England. And so he kept on blundering.

Hitler's idea, it seems, was to scare Britain into signing an armistice via a determined aerial attack. The battle commenced in July 1940. In terms of quality and quantity, the two sides were about even, though the British had the edge in terms of quality. Both sides had good pilots. Quigley thought that the British pilots were better. But the two great advantages of the British were that: 1) they were fighting on home soil, and their downed pilots could go back into battle the next day, while downed German pilots were out of the picture; and 2) the British had great organization, epitomized by their radar system.

Moreover, the British had their "stoutness" trait to oppose the high morale of the hitherto victorious Germans. Hitler's notion that he could "scare" the British was totally wrong. A few bombs could never scare the British people - on the contrary, the bombs would reinforce their resolve. And that is exactly what happened.

Nevertheless, the Germans did reasonably well in the first two months of the Battle of Britain. They correctly targeted the British infrastructure - airfields, factories, and so on - and, though they could not reach northern England, they strained the RAF's resources. But the tide of the conflict was always against the Luftwaffe. Hitler dropped the ball in September, when he decided to bomb civilian targets, in response to the British raids on Berlin that had started on August 25. That decision spelt the end of the Battle of Britain in the strategic sense. Bombing civilian targets could only strengthen the resolve of the British. The damage done on military production would be insignificant, and the German losses of men and materiel would render the exercise a net drain on the strength of the Luftwaffe. The 15 September defeat of the Luftwaffe was the turning point. The Battle of Britain was over except for the thousands that would succumb to the unnecessary bombing. By December, Hitler turned his sights eastward, where he had to bail out the Italians in Greece. Moscow always remained the ultimate goal.

As the war progressed, the Allies bombed away to little effect. Their targeting of civilian centres was militarily useless and a war crime. The annihilation of Dresden was an act of evil of the magnitude of the destruction of Hiroshima.

8.7.6 Stalin Almost Throws Away the War

When the Nazi war machine invaded the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, Stalin lost his head and managed to almost lose the war during the first week of hostilities. Stalin finally made a speech to the nation on July 3. The nature of his activities over the previous half-score days remained murky for decades. The legend went that Stalin lost his mind and drank for about a week, before recovering his, shall we say, indomitable spirit. After the Russians opened up their archives in the 1990s, some of what happened began to come out. Yes, Stalin lost composure - but, no, he did not entirely drop the ball and lock himself up with a barrel of vodka. One serviceable recent source on this issue is Constantine Pleshakov's *Stalin's Folly* (2005).

A few issues related to the June 22 invasion need clarification. The accepted story goes along the following lines: the evil robot-like Germans invaded the innocent hapless Soviet Union and quickly smashed the pathetic inept Red Army, which was nothing but a few guys armed with shovels and bayonets, with perhaps a few prehistoric tanks and airplanes thrown into the bag. There are variations to the theme - some people consider the USSR as evil as Germany and revel in the mutual destruction of Hitler and Stalin. I have always marvelled at how some excuse the massacre of an entire supposedly "enslaved" people on account of the putrefaction of their ruler.

In reality, out banker friends had financed both the Bolsheviks and the Nazis, and finally got the war that they wanted. Adolf and Joe were not directly controlled, having become weird Frankensteins. Hitler had mopped up Europe, had decided that England could not be invaded, thought that the

longer he waited the stronger Russia would become, and, accordingly, invaded Russia at the first available opportunity. Russia had to be attacked in the early summer, after the thaw had dried up. The French campaign, short as it had been, had taken the summer of 1940 - and so the USSR was hit in 1941. Adolf simply followed the plan he had concocted in the early 1920s.

Stalin, on the other hand, had, perhaps despite himself, rebuilt the old Russian Empire. The USSR in 1941 occupied more or less the exact territory of the 1914 Tsarist Empire. Stalin had *consciously* modelled himself after the tradition of Ivan IV Grozny. Like Ivan, he had tried to create a stable and central, if awfully despotic and inefficient, regime. Like Ivan, he had resorted to vicious purges. And like Ivan, he suffered for what he did, but he was too much of a true man of steel (in Hitler's opinion "half-beast, half-god") to let his conscience get ahead of his ambition. A beast, Stalin was. A god, he was not. Stalin was a man, and therefore subject to committing errors - and what errors! The Man of Steel was, before all, a (counter-)revolutionary and a spymaster. He purged the army to avoid a bonapartist coup, without realizing that he was the Bonaparte, and his was the counter-revolution. Just as his comrades had purged the Tsar, so did he have to purge them. After decades of chaos, Russia required stability, and Stalin provided it in his crude murderous way. He recreated the Tsar's secret police in his NKVD. He recreated the landed estates in the kolkhozes. He even reintroduced slavery in the Gulag system. He supplanted the nobility, which had had some grace along with the Oblomovitis, with his thoroughly vulgar and often moronic politburo. He rolled history back by a century, but did achieve stability.

But internal stability was not enough. Russia had to be able to defend itself. Anglo-Americans tend to find it hard to understand that "democracy" and prosperity require some stability and security. England and America, being islands, have not been invaded in centuries - the Americans since 1812, and the English since before the modern age. On the other hand, in the last two centuries, Russia has been invaded by every single Great Power - France, England, Germany, Italy, America, and Japan. One can add the Hapsburgs and the Ottomans to the list. To top it all there was the invasion by terrorists in 1917. Too many of those invasions were catastrophic. How can a nation develop industrially, politically, and culturally in such circumstances? Even Germany had a century of relative peace between 1815 and 1914. In the same period, Russia suffered the Crimean War and the Russo-Japanese War.

And so, Stalin's second - and secondary - preoccupation was preparing for war. He industrialized - to make war materiel. Though relatively weak industrially, the USSR, with a little help from its friends, had a decent military-industrial complex by the late 1930s.

This brings us to the order of battle in June 1941. Roughly, the Germans had 3.2 million men, about 3000 tanks, and 2000 aircraft. Their infantry had solid training, recent battle experience, decent equipment, and high morale. Their tank forces were professional and masterfully commanded, though the machines themselves were relatively poor in quality. The German airforce was well-trained and its planes were modern. The Soviets had about 3 million men, who were poorly equipped. Their morale tended to run the gamut. Many loathed the regime and defected to the Germans. Many had great morale, but, in the first days of the war, found themselves confused and terrified. In general, with significant exceptions, the morale of the Red Army throughout the war was quite good.

In terms of machinery, the Soviets had more than 12,000 tanks. About 2,000 of those were modern T-34 and KV-1 models. The T-34 was superior to its German equivalent, the Panzer-IV. The Germans had nothing to compare to the heavy KV-1, whose armor their guns could not penetrate. The other 10,000 tanks were older, lighter machines - but the Germans had showed that light tanks can do the job just fine. Likely because Stalin's high command had been dominated by imbecilic old cavalrymen, the Soviet tank doctrine was obsolete. Zhukov, whose star was rising on the eve of the war, understood the general idea of tank warfare and would fix the Soviet doctrine as the war progressed.

In the air, the Soviets had about 9000 planes. A small proportion of those were modern, but most were obsolete. The Germans had tested and improved their air combat doctrine in the past two years, and their pilots had accumulated experience. The Soviets pilots were not as good, and their

methods of communication were awful.

But the greatest problem the Soviets had in June 1941 was that they had been caught unprepared. Absurdly, Stalin had thought that Hitler would try to finish the British before going east, in order to avoid a war on two fronts. Thus, Stalin expected hostilities to commence no earlier than in 1942. Worse, Stalin had fully intended to invade Europe. It should be understood that his was not a communist ambition, but an imperialist one. Soviet Communism and Russian imperialism tend to be despotic, but they were not fully anti-human, which the Nazi lebensraum doctrine, unfortunately, was. In his own strange way, the Georgian Stalin was a pan-Slavist. From the strategic perspective, Stalin was in the right - there was a vacuum of power in Europe; Hitler would certainly attack Russia at some point; might as well take the initiative.

Miscalculating the date of the attack by a year, however, was a stupendous error. In June 1941, the Soviets had: 1) a half-baked plan for invading Europe and *no plan for defence*; 2) a half-armed army sprawled along the unfortified western border; 3) awful communications and awful leadership.

In regard to the leadership - the Civil War had purged most of the old Tsarist officer class. The Soviets had had to build a command structure and an officer corps from scratch. Then, in the late 1930s, Stalin went and purged the army again to protect himself from bonapartism. And so, in 1941, the army consisted of a gaggle of semi-demented Civil War relics, hordes of half-competent yes-men, and a few capable leaders here and there.

In 1941, the Red Army was in a half-formed attacking formation. Infantry, tanks, and planes lay near the border - but they lacked rifles, fuel, and ammunition. Great forces were concentrated in the salients in Byelorussia and the Ukraine. Obviously, such an arrangement doomed the Soviets to catastrophe if they lost the initiative - which they did.

To top it all, Stalin had no plan of defence. It is that simple. He only had a plan of offence, since he correctly perceived that initiative is of paramount importance - and when the fighting started, he stuck to the only plan that he had. But to obtain the initiative one needs organization. Tanks are no good without radios. And the Soviets had subpar organization in 1941.

But it gets worse. Stalin had been warned about the incoming attack. He ignored the warnings of his spies, because they had been warning him for more than a year (likely because of Hitler's habit of constantly setting dates for his invasions, and then rescheduling). But it was not just the spies. Every indication pointed to war. The Germans brazenly violated Soviet airspace and undertook blatant scouting operations on Soviet soil. German defectors told of the attack on the evening of June 22, 1941. The Russians knew.

The problem was that Stalin: 1) was certain that Hitler would not strike; 2) knew that the Red Army was not ready; 3) could not emotionally and rationally tolerate *any* criticism or dissent, even from his top commanders. This outlook led to acts of pure lunacy. For example, in the weeks before the war, the Germans asked Stalin to let them in to ostensibly look at the graves of Germans who had fallen in World War I. Zhukov and others correctly pointed out that that was an obvious ploy. Stalin would have none of it. When the Germans told him that the spy airplanes were flown by rookie pilots, he took them at their word. The Soviet generals complained that the "rookies" descended above Soviet military installations. Stalin said that Hitler must be unaware of the insubordination of his generals. Even when hell broke loose on the morning of the 22nd, Stalin still clung to the hope that the whole affair was a provocation, perhaps one done over the head of Hitler. How a man as paranoid and cunning as Stalin could have sunk to such depths of delusion boggles the mind.

So when the Germans struck the unprepared Soviet armies, Stalin did everything wrong. That the Soviet armies should have been placed in depth rather than at the front, to move up only when in full battle readiness, is blatantly clear. That they should have policed their lines of communications and anticipated the attack goes without saying. But even in their imperfect state of readiness, the Soviet armies were considerable and could have easily stemmed the German tide well short of Moscow. People forget that Hitler's armies habitually operated on the brink of their resources. Had

the Germans been halted even for a while, they would have been in deep trouble - that is abundantly clear from the events of December 1941 and the rest of the war.

Unfortunately - and I say this in general, because, as bad as Stalin was, he never desired mass genocide, which was Hitler's official policy - Stalin acted in the worst possible way in the first week of the war. His first three directives, written in the first hours of the war, speak volumes. Directive one said: do not succumb to provocations, i.e. do not defend yourself. Directive two said: destroy the enemy forces! And directive three said: go conquer Prussia. And so, in the first crucial days of the war, amidst mangled lines of communication, the Soviet troops did not know if they could respond to enemy fire (!), attempted doomed and useless haphazard attacks, and avoided organized retreat for fear of retribution by Moscow. Short of an unconditional surrender, this was the worst conceivable manner of waging the war. The Soviets should have immediately pulled back to reorganize, and should have defended in depth after the 1812 model. They eventually adopted this obvious strategy, and won the war, but only after losses which are simply inconceivable.

But the salient point is that the Red Army, though unprepared, was anything but toothless or poor. This follows a priori from the fact that the Soviets won the war. The Red Army, for all its weaknesses, was stronger than the Wehrmacht, and only the insanity of Stalin gave the Germans their real chance of winning the war. The Germans were sabotaged on their own side by Hitler, who, for reasons I dare not guess at, failed to switch to a war economy even in 1941. And this is the reality of the eastern front: the Germans had an excellent army that was always short on supply and manpower. Their general staff was great, and their commander in chief was a mad genius blessed by fate. The Soviets had a powerful, but poorly organized army, an utterly incompetent leadership, which vastly improved over the course of the war as Stalin switched to meritocracy, and a commander in chief who combined an inspiring and imposing personality with certain personal inadequacies, which manifested themselves tragically in the first days of the war. Thus, the Germans were lucky to even have a shot at winning the war, and the Soviets were lucky to survive after their colossal mistakes of June 1941.

After writing (but not signing, to eschew responsibility; he had his cronies sign) the three directives, Stalin succumbed to indecision, equivocation, and depression. In a moment of lucidity, he ordered the evacuation of the western Soviet industry to the east - one of his best and most decisive moves of the war. On June 29, Stalin finally collapsed completely. There was a confrontation between the Great Leader and Zhukov. The latter told Stalin off. Stalin bawled him out, and Zhukov, who was no weakling, burst into tears. Stalin stormed out of the offices of the General Staff, growling "Lenin left us a great legacy, and we have [fouled] it up." And so, the Man of Steel went to his dacha and fell to brooding. This was a serious problem, since the entire Soviet command structure hinged on him. His flunkies - Molotov and Beria and the likes - did not know what to do. Without him they were nothing. In the end, On July the first, Beria led the few men closest to Stalin to the dacha, and went up to the boss. Stalin looked at them with concern. In his paranoia, he fully - and justifiably - expected a coup. But Beria told him that "We need you do concentrate all authority in your own hands." That show of faith revived the Father of the USSR, and he got up, and assumed responsibility, and two days later finally spoke to the people. Though he still meddled in the conduct of the war, he delegated responsibility to Zhukov, who, insensitive bastard that he was, had a good idea of the details of modern warfare.

Churchill had expected the invasion of the USSR.¹⁷ When he got the news on the morning of June 22, he told his secretary to call the BBC. That evening, Churchill said that though he was not too hot on communism, he would support Russia. The cat was in the bag, the anti-German alliance was nearly complete, and things went according to plan. After the war, Churchill would continue the usual British policy of plotting against the strongest European power - in 1945, Russia. The Americans also expressed support for Uncle Joe. FDR would become his best friend (figura-

¹⁷See Ch.1 of Tome 2 of David Irving's biography of Churchill. Early in 1941, Winston told Menzies, the head of the MI6, that the year would see "a very big and very ugly war."

tively speaking). In 1945, Moscow would greet the news of FDR's demise with a collective wail - the man was as loved in Russia as he was in America. Back in 1941, America still had to join the war.

A few quick words on two more issues - the Lend-Lease and the Hitlerian and Stalinist ideologies. The American aid to Russia was necessary and good (though I do feel that there was no need to give nuclear secrets to the USSR). The Lend-Lease was not aid to Communism, but aid to Russia, which was America's top ally in the war against Germany. It created jobs in America and it saved American lives by indirectly curbing German power.

As for Hitler's ideology, the lebensraum doctrine was pure madness based on the British Malthusianism, eugenicism and Social Darwinism. Hitler genuinely wanted to annihilate the peoples to the east of Germany. Our Holocaust-obsessed society forgets that the Jews were not the only victims of Nazism. The Poles, the Ukrainians, the Russians, the Gypsies, and others, all suffered grievously. What Hitler did was also mad from the purely strategic perspective. Many German Jews were integrated patriots who could have contributed to the war effort. The "Jewish problem" was always cultural and never racial. But Hitler failed to see that and shot himself in the foot. The Ukrainians and the other anti-Soviet Eastern Europeans would have gladly welcomed the creations of German-controlled puppet states, and would have supported the Nazi war against Stalin. Instead of seeking their help - if only temporarily! - Hitler declared them sub-human and demanded that they be treated like vermin. Unsurprisingly, by 1944 the Soviet partisans were a serious problem for the Wehrmacht. This strange madness of his renders Hitler impossible to defend. He had his good sides and he did a lot of good things for Germany - but in this madness of his, he declared himself against the larger humanity, and doomed his beloved nation to annihilation.

Stalin, on the other hand, had a foreign policy of barbaric realism. The "Communism" stuff was just a thin veneer, something of a justification for conquering nation-states in an era of nationalism. Stalin, though never averse to violence, did not want to murder anybody he did not have to murder. He just wanted to extend his empire and his despotic control. As such, his desires were based on power and relatively sane. That he was a thug and a monster is beyond dispute - but he was easily preferable to Hitler.

One other key reason for the USSR's victory is Japan's reluctance to strike at the Soviet far east. Indeed, the elite far eastern troops were the ones to save Moscow in 1941. Japan had its own plans.

8.7.7 The Empire of the Sun Wants a Place Under It

The Japanese after 1853, having been startled out of their isolation by gunboat diplomacy, took a look at their neighbourhood and noticed that India and China had been raped by the Western Great Powers. Nippon began to build up, with some help from the British, who likely saw Japan as a counter-balance to a Russian expansion in the Pacific. Traditionally, the Japanese were good at copying and improving the inventions of others - and so they took modern weaponry, industry, and social organization from the west, and built their island state. After 1905, Japan was a Great Power. After 1918, it sought to expand at the expense of the fratricidal Europeans. And so the Japanese went after China, Korea and whatever else there was within their reach.

Japan's main problem was the island's total dependence on foreign oil. To have a reasonable degree of independence, a nation in 1930 needed a modern army, a modern navy, a modern airforce, and/or tough allies. In principle, for an island nation, a navy was enough. And to have a modern armed forces, one needed oil. Japan had no oil, Malaysia was British, Persia was in the British sphere of influence, the Philippines were American, Indonesia was Dutch, Indochina was French, and so the Anglo-Americans could ruin Japan at any time. Moreover, the Japanese were culturally close to the Germans, from whom they had borrowed their constitution, and after whose model they had structured their society. And so, seeing the Germans align against the Anglo-Americans, whom Japan would eventually have to fight under the expansionist logic of Imperial Japan, the Japanese joined

the Axis.

In 1938 and 1939, the Japanese tested the Soviets out in Mongolia. Zhukov administered a sound thrashing to the Emperor's army. Bugged down in China, on the eve of a more or less inevitable war against the Anglo-American axis, the Japanese decided to leave the USSR alone. Therefore, they responded favourably to Stalin's entreaties, and signed a non-aggression pact with the USSR on April 13, 1941. The two parties had secured their backs and could focus on their main targets. The world power configuration had become strange - but those were the realities of the day.

What if the Japanese had attacked the USSR in June 1941? Perhaps they lacked the manpower; but supposing they had made the effort, then what? Stalin would not have been able to pull his far-eastern armies, and Moscow may have fallen. From there, one can not guess - but the Berlin-Tokyo Axis may have stood a chance. Likely, the US would have invented another reason for joining the war (probably a submarine incident akin to the one of 1915). Germany and Japan were always in an inferior position in the face of the inevitable Anglo-American-Soviet alliance. But Japan left the USSR alone, and decided to take on the Anglo-Americans.

The decision, as Rakovsky pointed out, was suicidal - but it was also inescapable. Certainly, the Japanese were imperialistic and expansionistic. In their defence, having seen what happened to China and India, they had to become powerful to survive. But they overdid the jingoism. It is worth noting here that those Westerners who think that Japan was "evil" and their own countries "good" ought to look at: the British suppression of the Sepoy Mutiny; Rhodes's Boer war with its concentration camps; the British post-war massacre in Kenya; the American conquest of the Philippines; France's doings in Egypt; and, for that matter, Canada's destruction of the "Canadian Aborigines." This is not to excuse one evil with another, but to point out that one ought to think beyond the propaganda, and that one ought to look at one's own gang's dirty laundry. Whatever else we say, the Japanese doings in China and elsewhere in Asia were vicious and inexcusable.

Tokyo's hand was forced in August 1941, when the Americans, who supplied 80% of Japan's oil, declared an embargo on the island nation. The English also participated in the embargo, which extended to more than oil. The embargo had been, in effect, dictated by Roosevelt and Churchill, without any cabinet discussion. An asset freeze accompanied the move.

The combined effect of the embargo and the freeze was tantamount to a declaration of war, except that the crafty Americans had not resorted to explicit violence. They left the opening salvo to Japan, because they wanted a "day of infamy" to goad the American public into the war, and to have to moral upper ground. That the Japanese would attack was given - from the strategic perspective, they had to - within the context of their militaristic government, they had no choice. All the Americans had to do was take the hit, and then fight the war. Frankly, barring extraordinary circumstances bordering on divine intervention ("kami-kaze" had famously saved Japan from the Mongol invasions of the middle ages), the Japanese never stood a chance. The Americans were far too powerful, and not likely to commit silly errors. They had the excellent general Douglas MacArthur and an industrial capacity without equal on Earth. The Japanese were like the poker player who holds a small pile of chips and a half-decent hand, and has to go all-in or accept defeat in the long run. They gambled against tall odds, and they lost.

Everyone who paid attention must have know that Pearl Harbor was coming. The British, who had cracked the Japanese naval codes, certainly knew. One version of the story (Tarpley's) says that the British withheld the information from the Americans, and that this act, combined with bungling on the part of the American commanders in Hawaii, and sabotage from the Anglophile faction in Washington, resulted in the debacle. Another version says that FDR (who had spoken against an oil embargo on Japan in July; he would change his tune soon after) did know about the attack and consciously let it happen. The official story of "the day of deceit" is a joke. Whatever the case, the

attack was coming and the Americans were going to use it to enter the war.

That Roosevelt expected to fight Japan following a "mistake" on the part of the Japanese is a matter of record.

Toward August 1945, the Japanese were through and they knew it. The Allies, gathered at Potsdam in July 1945, demanded an unconditional surrender of Japan. Tokyo refused the offer. At the behest of the Wall Street puppeteer Stimson, the career Freemason Truman authorized the drop of the nukes. Off went Hiroshima (August 6) and Nagasaki (August 9). Stalin hit Japan on August 9, as he had promised the Western Allies he would. On August 10, the Japanese accepted the Potsdam offer with one condition - that their emperor would be left unmolested. The Allies gave an ambiguous response. A thousand aircrafts hit Japan on August 14 to show that the Americans "meant business." The Japanese surrender coincided with the time of this bombing.

The Japanese announced the unconditional surrender to their people on August 15. Their emperor was allowed to stay.

Many officers listening to the broadcast in Tokyo shot themselves.

Renegade Japanese and unsatisfied Soviets kept fighting until September 8. Imperial forces in Singapore surrendered only on September 12.

Japan was placed firmly into the Anglo-American camp, was allowed to industrialize, and remains occupied to this day. (For an overview of the realities of the ongoing occupation, consult Chalmers Johnson's works.)

8.7.8 Churchill Bungles Away

After finding his feet in his role as Prime Minister, Churchill created a Ministership of Defence and assumed the new post. That put him in charge of England's overall military strategy. Winston proceeded to - ostensibly - bungle and meddle to the great annoyance of his military commanders. He also made sure to keep the information provided by the excellent English code-breakers to himself. And so, the British conduct of the war fell into the hands of the duplicitous Churchill plus whoever else - if anyone - was behind him.

Winston Churchill (1874-1965) was born into the dynasty of the Dukes of Marlborough on his father's side; and a New York banker family on his mother's side. His grandfather had been Viceroy of Ireland. In Harrow, Winston excelled in English, history, and fencing. He would grow up into a master speaker and a bellicose man.

Churchill met the noble Clementine Hozier (1885-1977) in 1904; the two married in 1908.

After Harrow, Churchill hit the military academy at Sandhurst. He passed the entrance exams with some trouble, but graduated 8th out of a class of 150 in 1894. Churchill had already adopted a grand lifestyle and lived well beyond his means. He would constantly have to deal with debt. How much he owed to the bankers who bailed him out time and again, it is hard to tell. Sutton should also have written a "The City and Winston Churchill."

Winston sailed around the world looking for military conflicts. He went to Cuba, to India, to Egypt, and, of course, to South Africa in 1899. There, he established contact with Milner.

As we have seen, after the blunder at Gallipoli, Churchill had to resign from his post as First Lord of the Admiralty. To repair his reputation, Winston went to the front, where he fought with characteristic recklessness.

Around 1900, Winston campaigned for parliament and won a seat. He joined the dominant Cecil faction (which later would act in loose concert with the Milner people).

After the war, Churchill was made Minister of War. In 1923, he became consultant to a British oil firm working on the Persian oil fields. In the early 1920s he fell out of office. By 1924, he had made a comeback, and became the Chancellor of the Exchequer under Baldwin. He went back to the gold

standard and opted for deflationary policies; his actions were one of the causes of the Depression.¹⁸ His actions also led to the General Strike of 1926, during which Churchill praised Mussolini for taking no lip from strikers and other troublemakers. Churchill lost power again in 1929. He spent the early 1930s writing a biography of his ancestor the 1st Duke of Marlborough. In a work of his, the great defender of democracy - who was appointed rather than democratically elected - proposed abandoning universal suffrage. He was against the Round Table's idea of granting independence to India.

During the 1930s, Churchill was a staunch opponent of German rearmament and appeasement. At the same time, he praised Mussolini until 1937. The war brought Winston back in the government, and by May 1940 he was in power.

As David Irving showed in his biography of Churchill, Winston was a masterful demagogue and a strange character. He was a notorious drunkard and a convinced exhibitionist. Churchill liked to walk naked in front of other men. Had he had homosexual encounters? Very likely. Homosexuality was rampant though not acknowledged among the Harrow-Eton upper classes of Victorian Britain. Churchill lied without the slightest shame, and likely had a professional impersonator record his famous 1940 speeches ("finest hour," "we shall fight on the beaches," and "blood, toil, tears, and sweat"). Often arrogant, sometimes infantile, and always impetuous, Churchill antagonized those around him. For example, Churchill and de Gaulle loathed each other.

What exactly Churchill was, and why exactly he did what he did, remain pertinent questions to this day.

He was given a Noble Prize for literature in 1953.

Churchill was a one-worlder.

(Monteith, *Brotherhood of Darkness*, p. 17, emphasis mine) ...Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. wrote an article that appeared on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal. In October 1993 many people were concerned because we seemed to be relinquishing national sovereignty, and moving toward world government and a New World Order. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. addressed that concern:

The world of law will not be attained by exhortation...
 Let us not kid ourselves that we can have a new world order without paying for it in blood as well as in money. Maybe the costs of enforcement are too great. National interest narrowly construed may well be the safer rule. But let us recognize that we are surrendering a noble dream. **Remember those lines of Tennyson that Churchill called "the most wonderful of modern prophecies"** and that Harry Truman carried in his wallet throughout his life:

For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
 Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be.
 Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
 From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue...
 Till the war-drum throb'd no longer, and the battle flags were fur'd
 In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World.

Winston was also a eugenicist.

(Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus*, p. 136, emphasis mine) The obsession of the American eugenics movement with the gonads of the inferior races and subraces, and its swift successes in winning the leaders of state and national governments to the cause of the

¹⁸Indeed, Churchill was in New York in October and early November 1929. He knew Baruch. A search for references on the subject produced the following title: Pat Riott - *The greatest story never told: Winston Churchill and the crash of 1929* (1994). The topic is well worth looking into.

forced sterilization of the poor, the unfortunate, and the victims of industrial accidents and other traumas from wars to preventable infectious diseases, was on the eve of World War I to invest the scientific racists of America with the leadership of the world eugenics movement. The passing of the flame from the Old World to the New was effected **as early as 1912, at the First International Congress of Eugenics**, held at the University of London a year after Galton's death.

The president of the Congress was Major Leonard Darwin, son of Charles Darwin, and living proof that neither scientific genius nor great intelligence is hereditary, or transmissible in the genes of the parents. **The English vice-presidents of the Congress of Eugenics included a future Prime Minister, First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill**; the Bishop of Oxford; the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Alverstone; and the president of the College of Physicians, Sir Thomas Barlow. The German vice-presidents included M. von Gruber, professor of hygiene at Munich, and Dr. Alfred Ploetz, president of the International Society for Race Hygiene. The American vice-presidents included Gifford Pinchot, a future governor of Pennsylvania; Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard University; Alexander Graham Bell; David Starr-Jordan, president of Stanford University; and Charles B. Davenport, listed on the program as secretary of the American Breeders' Association.

And so, the unelected semi-dictator of Britain during its "finest hour," was an alcoholic manic-depressive exhibitionist one-worlder eugenicist hater of universal suffrage.

Churchill's wartime "mistakes" are many and bizarre. Take his bombing of the continent, waged on the part of the British on behalf of Churchill by the diabolical beast Arthur "Bomber"/"Butcher" Harris (1892-1984). The Allied "strategic" terror bombings of European civilian targets amounted to dumping vast amounts of industrially mass-produced bombs on populated areas. Many bombs simply fell into the fields without doing any damage. The creature Harris stuck to area bombing even after the Americans switched to "precision" bombing (which was anything but precise). To gauge the effects of the bombing, one need only look at Germany's military production figures, which peaked in 1944, when Germany had already lost the war and could not defend itself from the bombings. The bombing campaign of the Western Allies, of which Churchill was a great proponent, was a massive failure. It amounted to a pretence of being at war, and genocide against defenceless civilians. Churchill simply allowed the Soviets to carry the war, making sure to kick Germany after it went down.

Worse, the RAF targeted non-German cities. Take Rotterdam. The infamous May 1940 Luftwaffe Rotterdam bombing, which happened to coincide with the destruction of Shell facilities in the hands of the British, reportedly killed about a thousand people (Western news agencies reported 30,000 deaths) and left 85,000 homeless. Well, the Anglo-Americans also bombed Rotterdam during the war, killing, reportedly, about 900. The Americans hit the city in March 1943, killing 400 and rendering 16,500 homeless. Howard Zinn famously recalled how his bombing squadron was ordered to bomb harmless Italian targets long after the war had been decided.

And so I do not see how one can form any conclusion far removed from either: a) the Allied commanders were morons and thugs, or b) 1) the Anglo-Americans commanders in chief deliberately botched their sides' war efforts by insisting on useless "strategic" terror bombing campaigns; 2) banking-industrial interests made vast profits from lucrative military contracts related to strategic bombing, to be followed by more contracts in the post-war rebuilding of Europe; 3) the Anglo-Americans wanted to ruin Europe not only by letting it fall before Hitler, but also by manually blowing it up.

Then there is the suicidal 19 August 1942 Allied landing at Dieppe. Ineptly executed and never meant to succeed, the attack collapsed pathetically within a few hours after the the fighting began. About 6,000 Allied troops, most of them Canadians, hit the beaches of the channel port Dieppe at 5:00AM. A German garrison of 1,500 opposed them. Six hours later, the Allies were routed. The

Allies suffered over 3,500 casualties, the Germans about 600. In the air, the Allies, despite their supremacy, lost about a hundred craft, while the Luftwaffe lost about fifty.

Dieppe was a political move more than a military move. In the summer of 1942, the Red Army was in serious trouble and desperately needed succour. Stalin demanded a (real) second front, and Churchill kept telling him that the Western Allies were not ready. One suspects that the purpose of Dieppe was a demonstration of the Allies' supposed lack of preparedness. The fellow in charge of the planning of the operation was Philip the Virus's favourite uncle, Louis Mountbatten, nee Battenberg. The Allied intelligence analysis of the German positions was pitiful. Poor security measures on the British side warned the Germans of the impending assault. Planning had been minimal and incompetent. The official history - God help us! - says that the brass learned from the debacle and therefore the lives lost were not lost in vain. That is pure baloney.

The Allied brass learned such lessons as: Scouting is good; storming fortresses can be painful; secrecy and surprise are useful; etc. Never mind Clausewitz - any ten year old on the streets of London could have helped them figure that stuff out!

To be fair, the English likely truly were not ready to open a second front in the summer of 1942, though the Americans did invade North Africa in the autumn, there to receive a good beating in the hands of the Afrika Korps, which they eventually overwhelmed. Given their lack of preparedness (and lack of landing vessels), the British should not have attempted a landing. Attacking further down (south) the French coast was out of the question due to the range of the Allied fighter air support. Of course, had they made landing craft instead of bombers, the Brits would have been better prepared.

The Americans, including Roosevelt, worried by the Soviet situation, were willing to go ahead with the cross-channel invasion in 1942. The proposed related operations were code-named Bolero and Sledgehammer. Churchill sabotaged the effort. A properly executed 1942 invasion, commanded on the ground by someone like Patton, could have shortened the war by years. By mid-Summer, Roosevelt had abandoned the French invasion and had opted for North Africa. Churchill paid a visit to Washington to help him make up his mind.

In July 1943, at the height of the Battle of Kursk, the Anglo-Americans invaded Sicily. After defeating the handful of German divisions, and the thousands of surrender-happy Italians, the Allies advanced up the boot of southern Italy.

Even if the Allies had been unprepared for establishing a French second front in 1942, they were perfectly ready in 1943. Yet Churchill insisted on his tried and tested and failed "soft underbelly of Europe" "strategy."

Attacking Italy would never do much, since the peninsula is narrow and mountainous, and a competent defender can hold his own with a relatively tiny force. The Germans had an excellent general in Kesselring, and he did indeed hold Italy with a small amount of troops. On the grand chessboard, Italy was not much of an ally for Germany, and southern Italy was not important industrially.

The invasion of Italy was another waste of time and effort. Churchill was simply waiting for the Germans and the Russians to kill each other, which they did.

The proper target always was France. Through France, the Allies could advance over the north-European plane, where they would have sufficient room to enjoy their numerical superiority and their considerable armored forces. After Kursk, it was clear that the war on the eastern front had been decided. By the end of the 1943 campaign, the Russians had approached the borders of Germany. It was clear that the 1944 campaign would smash the Germans and unleash the Soviets into Europe. The Allies had to act and bite their own piece of the pie. Somewhere at some point it had been decided that the Soviets would get eastern Europe and the Allies would get western Europe; certainly by Yalta (January 1945) the decision had been tacitly accepted by all key players.

And so, the second front in France finally came about on June 6, 1944. Two weeks later, on the third anniversary of June 22, the Soviets commenced their impressive operation Bagration, which finally expelled the Germans from the USSR, and crushed the Wehrmacht for good. The Western Allies

had played their hand perfectly. Russia and Germany had emasculated each other, the Soviets had prevailed, and the Anglo-Americans could swoop in to save the day in one masterful strike of geopolitics and demagogical propaganda ("democracy" and so on). Germany, France, and Italy would be brought into the Anglo-American sphere for good (Germany and Italy remain occupied to this day; France showed some spunk under de Gaulle, but is generally subservient). Some writers have protested against the "betrayal" of Eastern Europe to "Communism." They have a point; however, what else could the westerners do? The Red Army bore the blunt of the battle. The Allies could try to rush for Berlin, antagonizing Stalin and losing thousands of men, or they could let the Soviets rape Prussia and lose a few hundred thousand more men. Moreover, with the Red Army in Eastern Europe, what could the Allies do? Wage war on their faithful ally who had won the war for them? The fact remains that the Germans wanted an Allied occupation, and, after a certain point, focused their defensive efforts on the eastern front. Patton complained that his armies could have taken over more territories. But Europe had been divided, and Patton was quietly snuffed out.

From the *London Telegraph*, December 20 2008:¹⁹

General George S. Patton was assassinated to silence his criticism of allied war leaders claims new book

The newly unearthed diaries of a colourful assassin for the wartime Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the forerunner of the CIA, reveal that American spy chiefs wanted Patton dead because he was threatening to expose allied collusion with the Russians that cost American lives.

The death of General Patton in December 1945, is one of the enduring mysteries of the war era. Although he had suffered serious injuries in a car crash in Manheim, he was thought to be recovering and was on the verge of flying home.

But after a decade-long investigation, military historian Robert Wilcox claims that OSS head General "Wild Bill" Donovan ordered a highly decorated marksman called Douglas Bazata to silence Patton, who gloried in the nickname "Old Blood and Guts".

His book, "Target Patton", contains interviews with Mr Bazata, who died in 1999, and extracts from his diaries, detailing how he staged the car crash by getting a troop truck to plough into Patton's Cadillac and then shot the general with a low-velocity projectile, which broke his neck while his fellow passengers escaped without a scratch.

Mr Bazata also suggested that when Patton began to recover from his injuries, US officials turned a blind eye as agents of the NKVD, the forerunner of the KGB, poisoned the general.

It is worth noting that there are acres of dirt on Marshall and Eisenhower.

The realities of power were elementary - the Soviet Russians had entered Eastern Europe and would keep it; and the Western Allies had occupied Western Europe and would stay there for good. The reader should notice that the Soviets have been out of Eastern Europe for more than 20 years, while the Americans are still in Germany and Italy.

Some versions of the "communist betrayal" go as far as to say that the "American boys" died only so that "Communism" could extend its grasp over Europe. That is absurd. What did Russia "win"? Its European part was utterly demolished and millions of its citizens perished. The Soviets managed to grab nationalistic Poland, which was not particularly rich and would always create trouble; Hungary and Czechoslovakia, which were relatively developed; and Romania and Bulgaria, which were poor and agrarian. Throw in a few chunks of empty land in the far east.

What did the Anglo-Americans get? To begin with, they suffered only negligible losses on their mainlands. They got much of the Japanese empire replete with Japan - an industrial powerhouse and an indispensable base in East Asia. They got Italy and the industrial part of Germany. They

¹⁹<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/3869117/General-George-S.-Patton-was-assassinated-to-silence-his-criticism-of-allied-war-leaders-claims-new-book.html>, accessed Dec 22, 2011.

got a broken Benelux and France, whom they could proceed to rebuild into excellent markets for the abundant American export goods. They got all that and much more, with relatively minor losses. And they got their coveted United Nations. Yes, World War II was good for the Anglo-American Oligarchs, though perhaps not as good for the Englishmen and Americans who did the dying and the austere living.

People fail to realize that after World War II, the Soviets were *always* on the defensive. While the Anglo-Americans raped and pillaged the world - Suez, Korea, Indochina, Israel's Western-backed wars, Falklands, Grenada, the coup in Iran, endless coups in South America, coups in Africa. The Soviets may have *backed* the wars in Korea and Vietnam, but they did not personally wage them. Their sole significant war was the one in Afghanistan - and that war destroyed them. Most "communist" regimes were merely nationalist regimes rebelling against corporate/imperialist incursion; many had no ties with Moscow; some sought help from Moscow on the principle of "my enemy's enemy"; and some were actively sponsored by Moscow in line with Russian strategic interests. Certainly the Anglo-Americans with their CIA and MI6 always had the upper hand in the underground battle of regime changes and semi-secret diplomacy.

Some authors have absurdly claimed that the Russians only pretended to drop communism, and that in fact communism survived and still lurks in Moscow. One has to disagree. First, "Communism" had died a long time ago. Second, the cataclysm Russia endured in the 1990s could not possibly have been caused by anyone intending to use Russia as a base for conquering the world or anything else constructive. In reality, the Oligarchs tried to: 1) emasculate and weaken Russia; and 2) merge the pathetic new Russia with the Western neo-liberal system, as a kind of a colonial supplier of oil and gas. Their efforts succeeded to a large degree, but not fully. Putin managed to regain some independence and power for Russia. "Anti-globalists" should welcome a strong Russia as a bulwark against the banker take-over of the world.

The ridiculous Cold War propaganda should be buried. People should start asking such elementary questions as: if Russia is bad and we are good, then how come we are always the ones at war? If the Russians are slaves of their government and then we are free men, then why would we want to kill Russians? If some foreign entity owned all our land, and we tried to take back our land, and we were called communists and bombed to oblivion, how would we feel? You know, basic questions like that.

Miscellanea

Much more can be said about the Second World War, but we lack the space. Let us, nevertheless, make a few more points.

From the strategic perspective, the war was over by August 1943. The Germans had been kicked out of Africa, the German European fortress had been penetrated, and the Soviets had halted the German summer offensive. Japan had been on the retreat since Midway in 1942.

And if the Axis could harbor some illusions in 1943, they certainly should have known they were finished by the autumn of 1944. After Falaise and Bagration, the Wehrmacht was through. The Japanese, totally outnumbered, would be wiped out at Leyte Gulf in October. It was all over. And that begs the question: why did Berlin and Tokyo not offer unconditional surrenders?

The Germans likely fought in order to allow the Western Allies to occupy their nation. But surely they knew they had no chance; and surely they knew the Allies would not accept anything short of unconditional surrender. Perhaps they fought out of habit, in deference to Hitler, who had miraculously survived the July 1944 bombing plot. Whatever their reasons, they were mad. The war should have ended in the autumn of 1944. This is pertinent, because the continued fighting led to the total collapse of the German infrastructure, and thus to the deaths of millions. Had the fighting stopped in late 1944, millions of lives, and a lot of infrastructure, would have been saved. But no.

The contrast with the orderly 11 November 1918 surrender, and even with Brest-Litovsk, is inescapable.

And what of the Japanese? In January 1945 they still held various possessions in East Asia, and had their main islands. But they should have known they were through! The combination of a blockade and heavy bombing would have ruined their home base. They were finished - so why did they not surrender, why did they wait for the nukes?

Again, I feel that the men in charge of Japan were out of their minds. They were mad with jingoism, nationalism, fanaticism - whatever it was - and they did not reason things through.

Let that be a warning to all of us.

People who favour Russia tend to view the atrocities committed by the Red Army during the conquest of Germany as a more-or-less justified revenge. One has to understand that to get to Germany, the Red troops had passed through a demolished Ukraine and a squashed Poland. They had seen countless comrades and family members die in what was indeed, despite Stalin's scheming, an unprovoked attack. They had lost appreciation of life and law in a war that was utterly cruel and barbaric. And they were angry, and when they hit Germany they had their revenge. Saying that the Soviets left no woman - no matter how old - unraped, would probably not be a great exaggeration. Nor were the Germans the only sufferers - the Reds also raped Poland upon liberating her. They even raped Russian women. The stereotypical image of the "Asiatic Godless Mongol horde" is not entirely inaccurate. But the Germans had awakened and angered the beast. Noble defenders of Europe and "Christianity," they were not.

Still, what the Red troops did is inexcusable. Have your revenge on the SS and the more bloodthirsty units of the Wehrmacht; rob Germany blind; but were the mass torture and rape really necessary? But then, Russia had suffered terrible destruction twice in 30 years in the hands of the Germans. The Soviets were making sure to humiliate and debase Germany - after the Germans had tried to completely destroy Russia. Moscow did not intend to ever have to fight the same fight again if it could help it.

It was an evil situation, and instead of blaming one or the other side, we must look at the root cause - the war - and at those who caused the war.

The democratic, Christian, and loving Westerners like to think that the evil German, Russians, and Nips were bloodthirsty and barbaric, while the nice Anglo-Americans were civilized and good and saved the world. These are pleasant thoughts but they do not reflect reality. For one thing, the German conduct in Western Europe was gentlemanly and restrained - which is one reason why so many people there collaborated with the Germans.

As for the Allies, they could be as barbaric as anybody else. We have already looked at the Allied terror bombings. Many more examples of barbarism can be found. For example, the blacks in the American armed forces were drafted and segregated. In other words they were forcefully rounded up and told to go die in Europe to defend "democracy."

In the Pacific War, the Americans saw the Japanese as vermin and treated them as such. Look up, for example, James J. Weingartner's writings. From his 1992 paper *Trophies of War: U.S. Troops and the Mutilation of Japanese War Dead, 1941-1945*:

...the war which the United States waged against Japan from December 1941 until August 1945 was characterized by a degree of savagery unmatched by the war being fought simultaneously against the European Axis. The explanation for this goes far beyond the fact that the United States had been the victim of a Japanese "surprise attack," whereas Germany and Italy initiated war by means of formal and "gentlemanly" declarations. To a much greater degree than Germans (and certainly Italians), Japanese became dehumanized in the minds of American combatants and civilians, a process facilitated by the greater cultural and physical differences between white Americans and Japanese than between the former and their European foes. It was, moreover, an outgrowth of a long history of white antipathies towards "colored races" - American Indians, blacks, and Asians-which had frequently found expression in acts of murderous violence.

...

American troops were notoriously reluctant to take prisoners which, along with the equally notorious reluctance of Japanese troops to surrender, accounts for the fact that the maximum number of Japanese prisoners in U.S. operated POW compounds was a mere 5,424. As late as October 1944, no more than 604 Japanese had been captured by all of the Allied powers. In the minds of many American soldiers, combat against Japanese troops assumed the character of a hunt, the object of which was the killing of cunning, but distinctly inhuman creatures.

...

The percentage of U.S. troops who engaged in the collection of Japanese body parts cannot be ascertained, but it is clear that the practice was not uncommon. U.S. Marines on their way to Guadalcanal relished the prospect of making necklaces of Japanese gold teeth and "pickling" Japanese ears as keepsakes.

...

General George C. Marshall, U.S. Army Chief of Staff, was sufficiently disturbed by these accounts to radio General Douglas MacArthur in October 1943 about his "concern over current reports of atrocities committed by American soldiers." This was followed in January 1944 by a directive from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to all theater commanders calling upon them to adopt measures to prevent the preparation of skulls and "similar items" as war trophies, and to prevent members of the armed forces and others from removing from the theater skulls and other objects which might be represented as Japanese body parts.

We need not continue. But just to drive the point home, in regard to a dreamy picture published in *Life*, of a pretty American gal gazing at a polished autographed Jap skull,

Most thoughtful was a reader who observed:

Let us reverse the situation and imagine that one of the most prominent magazines in Tokyo published the picture of a young Japanese girl in such a pose, gazing at the skull of one of our sons who died for his country - the storm of protest at such savagery would sweep America and it would most certainly be held up to us as an example of the hopeless depravity of Japanese youth.

So how about whenever we hear of the atrocities of the Germans (which were generally confined to the Eastern Front) and the Russians (who acted in revenge), let us also hear of the brutality of the Americans. The Bataan Death March and Pearl Harbor surely could not serve as an excuse for unleashing barbarity on the part of the noble, democratic, and civilized American fighters for freedom.

And this is not to say that the Americans are evil, or that their enemies were good. The point is that we have to get beyond the banality of propaganda, and that people should look at their own mistakes and misdeeds before condemning others - judge not lest ye be judged.

It is also worth noting that the Catholic church in America blasted the desecration of the Japanese dead.

Another American act of barbarity was the treatment in the hands of the Americans of the German POWs after the war. James Bacque's *Other Losses* (1989) offers a decent look at the subject. As related above, the primary concern of the Wehrmacht in the last days of the war was to halt the Red Army for long enough to allow as many Germans as possible to fall under the jurisdiction of the Westerners as POWs or under occupation. Little did the Germans know what evils awaited them. The Western Allies - meaning, mainly, the Anglo-Americans and France - herded the Germans into open-air barb-wire enclosures, and left them to rot. More than five million unfortunate souls suffered the crime of losing the war.

(p. xix) Open to the weather, lacking even primitive sanitary facilities, underfed, the prisoners soon began dying of starvation and disease. Starting in April 1945, the United States Army and the French army casually annihilated about one million men, most of them in American camps. Not since the horrors of the Confederate-administered prison at Andersonville during the American Civil War had such cruelties taken place under American military control. For more than four decades this unprecedented tragedy lay hidden in Allied archives.

Women and children were among those who perished. The notion that the Americans lacked the resources to prevent the mass deaths deserves some attention. For that matter, many of the deaths in the German concentration camps occurred in 1945 when Germany disintegrated - thanks in no small part to the Allied bombings - and could not feed even its citizens, never mind the prisoners. But the Americans and the French in 1945 should have been able to feed and house the German POWs. The British and the Canadians, who had about a million prisoners, conducted themselves tolerably well. They did know of what was taking place in the American camps, and the Canadian government, to its credit, protested - once. It is worth noting that the Canadian Bacque writes with a markedly pro-British tone.

The scandalous crime was meticulously covered up with characteristic American efficiency and mendacity.

The man in charge of the affair was Eisenhower, who loathed Germans, and who had serious ties with the CFR crowd.

After the publication of the book, a panel of historians organized by a "Eisenhower Center for American Studies" lambasted the Bacque's research. Their thesis was that while the Germans POWs did indeed suffer, and some died, the casualties were short of a million, and Eisenhower was not guilty of pre-meditated mass murder.

That the Allies deliberately withheld food from the Germans after the war has been confirmed by independent studies. Whatever the exact case, defenceless Germans were unnecessarily subjected to privation after the war. This can only be excused under the "collective guilt" argument. Under that argument, the Americans deserve vicious divine retribution for their genocide against the Indians, their massacres in the Philippines, Korea, and Vietnam, and countless other crimes.

Another ugly American post-war move was Operation Keelhaul - the "repatriation" of millions of Soviet citizens who founded themselves in the West after the war. To be fair to the Allies, what else could they do? Stalin had his hands of a fair amount of Western POWs. The unfortunates keelhailed back east were shipped to the Gulags. To show that he was not bluffing, Stalin kept a good dose of Englishmen and Americans (say, 50,000) when the British refused to hand over all Soviets under their jurisdiction.

Then there is the Kangaroo Court at Nuremberg. The Allies, along with their Soviet pals, decided to sue the Germans for the crime of losing the war. Churchill had wanted to just shoot the captured Nazi top officials, but the Americans had persuaded him of the demagogical advantages of show trials. Stalin, the renowned world expert of show trials, likely needed no convincing. In a famous Teheran Conference episode, Stalin and Roosevelt joked about slaughtering 50,000 Germans officers after the war. Churchill told them they were nuts and left the table. Roosevelt revived the joke when the big three met at Yalta in 1945. In the end it was decided that summary executions would look bad, and the show trials method was adopted.

And so the Allies gathered at Nuremberg and began their farce. The idea clearly was to set up something like a world court. They went and tried a gaggle of top Nazis and hanged the choicest monsters, plus a few men who acted out of ill-founded patriotism more than anything else.

The great product of the Nuremberg Kangaroo Court were the Nuremberg Principles, which the Anglo-Americans (and the French and others) have been violating for more than a half-century. As Noam Chomsky has pointed out, every American president since Truman is guilty by the Nuremberg

Principles. The fact that nobody cares about this proves: 1) the obvious, that the victors are always right; and 2) that the notion of a United Nations governed by universal law is little more than a front for the Anglo-American attempt at taking over the world. Jingoistic Englishmen and Americans are warned that the resulting empire is meant to benefit the Oligarchs rather than the people. The Americans and the Englishmen do the dying, the killing, and the manufacturing of weaponry. Once they have fulfilled their purpose in being the thugs of the empire, their privileges are to be removed, and they are to be slaves along with everybody else.

But enough of World War II. The main points we aimed to establish are: 1) The war was carefully manufactured by banking and Anglo-American imperialist interests; 2) the goal in Europe was the creation of an orgy of destruction, to be followed by the memorable German-Soviet war; 3) Germany had to be destroyed, and Russia was to be contained after the war; 4) Nationalism was to be destroyed, to be replaced by the polar ideological split; 5) In Asia, Japan was to be forced into the Anglo-American camp; 6) Though we did not discuss this, a scuffle had been developing between the Americans and the British since 1918, and by 1945 it was clear that Washington would have to carry the torch as the leader of the English-speaking world; 7) The plight of the Jews served to provide justification for the creation of the Anglo-American-Banker Middle-Eastern bridgehead at Israel.

In particular: in general, the war is better understood through the prism of power politics rather than through the standard good vs evil framework. The Germans and the Japanese had two fatal problems - they were too ideologically doctrinaire, and they were too weak. Those factors allowed the wily Anglo-Americans to goad the Berlin-Tokyo Axis into making the first move and losing the moral upper hand. Once the United States joined the war, it was all over. Tragically, the four years of cataclysmic warfare between December 1941 and August 1945 were only a formality.

The other crucial point is that World War II could have been avoided. Germany - perhaps even under Hitler! - could have been kept in its place, and the USSR and Japan could have been contained. But, as the Carnegie lovers of "peace" explained, war is good, war works.

8.8 After the War: American Empire

Since the mid 1990s, there has been a plethora of books lamenting the American grab for an empire. The insightful Parenti and the meticulous Bill Blum published two opening salvos by 1995: *Against Empire* and *Killing Hope*. Subsequently, Chalmers Johnson wrote an excellent trilogy on the subject: *Blowback* (January 2001), *The Sorrows of Empire* (2004), and *Nemesis* (2007).

Roughly, the following happened: After the war, the Americans looked around and realized that they had half of the world's wealth. It was decided, and famously formulated by George Kennan (1904-2005, Senior Fellow at the CFR), to try to keep things that way. And so the Americans, with guile and force, pretty much tried to conquer the world, while keeping the only two powers that could opposed them - Russia and China - divided and besieged. At the same time, an effort was made to gradually bring Russia and China into the emerging global system.

The American effort was a combination of: 1) pure militaristic imperialism; 2) quiet economic-corporate-diplomatic imperialism; and 3) an attempt at crafting the one-world government system. In general, the Americans labelled any independent regime "communist" or, more recently, "terrorist." For all their lip service to democracy, they collaborated with despots whenever convenient. Wherever they could, the Americans achieved their aims "peacefully," via CIA coups and forced economic agreements. Where the soft approach did not work, they resorted to military force. And so, by 2000, the Americans had something like 700 bases strewn across the globe, as well as various "free-market" "Washington consensus" economic agreements. The attempt to colonize Russia in the 1990s was relatively, but not completely, successful.

Now, in regard to China, certain high echelon elements in the US government quietly sabotaged the Chinese Nationalists to the benefit of the Communists. Mao came to power, did his evil mad deeds, and died. Zbig, Kissinger, and the Rockefellers managed to get China to open up in the

1980s. The Chinese could industrialize, and the Americans would have a vast new market as well as a vast new source of slave labour. Everybody won. The Americans, I suspect, intended to keep China in chains in three ways: 1) via control of the world's oil; 2) via encircling China militarily; and 3) via pro-"democracy" demagoguery. Judging by the perfected techniques of Color Coups, it is my impression that the long-term goal of the Rockefeller faction is to take over China via a fake "democratic" coup; or to otherwise goad the Chinese into accepting the world regime by granting them a major but inferior role in the "unified" world. Other factions in America and in the world have their own agendas, and so I find the general picture rather hard to untangle. I feel that I am on the right track, but that what I wrote above is not the whole story.

And so, here we find ourselves today, with the Americans badly overstretched, in serious economic trouble, and with China and Russia finding their feet and aligning diplomatically. The two great Eurasian nations should have allied long ago. Russia has the oil and the know-how, and China has the workforce. Judging by Zbig's serious criticism of the Bush regime, I get the impression that the Neo-cons outflanked the Rockefeller gang, and, by adopting a rather ridiculous all-out barbaric worldwide military offensive, combined with inept doctrinaire economic policies, have endangered the whole scam. All of this is hard to gauge.

It is also hard to tell what will happen next. Undoubtedly, the world economic system is on the brink; and there exists a serious threat of a World War III. In the ideal scenario, the Americans will relax their military offensive; they will rebuild at home; and they will adopt a policy of peaceful and - why not? - mutually supportive co-existence with Russia and China. In such circumstances, the prospect of a true United Nations built on a solid popular edifice exists. A new renaissance can occur within a decade. This is what we aim for.

On the other hand, the crazies may prevail, and we could have a World War III. Nothing much to say about that, except that we must not allow it to happen.

The reader must understand that the threat of an economic collapse of world civilization, or of a suicidal World War III, is real, and demands consideration and action. Understanding how the world works is interesting, but there are other things that one can do. However, in the current situation we really have no choice. We must do something.

8.9 The International Drug Trade

The drug trade, in its present form, dates back to the 19th century, when the Anglo-Americans busted China open and dumped tons of opium at the Chinese ports. Throughout the 20th century, and particularly after the Second World War, the intelligence agencies have been peddling drugs and the banks have laundered the incomes. The drug racket is a big racket governed from the top, by the Oligarchs. The prohibition farce, which made such illustrious figures as Joe Kennedy and the Canadian Oligarch Bronfmann, can be ascribed to the overall drugs scam.

Some useful references: Alfred W. McCoy's *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia* (1972); LaRouche's Crew's (Executive Intelligence Review) *Dope Inc* (first issued in 1978); Pulitzer-Prize winner Gary Webb's *Dark Alliance* series (1996); Lee&Shlain's *Acid Dreams* (1985); and others. Also useful is elementary common sense applied to such historical episodes as the Opium Wars and the Iran-Contra scandal.

8.9.1 The British Invent the Opium Trade

What happened was, after demolishing the excellent Indian textile industry, the British (via the East India Company) started shipping English textiles to India, exchanging those for opium as well as tea and other stuff. The opium they carried to China, where it served the dual purpose of: 1) draining the Chinese silver reserves; 2) emasculating the Chinese population through addiction. The Chinese Emperor tried to crack down on the opium trade in 1839. The British went there with their gunboats

and diplomatically smashed China, forcing the Chinese government to open four ports to the British and to hand over Hong Kong. The profits were excellent, just wonderful. Peerages were acquired and banks bloomed (Jardine Matheson & Co; Barings; Rothschild). Around that time, Malthus, Smith, Bentham, Ricardo, and the Mills had formulated the "free-trade" doctrine, and opium was, after all, to be freely traded along with everything else.

An incident spawned another Opium War in 1856. This time, the Americans, the Russians, and the French also joined in on the rape of China. New ports were opened, missionaries were given permission to travel around China, the opium trade was declared legal, and an indemnity was paid to the French and the British. Opium floated into China. The profits were beautiful, just gorgeous (new players included the Hongkong & Shanghai Corporation, and Rio Tinto). Fattened by their profits, the British decided to also dump textiles into China, and they did.

To facilitate their business, the British quietly built up the Triads secret society/ sect/ criminal gang in China.

In the early 20th century, as humanity made a feeble effort toward civilizing itself, there was an Opium Convention at the Hague in 1911-1912. The world Powers decided to ban the opium trade. The British simply moved their opium business underground. They unloaded the stuff at their bases in Hong Kong and Shanghai, and let the criminal networks distribute the dope. Since the drug trade was now on the black market, prices - and profits - jumped. Nor did Her ("His" at that time) Majesty's faithful have to pay any more import tariffs. Pax Britannica ruled supreme in 1914 as the British prepared to let Europe smash itself.

(*Dope Inc*, 1978 edition, p. 21, emphasis in original) As late as 1927, official British statistics showed that *government opium revenues* - excluding the far more expansive black market figures - accounted for significant percentages of total revenues in all of the major Far East Crown colonies.

British North Borneo 23%; Federated Malay States 14%; Sarawak 18%; Straits Settlements 37%; Confederated Malay 28%.

In India as well, official Crown policy centered on protection for the opium market.

Note that apart from profits, the head honchos like to peddle drugs (and booze) in order to keep the population dumb and sedated. British gin and Russian vodka are classic examples of this policy of pacification. Better yet, alcohol is an "inelastic" good, meaning that when you raise prices, people still keep buying the stuff. And so governments could garner solid tax revenues by taxing alcohol.

Decent elements of the US government occasionally fought against the British opium trade. At the same time, various American interests joined the drug peddling and made solid profits.

The British Oligarchs used Jewish money-lenders as frontmen for their operations. The names of the Jewish drug-peddler dynasties are: Mocatta, Goldsmith, Montefiore, de Hirsch, etc. These dynasties had their own secret society - the Order of Zion. The LaRouche people think that Palmerston (the powerful 19th century British politician), who was head of Freemasonry, exerted control over the various European (and even North American) secret societies - Mazzini's crew, Bakunin's Anarchists, and so on. The thesis certainly fits with the facts and makes sense. Via the secret societies and the various mafias, Old Pam and his successors could efficiently and quietly murder their opponents.

The EIR say that the British created a drug network in the United States via the ethnic immigrants of Italian, Jewish, and Chinese origins. This is credible: the Mafia was an offshoot of the Carbonari, whose leader Mazzini spent much time in London. The Chinese Triads had ties to the British opium traders. The top Jewish banker boys were heavily integrated with the London Oligarchs.

One notable example of the archetypical drug overlord is the notorious "Canadian" Sam Bronfman.

Sam (1889-1971) was born in Romania in a Jewish family connected with the various secret societies. As we mentioned before, at the time Romania was a hotbed of Freemasonry; it turns out that various parallel Jewish organizations were also in business. Incidentally, the EIR states that:

(pp. 31-32) The Order of Zion was simply the Jewish division of the Most Venerable Order of St. John of Jerusalem, the London-centered chivalric order and secret society, whose members swear - and act on - a blood oath. A secret meeting in Paris in 1884 yielded the famous minutes of the Order, published under the title, *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. The minutes were intercepted and published by the Russian counterintelligence service, the Okhrana. Probably, the decision to publish the captured minutes involved retaliation against the Order of Zion's role in fomenting a sweeping destabilization against the government of Russian Prime Minister Count Witte, whose government fell during the so-called 1905 revolution. ... The question of the authenticity of the *Protocols* has been a matter of fierce, even hysterical dispute. The question may be settled with dispatch by a textual comparison between the oaths of the Order of Zion printed in the *Protocols*, and the blood-curdling oaths sworn by initiates into the fourth Grade of the Knights of Columbus of Mexico, which maintains close ties to the Jesuits and to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which reads in part as follows: [follow the oaths]

Sam's father, Yechiel, migrated to Canada in 1889. The Bronfmans had been selected by the de Hirsch gang.

The early Italian mafiosos had ties to Mazzini, Pike, the Jewish mob, and London. Their activity centered around New Orleans. Curiously, we have seen in various places that the New Orleans mob was alive and well in the 20th century, and, as the Eustis woman claimed, played a hand in the murders of Lincoln and Huey Long. It is well known that the New Orleans ring also had a hand in the assassination of Kennedy.

The other two branches of the Mafia were, of course, in New York and Palermo. Though relatively autonomous, the three groups maintained contact.

That the Anglo-Americans exploited the blacks and the Indians is well known. But then there is the Chinese slave - or "indentured servant" - or "coolie" - trade of the 19th century. Someone had to build the railroads and so boatloads of Chinese were brought in to work and die in the sun. With them came the Triads. They settled on the West Coast - particularly in Frisco and Vancouver. Morphine addiction was a serious problem in late 19th century America. Snake-oil peddlers sold "painkiller" panacea drugs, which healed everything - by drugging the user with morphine. Thousands of American housewives unwittingly succumbed to addiction. Profits were great.

Who were the American players in the opium trade? We have already met Russell; the Astors also made their fortune from opium. Another narco-lord was Stephen Girard of the Girard Bank and Trust. The Perkins and Forbes dynasties made good drug-profits. Various other Boston Brahmin families, many of them heavily represented in the Skull & Bones roster, participated. The group's leading banker, Morgan, also took a cut of the cake.

Then came the prohibition:

(p. 44) Prohibition brought the narcotics traffic, the narcotics traffickers, and large-scale organized crime into the United States. Illegal alcohol and illegal narcotics made up two different product lines of the same multinational firm. The British, through their distilleries in Scotland and Canada, and the British, from their opium refineries in Shanghai and Hong Kong, were the suppliers. The British, through their banks in Canada and the Caribbean, were the financiers. Through their political conduits in the United States, the British created the set of political conditions under which the United States might be won back by means other than the failed Balkanization plan of the Civil War period.

It is worth noting that Bronfman, who was the main booze runner on the Canadian side, had ties to the de Hirsch gang of London; and as for Joe Kennedy, he even got to be ambassador to London, and was big in the Knights of Columbus.

Lansky and Rothstein bought their opium perfectly legally from British sources in the Far East. And so it went.

The "dry" movement was a classic Foundation operation funded from New York by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, and other allied forces.

(p. 46) Who made up the Temperance Movement? It was run by Jane Addams, who studied the Fabian Society's London settlement house Toynbee Hall experiment and came to the United States to launch a parallel project which later produced the University of Chicago. The "cadre" were drawn almost exclusively from three pools: 1) the settlement house and suffragette networks run by Addams and the Russell Sage Foundation; 2) the pro-terrorist synthetic religious cults operated out of Oberlin College in Ohio; and 3) the Ku Klux Klan in the South.

The KKK was, of course, founded as an offshoot of Albert Pike's Scottish Rite Masonry. So was the ADL, for that matter.

The University of Chicago had solid ties to the mob. Saul Alinsky of that noble institution, the noted leftist and revolutionary of the 1960s, was an accountant for the Capone Mob at the height of the Prohibition.

In the late 1940s, Milton Friedman, the notorious nut, (p.48) "was installed as President of the Gold Seal Liquor Company - the original Capone enterprise." The great free-marketeer was also given the presidency of the Illinois Wholesale Liquor Dealers Association.

Robert Maynard Hutchins, the president of the Rockefeller U of C between 1929 and 1950, was investigated for ties to the drug industry as late as in the 1960s. Hutchins, whose ties to the British Oligarchy were so heavy he became a Knight Commander of the British Hospitallers, was also tied to the Vegas racket.

The excellent profits spawned the American organized crime network. Some smugglers, like Joe Kennedy, went legit. Drowning in money, the Jewish mobsters came up with Las Vegas. Lansky and Bugsy Siegel created Vegas from scratch in the 1930s and 1940s. Vegas, that hideous scar on the face of America, was the city worst struck by the 2008 mortgage crisis. Vegas is a mixture of ugly knock-offs of famous monuments, cheap booze, one-armed-bandits who rob the chumps day and night, all kinds of drugs, tired whores, and broken dreams.

The EIR people claim that (p. 51) "Nixon was a casualty in the war against Britain's drug invasion of the United States." Nixon had taken steps at fighting the drug trade from the top down. It is certain that Nixon was deliberately ousted from power (Peter Dale Scott and Daniel Estulin have filled in the missing details in their writings). He was the last relatively independent American president. Evidently, his offences were not great enough to warrant assassination as in the case of Jack Kennedy, but he did enough to be summarily discharged via the ridiculous Watergate scam. His "War on Drugs," if it did target the top of the dope pyramid, provides a good enough explanation; Nixon "failed" in other ways as well.

The details of the structure of the dope trade are interesting, but have to be omitted here. Look them up in EIR's original work.

During World War II, the British trained the American OSS, which grew into the CIA. The CIA had extremely heavy ties to the Skull&Bones mob, whose key member-dynasties had participated in the 19th century opium traffic.

This brings us to the post war world and the CIA heroin smuggling in East Asia. Note that Alfred

W. McCoy's doctoral thesis *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia* qualifies as official history. The man was from Yale, and his research has been vindicated.

Curiously, the (Second World) War, by disrupting worldwide commercial traffic, and strengthening border security, severely damaged the international drug traffic.

Another curious and telling factoid is that the OSS established connections with the Sicilian Mafia when the Americans stormed the island in 1943. In the late 1940s, the CIA recruited Corsican mobsters in their fight against the Communists in Marseilles. That is the "French Connection," and that is, for that matter, where Sarkozy's roots lie.²⁰

In the 1960s, the Italians cracked down on the Sicilian mob and the Turks smashed their poppy growers. And so the heroin industry moved Southeast to the Golden Triangle-Indochina area. All the while the CIA did its thing. Heroin flooded the US and addiction became a major public health problem. Wrote McCoy, "Unlike some national intelligence agencies, the CIA did not dabble in the drug traffic to finance its clandestine operations. Nor was its culpability the work of a few corrupt agents, eager to share in the enormous profits. The CIA's role in the heroin traffic was simply an inadvertent but inevitable consequence of its cold war tactics."

Without going into the details, let us focus on the conclusion: the CIA trafficked heroin. What more is there to say? The CIA with its connections to the Anglo-American Oligarchy and the various secret societies and organized mobs transported and dealt drugs. This is official, it is documented history, it is how things are.

It is worth noting that Chairman Mao's gang was also in on the racket.

Let us move on to the 1980s. The Iran-Contra affair: US government elements tied to the Bush gang and the CIA sold guns to Iran (which was in war with Iraq, where the CIA had installed Saddam), and used the profits to finance the Nicaraguan Contras, who, in turn, gave cocaine to the CIA, which the spooks distributed in the ghettos of America. This is official history, subject to congressional investigations and so on.

In the mid-1990s, Pulitzer-Prize winner Gary Webb proved that the CIA had peddled crack cocaine to the American blacks. In 2004, Webb was found dead with two shotgun-shots to the head. He was pronounced a suicide.

So then in 2001, Bush Jr invaded Afghanistan, where the Taliban (invented by Zbig and the CIA in the late 1970s and the 1980s) had recently annihilated the poppy fields. Bush Jr of Skull & Bones, whose father Bush Sr of Skull & Bones had been the head of the CIA and whose henchmen were implicated in the Iran-Contra scandal. Immediately, the Afghan poppy crop grew to new heights. Heroin flooded Russia.

What are we to think?

Or take the case of Colombia. The country is the world's major supplier of cocaine. It also happens to be the main American base of operations in Latin America. Again, the conclusions are obvious.

This should suffice as far as opium-morphine-heroin and cocaine go. Let us now look at LSD. We consult Lee & Schlain's *Acid Dreams*, and keep an eye open for our old friend Aldous the lover of Soma.

8.9.2 Acid

LSD ("acid") was first synthesized by the Swiss scientist Albert Hofmann in 1938. Hoffman (1906-2008) was a University of Zurich graduate. He invented LSD while working for the pharmaceutical firm Sandoz of Basel. The man was into "secret mysteries."

In 1943, the good (mad?) doctor took a look at his creation, and accidentally swallowed a modest dose. He was intrigued. And so were others.

²⁰See Thierry Meyssan's article *Operation Sarkozy*, found for example here: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=10060>, accessed Dec 23, 2011.

So who popularized LSD? Who else, but the CIA. As a part of their research into mind-control, the infamous MK-ULTRA program, the spooks fed people LSD to see how they would react. The agents used hookers to lure unsuspecting dupes into safehouses. There, the victims would drink a spiked cocktail, and the spooks, defenders of society and peeping toms that they were, would watch and record sage observations. Perhaps they drank beer, ate popcorn, and otherwise amused themselves.

Every drug to appear on the market in the 1960s had been tried out by the CIA. They had sought to create mind-controlled assassins and other such Manchurian Candidates. Did they succeed? Who knows? But when one reads of John Lennon's murderer, one wonders.

The CIA experiments started in 1942, when Bill Donovan of the OSS (proto-CIA) got a bunch of top American scientists to try to develop a truth serum. The doctors came up with a heavily concentrated marijuana-based truth drug, which the spooks, after some experimentation, began to offer to their victims in the form of a cigarette. The operational results of the use of the serum were mixed.

In 1947, the CIA revived the project under the codename "Chatter." The endeavour failed and was terminated in 1953.

Parallel projects drew on Nazi results in attempted mind-control. One project was called "Bluebird." In August 1951 the operation was renamed and became "Artichoke." (Choke?) The experiments built on the "science" of behaviourism. The effects of heroin and cocaine were examined, but the two drugs did not do the job. Sometime in the early 1950s, the CIA discovered LSD. The early results of the LSD experiments were encouraging, but ultimately LSD was found unsatisfactory as a truth serum. The spooks, however, were not about to let something as nifty as LSD go to waste. Perhaps the drug was not a truth serum - fine! - but could it not be used in other contexts? The experiments branched out in all directions. By 1955, the CIA were looking for a drug that would produce euphoria without a hangover - i.e. Soma.

To expand their effort, the CIA recruited academic researchers by distributing LSD-related grants. The good doctors had great fun. They gave LSD to spiders, cats, mice, fish, and other critters. Once they injected an elephant with an overdose of LSD. The big fellow fell over in a stupor. In trying to resurrect the elephant, the mad doctor in charge - Louis Joylon "Jolly" West - managed to kill the animal.

Another mad doctor was Ewen Cameron, president at various times of the American, the Canadian, and the World Psychiatric Associations. This specimen was in charge of the notorious psycho-schemes at McGill University. Nine of his patients - who had never agreed to participate in any experiments - later sued the American government.

Another CIA-recruited madman in a white coat was one Harris Isbell. The doc experimented on junkies and other derelicts, who would be his guinea pigs in return for free H. In his scientific endeavours, Isbell once fed LSD for two and a half months to a bunch of unfortunate black inmates. Another brave researcher was Carl Pfeiffer from Princeton. He also experimented on inmates - or should we say "volunteers?"

To have enough acid to play around with, the spooks tried to buy one million doses of LSD from Sandoz in the mid 1950s. The Swiss did not have as much, but a deal was struck anyway. Sandoz promised to tell the CIA whenever anyone ordered acid. Just to be safe, the CIA asked Eli Lilly to cook some home-baked acid for them.

Allen Dulles authorized MK-ULTRA, the CIA drug & mind control flagship operation, in April 1953. The man in charge of the racket was a Dr Gottlieb. The experiments gradually got out of hand. One man went nuts and killed himself. This did not stop the spooks, and they began to experiment on unsuspecting civilians in San Francisco in 1955. The experiments continued without interruption until 1963. Remember that San Francisco was *the* epicenter of 1960s drugs craze.

The justification for doing these insane tests was the Cold War - the CIA just had to keep ahead of those pesky Soviets. The Russkies were, of course, far behind in the pills race.

The Army did its own research. One of their ambitions was the spiking of an entire enemy city's water supply with acid.

In the 1950s, the LSD craze was confined to the limited circle of the spooks and their lapdog scientists. Yet by the late 1960s, parts of America had embarked on a full-blown acid trip. How did that happen, and more importantly, who were the men driving the development forward?

The key early LSD-pusher was one Alfred Matthew Hubbard. This Hubbard (1901-1982) was born dirt-poor in Kentucky, had served in the OSS during the war, and had made good as a "uranium entrepreneur." He knew everybody who was somebody, drove around in a Rolls-Royce, and carried a suitcase full of acid, which he proffered left and right. They called him "Cappy," because he held the rank of captain. He had served time, had escaped to Canada to avoid another stint in jail, and had received an official pardon by Truman. Before Pearl Harbor, he had smuggled war materiel to England - providing us with a serious British connection. But then, the OSS was trained by the British. Hubbard's smuggling efforts were illegal and are the reason for his "escape" to Canada and his subsequent official pardon.

The man who first gave Cappy LSD was Ronald Sandison. Doc Sandison (1916-2010) was a graduate of King's College. He flew with the RAF during the war. After the war, he was put in charge of a decrepit mental joint. The man pulled the institution out of hell, and turned it into a renowned hospital. Perhaps he was given a hospital and financing for the purposes of conducting experimental research. In the early 1950s, Sandison found LSD. He would research the drug for the next decade. Hubbard next made contact with the British doctor Humphry Osmond, who then worked in Canada. Osmond was another LSD researcher and King's College graduate. He was the one who gave Aldous Huxley mescaline in 1953. In his enthusiasm, Huxley conferred with various spooks and mad doctors engaged in the LSD research. He was tight with Cappy ("such a very nice man") by 1955.

Possessed of his own plane, yacht, and private island, Hubbard criss-crossed the world doling out dope. The LSD craze *started at the top*, and Hubbard was instrumental in popularizing the drug. All the while, Hubbard maintained his connections, and bragged that he was pals with J. Edgar Hoover. He said he hated the CIA - but so what?

The man was a top agent. His resume contained stints with both the Feds and the prohibition-era Mob. He was one of those elusive personalities nobody talks about - like Parvus, Maurice Strong, Manly P. Hall, and Rakovsky.

In the late 1950s, various psychiatrists in Hollywood, some with ties to Hubbard, began to stuff their celebrity patients with LSD. The drug made the circles in Hollywood, whose degenerate denizens were always up for some fun. Ginsberg tried acid in 1959 as part of an experiment. He related the experience to his boyfriend, the despicable pile of scum Burroughs (1914-1997), who shot his wife and remained unpunished for the murder, depressed his son into (quasi-)suicide, and probably violated small Arab boys. To show our reader how the whole mess is connected, the whole hideous scam, we observe that Burroughs's maternal uncle was Ivy Lee, the servant of Rockefeller and IG-Farben. Burroughs's "writings," which resembled bodily secretions smeared on crumpled leafs of old newspaper, were instrumental in popularizing homosexuality and drug abuse in the United States.

While on this wavelength, we should note that Hunter S. Thompson (1937-2005) was a genuinely talented writer. Stylistically, he was almost without equal. He wrote with profound humor and irony in the great American satirical tradition of Mark Twain. Hemingway and F. Scott were major influences of his - indeed, HST's first novel, *The Rum Dairy*, reads like a mix of *The Sun Also Rises* and *Gatsby*. Thompson wrote the novel in the 1950s, and, unable to find a publisher, he changed his style into the hysterical half-journalism half-fiction half-memoir for which he became famous.

In light of what happened to the Black Panthers, Bill Cooper, and various others, it is clear that those who genuinely threaten the establishment find themselves in jail or dead. Yet Thompson was

left alone. Why? Evidently, because he was unconsciously doing a service to the head honchos. He was anti-establishment, but his rantings were general and rarely addressed the root causes of America's troubles. On the other hand, he was a rabid drug-abuser, and contributed greatly to the popularization of drugs in America. One can not help but reach the conclusion that the Oligarchs *wanted* to spread drugs across the USA, and hence failed to pursue HST, whom they could have jailed at will for drug offences.

Ken Kesey (1935-2001) was another drug-loving author made big in the 1960s. I am not a great admirer of his writings, but at least he did seem to possess a modicum of talent.

The "beat" generation, with, one supposes, some exceptions, was generally a pathetic collection of hacks, deadbeats, and assorted lunatics. Jack Kerouac drank himself to death in his mother's joint. How can one respect that? I can not help but suspect that the "beats" were deliberately elevated into the public consciousness for the purposes of social engineering; but research into the subject is best left for another time.

Another lover of LSD was Henry Luce, the Skull&Bones owner of *Time*. Naturally, Luce had close ties with the CIA. He tried acid in the 1950s and his wife tried acid and other big honchos tried acid and they chatted with Aldous and had themselves a wonderful time. They also met and dropped acid with Christopher Isherwood, the homosexual British author (see the movie *Cabaret*). Sometime in the 1930s, Isherwood had met Swami Prabhavananda, the great "guru," who also had connections with Huxley and Russell.

And so, in 1957, *Life* published a laudatory article on psychedelics. The author was Gordon Wasson, a vice-president at J.P. Morgan. The article created quite a splash and attracted Timothy Leary, the notorious drug propagandist. Leary was a behaviorist psychologist at Harvard, where LSD had been making the rounds. After two failed marriages, the first of which had culminated in suicide, Leary was, understandably, not entirely happy with life. He tried magic mushrooms while on vacation, and liked them. Leary went back to Harvard and contacted Harry Murray, an old OSS cadre. Next, Leary teamed up with Richard Alpert to research shrooms. Lee & Shlain naively write:

(Ch. 3) At first glance they were an unlikely, team, given their contrasting personalities. Alpert, the son of a wealthy New England lawyer, was ten years younger and obsessed with "making it" in the academic world. He seemed to be well on his way, having acquired all the accoutrements of success - the sports car, the cashmere sweaters, the cocktail parties, a faculty post at a prestigious university. The last thing Alpert wanted was to rock the boat and jeopardize his career.

Unlikely indeed. Leary, on the other hand, had been a "rebel" with a neurotic personality. Inspired by Aldous's writings, and some personal meetings with the man, the two docs embarked on their schizophrenic journey. Apparently, "Huxley felt the best way to bring about vast changes in society was to offer the experience to the talented, the well-born, the intelligent rich, and others in positions of influence." This example of double-speak hardly needs any elaboration. Huxley explicitly said at one point, that Leary was "what we want," presumably for popularizing the drug.

The perfect useful idiot had been discovered. Leary's research took off spectacularly. The man became a "chemical crusader." Allied with Ginsberg and various others, Leary took Harvard and Greenwich Village by storm. People being what they are - prone to surrendering to fashion and wanting to be cool - the psychedelics spread like wildfire among the "artistic" and upper-class circles of society. Burroughs, burned out by heroin abuse, did not like the schrooms - so they let him stick to his stuff.

Leary, knowingly or not, encountered CIA agents during his adventures. He fed acid to Mary Pinchot (1920-1964) the gorgeous Washington socialite, whose husband Cord Meyer (1920-2001) was a top CIA man. Pinchot was also a friend (very good friend!) of JFK's. Mary smelled a rat after JFK's death, raised a scandal, and died in mysterious circumstances. Curiously enough, Elizabeth Eisenstein, Quigley's "marvellous researcher," was a friend of Pinchot's.

JFK likely dropped acid.

In 1962, Leary published a paper, which said that America should dump LSD in its water supply in order to protect itself from a similar move on the part of the Russians.

Many people decided that Leary had fried his brains in trying to advance science. Even Cappy Hubbard thought that Tim had gone too far and was jeopardizing the LSD project.

In 1963, Alpert and Leary got the axe. Leary was OK with the development. To the great guru, LSD went ahead of Harvard. The media enjoyed the scandal and Leary became a celebrity. The man decided to get the young people of America to drop acid.

A crackdown on acid ensued. Regulative legislations passed. Likely, some considered LSD a health menace to society. Perhaps some backed the ban acid to increase the drug's popularity through reverse psychology. This is a standard and highly pernicious trick - for example, it is fairly well-known that introducing children to sex via "sexual education" tends to *increase* promiscuity.²¹

Huxley died within a few hours of JFK; his demise coincided with the beginning of the massive Leary-driven campaign for bringing LSD into the consciousness of mainstream America. One of Alpert and Leary's backers was William Mellon Hitchcock, a relative of the founder of Gulf Oil and of Mellon the big banker. Write Lee and Shlain, (Ch.4)

Why Hitchcock decided to throw his weight behind the psychedelic cause is still something of a mystery. Was he simply a millionaire acid buff, a wayward son of the ruling class who dug Leary's trip? Or did he have something else up his sleeve? "Mr. Billy," as his servants affectionately called him, claimed he got involved with LSD because kicking the establishment in the teeth was exciting. Of course, since Hitchcock was the establishment, some questioned what he was really up to.

...

When asked at the outset of one group session what question he wanted answered by the acid trip, he replied, "How can I make more money on the stock market?"

By getting America hooked on acid and laundering the profits, Billy! But surely you never thought of that.

Leary, in the meanwhile, married a Swedish model and had himself a merry old time.

Of course, everybody knew where the LSD crowd was; the law could persecute them at leisure; and yet J. Edgar did not bother to raid the Hitchcock estate. The various literati and "artists" and socialites and behaviorists of the East Coast, on the other hand, descended upon Millbrook in droves.

It is worth noting that at some point the LSD movement mixed with the Buddhism-Zen-Eastern mumbo-jumbo endeavour. Thus, LSD also served as a conduit for the budding New Age pseudo-religion. Both Leary and Huxley pushed forward the *Tibetan Book of the Dead*.

Millbrook attracted publicity, and Leary's celebrity rose. Others promoted LSD in London. The drug began to hit the mainstream.

Leary was finally busted, likely by ignorant local cops, in Texas in December 1965. He was slapped with 30 years and a heavy fine - but he managed to beat the rap. In April 1966, Gordon Liddy's people raided Millbrook. Liddy (1930-) had had a stint with the FBI, and in 1966 worked as a New York prosecutor. He would later be a key figure in the Watergate scandal. He served four years in the slammer before Carter pardoned him. The 1966 raid was a failure, but the heat forced the Millbrook people to tone down their activities.

²¹For a dramatic example of "negative suggestion," look up Derren Brown's exercise in murdering kittens, available for example here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xqIC7vGZepg>, accessed Dec 25, 2011. The incident looks genuine to me, though it may have been staged.

Meanwhile on the West Coast, Kesey, who had, like so many others, first dropped acid in a government experiment (at Stanford), was doing his part. The man Kesey set himself up at La Honda, north of San Francisco. During the late 1960s, his haunt was a major focal point of the drug/counter-culture movement.

San Francisco was the center of the late 1960s "counter-culture," new-left, drug-popping mania - and Kesey's set-up was a keystone of the whole affair.

The first wave of acid hit the campuses in 1965. Now where did the dope come from? A US government study in 1970 found out that the bulk of the acid in the US came from Britain.²² Various underground LSD-labs existed across the Untied States.

Rand and the Hudson institute monitored the LSD scene closely. Research was conducted on whether LSD could be used as an antidote to political activism. The reality is that a person stoned out of his mind is no great threat to the "establishment."

Herman Kahn (1922-1983) the geopolitical strategist, who was one of the framers of American nuclear policy, was interested in LSD as a method of "social control," and prophesied that by 2000 there will be a "dropped-out" segment within American society. What more indication do we need?

There is more, but this ought to suffice. The LSD movement came from the CIA, the British agent Huxley the lover of Soma, and the American upper crust. The media popularized the drugs through a mix of laudation and condemnation. There is sufficient cause to suspect that LSD was deliberately promoted as part of an overall drug-pushing campaign of social engineering, "cultural revolution," and subversive cultural warfare.

The "New Left" was utterly penetrated by feds, spooks, and foundation operatives. To get an idea of what really was going on, consider this datum from Chapter 9 of *Acid Dreams*: "According to Army intelligence documents later obtained by CBS news, nearly one out of six demonstrators at the Chicago convention was an undercover operative." The manipulators were there, diffusing useful political action into mindless violence, socially destructive "cultural revolution," and other outlets. As the EIR pointed out, there is another angle - Nixon likely really wanted to curb the narcotics problem. He encountered internal sabotage and was eventually ousted for this and other crimes of his.

Let us wrap up by looking at Leary's legendary prison escape, and relating the LaRouche crew's thoughts on the subject of LSD.

Leary went to the can in January-February 1970. He was sprung out in September by the notorious Weathermen outfit. The Weathermen were a gang of nincompoops, degenerates, naive revolutionaries, thugs, and assorted lunatics who wanted to bring down the American government, presumably by the collective force of their drug&sex-addled minds. I have nothing against healthy sex and the occasional consumption of drugs - but I feel that it is fair to say that mass orgies and endless partner swaps are hollow and barbaric, and that getting stoned out of one's mind for a prolonged period of time without a serious underlying cause is not particularly conducive to anything good.

These Weathermen were also penetrated by the cops/feds/spooks ("pigs").

Leary found his way to Switzerland, where the authorities put him in jail. A "silver-haired gunrunner," Michel-Gustave Hauchard, made Leary's jail-stint pleasant by providing the doc with luxuries. Leary spent only six weeks in the can, because Hauchard managed to force the Swiss government to free the mad doctor. It seems that even less information exists on Houchard than on Cappy Hubbard.

And so, Leary, the great prophet, lived like a king in Switzerland and held court to Billy Hitchcock, Hoffman, and other luminaries.

What next?

²²See <http://www.druglibrary.org/schaffer/library/studies/cu/cu50.html>, accessed Dec 25, 2011.

(Ch. 10) It's not clear why Joanna Harcourt-Smith was so intent on tracking Leary down. Born in Saint Moritz, she was a young globe-trotting adventuress who'd been married twice before she met Leary. Her father was a British aristocrat and her step-father one of the wealthiest men in Europe; she was also the niece of Simon Harcourt-Smith, a London publisher.

In the fall of 1972, Joanna met Michel Hauchard for drinks in New York. Hauchard, her ex-lover, bragged that he "owned" Timothy Leary, openly waving the check from his book advance. Joanna boarded the next plane to Geneva, and arranged to meet Leary at a nearby cafe. Tim was immediately attracted by her wit and sexy smile. As they drove back to Leary's pad, Joanna reached into her pocket, pulled out two hits of windowpane acid, swallowed one, and said of the other, "Whoever eats this will follow me." Leary gobbled the psychedelic, precipitating an all-night session of lovemaking, speaking in French, and overall grokking. The next morning, Tim told his housemates that he had found his perfect love.

This fairy tale competes the circle: the unbalanced dupe Leary was recruited by the British aristocrat Huxley and succored in his hour of need by the British aristocratic vixen Joanna, while the British flooded the US with LSD.

Nixon finally bagged Leary (in Afghanistan) in 1973. The mad doctor did some time at Folsom, and was finally pardoned by Jerry Brown in 1976. He became friends with Gordon Liddy. The two made a good buck touring America talking about abortion, "gay rights," and the environment.

Billy Hitchcock, when cornered by the law, revealed the lower ladder-rungs of an "international LSD conspiracy" which laundered vast amounts of money at British banking havens like the Bahamas.

The publicity generated by the trial crystallized in a sensational *Village Voice* article by Mary Jo Worth, "The Acid Profiteers." The article depicted Leary as a Madison Avenue huckster who was a front for Hitchcock's money. The whole psychedelic movement, according to Worth, was nothing more than a scam perpetrated by a profit-hungry clique.

I could not find the article, but the above summary of Worth's findings is a worthy summary of the entire LSD scam. Leary may have been an idealistic dupe, but his remote controllers knew how to make a public figure out of him. Hitchcock may have profited for his own benefit, but he was only the (bungling) tip of the iceberg. On this note, let us leave *Acid Dreams*.

Back to the EIR Analysis

The EIR people made a few other interesting discoveries, which fit perfectly with the overall picture we have been uncovering in this work. The British-controlled port of Hong Kong was the drug capital of the world and a center for the drug-money laundering banks. It is worth noting that Hong Kong's fellow island city-state at Singapore, easily one of the richest places on Earth, has the harshest drug policies in the world - there, any narco-trafficking is a capital offence. The boys in charge of Singapore clearly know the score.

The drug trade ties with the British gold and diamonds black trade. As we saw earlier, the diamonds industry was formed by the early Rhodes gang, and is a thorough scam. Rhodes also made wads of dough mining gold in South Africa.

We should, therefore, express no surprise at finding out that (*Dope Inc*, Ch. 7) "the Royal Institute of International Affairs runs drugs and dirty money." Note that the EIR first published their book after *Tragedy & Hope* went to print, but before *The Anglo-American Establishment* saw the light of day.

In sum, (emphasis in original)

From their base in the \$200 billion dirty money traffic, the institutions assembled in force on the leading committees of the RIIA dominate:

- 1) All of Britain's top commercial banks *directly*;
- 2) Both big British oil companies, British Petroleum and Royal Dutch Shell *directly*;
- 3) All the leading British merchant banks, *directly* or *indirectly*;
- 4) The world gold and diamonds trade;
- 5) Every leading old-line opium trading firm, including the P&O Steamship Company, Jardine Matheson, John Swire and Sons, and Charterhouse Japhet, *directly*.

The EIR proceed to provide endless names, lists of directorships, and personal associations. Of interest are the heavy ties between the RIIA, the IPR (Institute of Pacific Relations based in the United States), and Mao's crowd. There are strong indications (backed by documentation) that Mao used opium to finance his revolution, and that he struck a deal with the British to authorize Red China's participation in the international drug trade.

RIIA has and has had since its inception connections with the top Jewish financiers of the ilk of Rothschild and Oppenheimer. Naturally, those folks are knee-deep in the drug trade.

The EIR labels Canada the "North American Hong Kong." The Canadian IIR acts as the focal point of the drug business. Canada's banking system is heavily integrated with the British system and the Caribbean money havens.²³

Another point of curiosity is that the families in charge of the dope business are heavily inter-related, include the royal family, and generally hearken back to the old pan-European Oligarchical circle that can be traced to middle ages, Venice, and beyond to Rome and God knows where (likely Babylon). The Italian-Jewish-Chinese mobs are mere fronts and relatively low level operations. Above them looms large the great Oligarchical machine. Write the EIR:

(Ch. 9, emphasis in original) The sinister element that sets the British oligarchy apart from the popular image of the Mafia family is its unshakeable belief that it alone is fit to rule the world... Their religion is not the Anglican Christianity they publicly profess, but a hodge-podge of paganism, including satanic cults as Theosophy and Rosicrucianism. The central, syncretic ideology of the oligarchy's inner cult life is the revived Egyptian drug cult, the myth of Isis and Osiris, the same anti-Christian cult that ran the Roman Empire. And like the ancient Isis-worshipping Egyptian dynasties, the British ruling family networks have maintained power for centuries by keeping the secrets of their intrigues *within the family*.

This coincides with our findings, and specifically with the influence of Freemasonry (which loves Egypt, Isis, and Osiris) among the top circle of British society.

Let us now look at the British origins of the 1960s "counter-culture." Note again that in this context, the adjective "British" must necessarily include the Anglophile interests in the United States, which may, together with their cooperation with the British, try to shift the focus of power to New England, New York, and Washington. Write the EIR,

(Part IV, p.364, emphasis in original) The British fostered the creation of the bestial rock and drug cult for the same reason that their colonial policy enforced backwardness throughout the empire and for the same reason that the pharaohs of ancient Egypt and the Ptolemaic priests of the first century A.D. Egypt fostered the practice. As long as a population is organized around superstition, magic, hallucinogenic drugs, and animal-like pursuits of immediate sensory gratification ("if it *feels* good, do it"), it will remain incapable of acting on behalf of its own interests. It was for this reason that the oligarchies of ancient Egypt organized themselves into *priesthoods* and created dozens of apparently contending pagan cults, all characterized by the same bestialist outlook.

In regard to our friend Aldous:

²³In regard to Canada's dirty underside, look up Yves Engler's *The Black Book of Canadian Foreign Policy* (2010).

The "case officer" for Britain's Opium War was Aldous Huxley, the grandson of Thomas H. Huxley, a founder of the Rhodes Round Table group and a lifelong collaborator of Arnold Toynbee. Toynbee himself sat on the RIIA council for nearly 50 years, headed the Research Division of British intelligence throughout World War II, and served as wartime briefing officer to Prime Minister Winston Churchill.

...

Trained at Toynbee's Oxford, Aldous Huxley was one of the initiates in the "Children of the Sun," a dionysian cult comprised of the children of Britain's Round Table elite. Among the other initiates were T.S. Eliot, W.H. Auden, Sir Oswald Moseley, and D.H. Lawrence, Huxley's homosexual lover. It was Huxley, furthermore, who would launch the legal battle in the 1950s to have Lawrence's pornographic novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover* allowed into the United States on the ground that it was a misunderstood "work of art." Aldous Huxley, along with his brother Julian, was tutored at Oxford by H.G. Wells, the head of British foreign intelligence during World War I.

Under Wells's tutelage Huxley was first introduced to Aleister Crowley. ...[Golden Dawn, Blavatsky] ... Crowley in turn initiated Aldous Huxley into the Isis-Golden Dawn Temple and introduced him to psychedelic drugs in 1929.

... Huxley was instrumental in founding a nest of Isis cults in southern California and in a San Francisco suburb called Ojai - which consisted exclusively of several hundred deranged worshippers of Isis and other cult gods. Isherwood, during the California period, translated and propagated a number of ancient Zen Buddhist documents, inspiring Zen-mystical cults along the way.

In effect, Huxley and Isherwood laid the foundation during the late 1930s and the 1940s for the later LSD culture by recruiting a core of "initiates" into the Isis cults that Huxley's mentors Bulwer-Lytton, Blavatsky and Crowley, had constituted while stationed in India.

Turns out that Sandoz was owned by Warburg. Humphrey Osmond was the Huxleys' private physician. The EIR repeat much of what we uncovered above. They add that

(p. 370) Watts [an associate of Aldous and an LSD/ new-age guru] at the same time [circa 1960] founded the Pacifica Foundation, which sponsored two radio stations - WKBW in San Francisco and WBAI-FM in New York City. The Pacifica stations were among the first to push the "Liverpool Sound" - the British-imported hard rong twanging of the Rolling Stones, the Beatles, and the Animals. They would later pioneer "acid rock" and eventually the avowedly fascist-psychotic "punk rock."

The Beatles' *Sgt. Pepper* record was a major influence on the acid scene. Mick Jagger (1943-) of the Stones was an alumnus of LSE. Both Jagger and McCartney have been knighted, which means that they have provided a service the queen found valuable.

During the fall of 1960, Huxley was appointed Visiting Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston. Around his stay in that city, Huxley created a circle at Harvard parallel to his West Coast LSD team. The Harvard group included Huxley, Osmond, and Watts (brought in from California), Timothy Leary, and Richard Alpert.

This is accurate, as we have seen.

The EIR also suggest that the 1960s rock explosion was organized under the auspices of Theodor Adorno (1903-1969), the notorious (or, in some circles, legendary) Frankfurt School psychologist and musical critic, whose almost impenetrable writings essentially say that music can be - and is - used as a method of mind-control. Nothing new here - Plato had this figured out two and a half millennia ago. In particular,

(p. 373) The social theory of rock was elaborated by British agent and musicologist Theodor Adorno, who came to the United States in 1939 to head the Princeton University

Radio Research Project. ... [follows a quote by Adorno] ... The Hit Parade is organized precisely on the same principles used by Egypt's Isis priesthood and for the same purpose: the recruitment of youth to the dionysiac counterculture.

In a report prepared for the University of Michigan's Institute of Social Research, Paul Hirsch described the product of Adorno's Radio Research Project. According to Hirsch, the establishment of postwar radio's Hit Parade "transformed the mass medium into an agency of sub-cultural programming." Radio networks were converted into round-the-clock recycling machines that repeated the top 40 "hits." Hirsch documents how all popular culture - movies, music, books, and fashion - is now run on the same program of preselection. Today's mass culture operates like the opium trade: the supply determines the demand.

The last point bears repeating. The major nodes of the recording industry and the mass media are totally controlled from above, and their supply does indeed dictate demand. Therefore the 1960s counterculture must necessarily have been the product of deliberate social engineering. The EIR's claims regarding Adorno's influence were later repeated by John Coleman (reputedly a former MI6 cadre). Alan Watt (not to be confused with Alan Watts) has also commented on the issue. EIR reasonably claim that the Vietnam War was used as a conduit for the counterculture movement. The antiwar crowd was drowned in drugs and free sex. The thesis, obvious in the given context, is reasonable. Of great interest is Bertrand Russell's role in the whole affair:

(p. 375) Just as Aldous Huxley began the counterculture subversion of the United States 30 years before its consequences became evident to the public, Lord Bertrand Russell began laying the foundations for the antiwar movement of the 1960s before the 1930s expired. Lord Russell and Aldous Huxley cofounded the Peace Pledge Union in 1937 - just before both went to the United States for the duration of World War II.

Russell's antiwar zeal, it should be noted, was a patent fraud. During World War II, Lord Russell opposed British and American warfare against the Nazis because he was a peripheral member of the pro-Nazi Cliveden set. In 1947, when the United States was in possession of the atomic bomb and Russia was not, Russell loudly advocated that the United States pre-emptively commence World War III - against the Soviet Union. His 1950s "Ban the Bomb" aboutface was fundamentally an antitechnology movement against the peace-through-development potentials represented by President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" initiative to the Soviets...

From the mid-1950s on, Russell's principal assignment was to build an international antiwar and anti-American movement. Coincident with the escalation of U.S. involvement in Vietnam under British [presumably East Coast Anglophile?] manipulation, Russell upgraded the old Peace Pledge Union (which had been used in West Germany throughout the postwar period to promote an anticapitalist "new left" wing of the Social Democratic party, recruiting several future members of the Baader-Meinhof terrorist gang in the process) into the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation.

In the United States, New York's Our Crowd [Jewish bankers] provided several hundred thousand dollars to establish the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS), as effectively the U.S. branch of the Russell Peace Foundation. Among the founding trustees of the IPS was James Warburg, directly representing the family's interests.

...

IPS in turn financed and ran the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) - the student antiwar movement - up through and beyond its splintering into a number of terrorist and Maoist gangs in the late 1960s. If one were to take the time to trace the pedigrees of all of the leaders of the antiwar movement in the United States, an almost unbroken pattern of either IPS or direct Russell Foundation control would emerge. This is not to say that the majority of antiwar protesters were paid, certified British agents. On the contrary, the overwhelming majority of antiwar protesters went into SDS on the basis of outrage

at the developments in Vietnam and subsequently got trapped.

The IPS was founded in 1963 by Marcus Raskin and Richard Barnet, the aids, respectively, to McGeorge Bundy and John J. McCloy, the two notorious high-level establishment operators. Noam Chomsky, Barbara Ehrenreich, and assorted others, have been IPS Senior Scholars. The current head honcho of the outfit is John Cavanagh, an anti-globalist. He is a founder of the International Forum on Globalization, which is anti-neo-liberalism, but pro-Man-made Global Warming.

8.9.3 The War on Drugs

Follow a few notes on the so-called "War on Drugs." As far as I can tell, the War on Drugs aims to: 1) control the price of drugs across the United States and the world via selective targeting of drug operations; 2) eugenically cleanse the American underclass; 3) provide an endless fountain of demagoguery for aspiring politicians.

Since the War on Drugs started, the American jails have been stuffed full, mostly with hapless members of the underclass - blacks, latinos, and white rednecks. The figures are truly astounding: the US rate of incarceration is about 750 per 100,000, easily the highest in the world, well ahead of Russia's 580 per 100,000. Evil China, by comparison, has a rate of 120 per 100,000. The author notes with a heavy heart that America, rather than being the land of the brave and the free, is the land of cowards who conduct genocides from the skies, and of gulag-victims. Without going into the ugly details, America's jails really are rife with drugs, (homo)sexual abuse, barbarity, and a general malaise of evil. In 2006, 7.2 million Americans were in jail, on parole, or on probation. 2.3 million - about two-thirds of a percent of the U.S. population - are in jail. Among the black population, something like one out of ten male blacks in their prime (late twenties early thirties) are in jail, and half the black male population has a record. In the big cities, 80% of young blacks have criminal records.

This madness began around 1975, when the Oligarchs banished Nixon. Until then, the US rates of incarceration had been relatively steady and normal. Since then, the rates have been rising almost incessantly.

Half of state and nine-tenths of federal prisoners are in the slammer for non-violent (usually drug possession-related) "crimes." Meanwhile, the Wall Street crooks walk free.

The effects of this lunacy are: the members of the underclass can not establish families, their culture disintegrates, and their women increasingly turn to the state for help; the members of the petty-bourgeois middle class are scared witless of the crime and the drugs, and back "tough" political candidates; drug profits are out of this world, just phenomenal.

From first principles, there must be three classes of drug warriors: the honest ones who fight a genuine threat to America, aim at the top, and encounter relentless sabotage; the demagogues and hacks who bag low-level drug-users to build careers in law enforcement and politics; and the saboteurs and drug-pushers who protect the high-level drug-industry interests. It is important to present the big picture to the first class of drug warriors, who could be highly potent allies to any anti-Oligarchical movement. The LaRouche crew has been pursuing such a policy of recruitment for decades.

America's "War on Drugs" is a debacle of almost incomprehensible proportions, a true national calamity, a potentially fatal destabilization of society. And yet the problem rarely encounters serious media attention.

Conclusions

In sum, 1) the drug trade was explicitly invented by the British Oligarchs, whose 19th century exploits in China are official history; 2) in America, the East Coast Oligarchy / Skull& Bones/ CIA organization, along with the ethnic mafias, runs drugs, and has been exposed by highly credible sources - in particular, Iran-Contra is official history; 3) the 1960s counter-culture revolution was organized from the top; 4) the British and the Brotherhood of Death are still in business. The goals of the drug industry are: 1) profits; 2) cultural sabotage.

In regard to the third point, we have explicitly shown that the neo-feminist movement was invented by the Rockefeller gang, and we have shown that the drug movement has ties with the British and the CIA/Skull&Bones. To complete the picture, we will soon take a look at the roots of the sexual revolution, which was as contrived as everything else.

8.10 Masons in the Vatican

The Masons and whatever groups stand behind them have been waging a quiet war against the Vatican since at least the 18th century. The Illuminati, the Communists, the Fabians, and the social engineering bankers all regarded the Vatican as a great impediment to their dreams of a perfectly ordered society. The Vatican, as the central institution of Christianity, has to fall before the New Religion can be brought in, and before familial and communal ties can be completely destroyed. Some Protestants revel in the notion of the destruction of the Holy See, out of bigotry, and without realizing that weakening the Vatican means weakening Christianity - including its Protestant denominations.

To destroy the Vatican one must corrupt the Vatican. Wipe out the Pope and his Cardinals, and they will be martyred, and new ones will be elected. That is not the way. Saboteurs had to gain the Throne of St. Peter, and dismantle the two-thousand year old edifice of the Catholic Church from within. That is what was attempted, and by all indications, the conspirators have succeeded.

Our key source in this section is Piers Compton's *The Broken Cross* (1983).²⁴ Also of interest is Maurice Pinay's *The Plot Against the Church* (1962).

Before we begin our analysis, let us note that the Catholic Church, whatever its faults, has been the backbone of Western (Christian) Civilization since before the latter's inception - for Western Civilization rose from the ruins of the Classical Civilization, over the bridge provided by the Roman Church. As far as my allegiances go, though not a Catholic, I am a son of the Christian and Western Civilization. This was not a choice on my part - I came into consciousness in a society that had been Christian for a millennium and lay on the outskirts of the West. I used to harbor atheistic prejudices, but those have dissipated. A priori, I am neither for the Church, nor against it - but if the (true) Vatican has a positive role to play in Western Civilization, then it deserves our sympathy, and if necessary, our aid and our protection.

And there is a great indication that the Vatican has been a boon for the West. The genesis of modern society can be found in Milan and Florence of the 14th and 15th centuries, just a few hundred miles north of Rome; France, the great Power of Europe until relatively recently, was always a Catholic land, and, to a certain extent, went back to the embrace of the Church after the lunacy of the Revolution. The Iberians, in their bloodthirsty and remarkable expansion of the 15th and 16th centuries, raised the banner of Catholicism. The Enlightenment and Nationalism clashed with the Catholic Church, but the fact remains - the Holy See has been an integral part of the highly successful Western Civilization - in a sense, it has been the backbone of that Civilization (Protestantism and Orthodox Christianity both branched out of Rome) - and its demise can not bode well for the West.

And even if we accept the dubious stipulation that the Church is obsolescent, and the time has come for it to gracefully bow down and retire to the Pantheon of History, let its fall come in the open,

²⁴Thanks to Henry Makow for this one as well.

with pomp and with honor. Let not the jackals tear down the Church from within.

Plots against the Roman Church have occurred throughout history. In the late 12th century, the Gnostic Cathars of France, of whom many bizarre claims have been recently made, conspired against the Catholic Church. Writes Compton (1.4),

It was a life and death struggle in which the Church, under Pope Innocent III, reacted violently by setting up the Inquisition. Its purpose was to examine Albigensians who, purporting to be orthodox, had entered the Church, and occupied some of its most exalted places in order to undermine authority and set up, in every sphere, a system of common ownership. The capture of the Papacy was, of course, their main objective, although most histories of the time are more concerned with the fate of those who failed to recite the 'Our Father' correctly before their questioners.

The violence and cruelty of the war that set in has left a permanent mark on history. The terms Albigensian and Inquisition are often employed as useful steps to an argument. Few realise the true significance of the struggle which left the Papal throne still secure, so far invulnerable, but always, under several guises and from any part of Europe, the object of attack.

From this time on that attack was more concentrated. It gathered strength. In 1482, at Strasbourg, it gained a new intensity as the enemies of the Pope declared their intention of waging war against him. A document dated 1535, and known as the Charter of Cologne, is evidence of the same hostility, and equally violent. Echoes of the Albigensian campaign, still insisting that non-existence was preferable to what its followers called the Satanic ordering of earthly life, lingered on in a traditionally orthodox and never thickly populated country like Portugal, where the continued activity of the Inquisition was such that, among the dozens of those sentenced to death between the years 1619 and 1627, were fifty-nine priests and nuns.

Then came the Illuminati, followed by the Carbonari, the Communists, and the other secret, vociferously anti-clerical cabals. It was decided that the only way to destroy the Church was from within, by gaining the Papacy. The task was a hard one, to be pursued over the decades, but the price was worth the exertion. Throughout the mid 19th century, the long hand of Palmerston, the representative of the British Oligarchy, made itself felt in the anti-Papal disturbances on the Continent.

It is worth noting that Compton refers to two spurious documents in close succession - a false version of the *Third Secret*, and Leo Taxil's fraudulent letter to Mazzini from Albert Pike. Compton's case is too strong to suffer significantly from such minor mistakes, but the point remains that the serious reader has to conduct his own research.

The first occult grab for the Papacy occurred, perhaps, in 1903, when the French Foreign Minister asked his compatriot Cardinals to back Cardinal Mariano Rampolla at the Papal Election. Rampolla (1843-1913) was rumoured to have crossed paths with Aleister Crowley, the noted Satanist. Out of the blue, Emperor Franz Joseph of Austria exercised his right of veto against Rampolla. For a century, his motivation remained unknown. Recently, it has emerged that Rampolla was accused of having close associations with the Ordo Templi Orientis, Aleister Crowley's secret society.²⁵ Writes Compton,

(1.8) After his death, Rampolla's papers passed into the keeping of Pius X. After reading them he put them aside with the comment: 'The unhappy man! Burn them.' The papers were put on the fire in the Pope's presence, but enough of them survived to furnish material for an article that appeared in *La Libre Parole*, in 1929 in Toulouse.

²⁵An explicit reference can be found in Rampolla's Wikipedia page: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mariano_Rampolla, Dec 26, 2011.

Some of the papers emanated from a secret society, the Order of the Temple of the Orient, and they provided proof that Rampolla had been working for the overthrow of Church and State. A notebook, discovered at the same time, throws a surprising sidelight on the possible Aleister Crowley connection; for several of the societies affiliated to the Temple of the Orient were those which have already been named, such as the Occult Church of the Holy Grail, and the Rite of Mizraim, in all of which Crowley exercised some great or small influence.

The conspirators had failed that once; but they would try again.

Pius XII (born Eugenio Maria Giuseppe Giovanni Pacelli, 1876-1958, Pope 1939-1958) was a good Pope who governed his Church wisely throughout a turbulent time. He placed an automatic excommunication on all Catholics who dared join the Communist party - a natural move, considering the communists' avowed anti-clericalism.

Pope Pius XII expired on 9 October 1958. He would be succeeded by one Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli (1881-1963). Roncalli had been the Papal diplomatic envoy to south-eastern Europe in the 1930s. After a long stint in Sofia, the priest made his way to Istanbul. There, it is said, Roncalli was initiated into a secret society, likely a branch of the Rosicrucians. Worth noting is that the Turkish leader at the time, Ataturk, was a Mason, as had been his closest revolutionary allies.

In late 1944, Roncalli was sent to France. When the anti-clerical Vincent Auriol became French President in 1947, he and Roncalli (2.3) "became, not only cordial associates as their offices demanded, but close friends."

This was not due to the Christian charity on one part and to diplomatic courtesy on the other, but to the ceremony that Roncalli had undergone in Istanbul, which established a bond of understanding between the two men.

This was given tangible expression when, in January 1953, Archbishop Roncalli was elevated to Cardinal and Aural insisted on exercising his traditional right, as the French head of State, to confer the red biretta on the newly created Prince of the Church.

Rumors of Masonic penetration and nefarious influences developed inside the broader Catholic Church during Pius XII's Papacy. An American priest, Father Eustace Eilers, died suddenly after claiming that he had evidence of foul play within the Vatican.

When Pius XII died, the Cardinals voted eleven times, and Roncalli emerged the winner. To appreciate the uniqueness of the situation, observe that Roncalli had never expected to become Pope - he had arrived in Rome with a return ticket for Venice, where he was stationed at the time. (2.4) "Roncalli's 'election' was a signal for outbursts of welcome, often from the most unexpected quarters, to echo round the world. Non-Catholics, agnostics, and atheists agreed that the College of Cardinals had made an excellent choice, the best, in fact for many years." Roncalli chose to call himself John XXIII. The last Pope to choose the same name had been Baldassarre Cossa (1370-1419), John XXIII, the Antipope of the late Rome-Avignon schism.

I am not entirely enamoured with symbols, but they can be important - and in respect to an ancient, tradition-bound institution, symbols are almost paramount.

The (controlled) world media greeted John XXIII with aplomb:

(2.4) But the secular world, as evidenced by some of the most 'popular' publications in England, insisted that something momentous had happened in Rome, and that it was only the promise of still greater things to come; while informed Catholics, who for years had pleaded the Church's cause, continued to scratch their heads and wonder. Had some information gone forth, not to them who had always supported religion, but to those who have served up snippets of truth, or no truth at all, to titillate and mislead the public?

Soon after Roncalli's election, replicas of his "personal cross" went on sale. Roncalli's cross bore the symbol of the All Seeing Eye enclosed in a triangle. The symbol is as Masonic as it is not Catholic.

On his glove, Roncalli wore a sun-symbol - another subtle Masonic message.

John XXIII's main act in office, initiated a mere three months into his reign, was the calling of a General Ecumenical Council of the Church. The Council was a momentous occasion. The last one, the "First Vatican Council," had been called in 1868, at the height of the Italian Unification. Indeed, the Council had been cut short in September 1870, when the Kingdom of Italy captured Rome. The last Council before the 1868 one had been the Council of Trent of the mid-16th century - the center-piece of the Counter-Reformation.

Twenty Ecumenical Councils had been held before 1958. Only two had taken place since the Reformation, both during times of acute crisis. The Church was strong in 1958 - and yet Roncalli went and called a new Ecumenical Council. What were his goals? It suffices to examine the policies adopted at the Council.

(3.1) "The same measure of unexampled publicity that marked the election of John XXIII, welcomed the plan. It was made to appear a matter of moment not only to the non-Catholic world, but to elements that had always strongly opposed Papal claims, dogma, and practice."

Some days before the Council opened, it appeared that the authorities responsible for it had been assured that this mainly Catholic affair would be given more than its usual share of normal publicity. A greatly enlarged Press office was set up facing St. Peter's. Cardinal Cicognani officiated at its opening and gave it his blessing; and the gentlemen of the Press poured in.

They included a surprising number of atheistic Communists who arrived, like hunters, expecting to be 'in' at a kill.

The rancour in Compton's usage of the word "gentlemen" is palpable and justified. The Pope warmly greeted Nikita's (Khrushchev's) delegate. Eyebrows rose - the two previous Popes, Pius XI and Pius XII had managed to condemn communism 158 times between 1922 and 1958. In principle, the Catholic church should always have been staunchly anti-Communist. At the same time, it could well afford to be pro-Russian - with the proviso that it should have explicitly made the distinction between Russia and the Communists. Moscow was granted two boons - the excommunications of Catholic Communists (an oxymoron) were toned down, and Marxism was given immunity at the deliberations of the Council.

The Italian CP welcomed the Council, comparing it with Louis XVI's tragic convocation of the Estates General. The Vatican was likened to the Bastille. Jacques Mitterand, the head of French Masonry and the brother to Francois, also praised John XXIII's move.

The Second Vatican Council opened on October the 11th, 1962. 2,350 Bishops presided. One of the greatest farces of the already clinically insane 20th century had began.

Those gathered at the Holy See were a weird bunch. (3.2) "One Bishop from Latin America expressed his bewilderment mildly by saying that many of his fellow prelates 'appear to have lost their faith.' Another was frankly horrified to discover that some to whom he had spoken, and who had but temporarily put aside their mitres, scorned any mention of the Trinity and the Virgin Birth."

Salah Bitah, the premier of Syria, had, upon hearing of the Council, labelled it an "international plot." Some prelates, upon arriving in Rome, had been handed a book claiming that the Council was a plot for the ultimate destruction of Catholic tradition and the Church itself (likely Pinay's book). A foul mood pervaded in Rome.

The general tone of the Council was soon set, with the 'good-for-nothings', or progressives, as they came to be called, clamouring for modernisation and a revision of values within the Church, and a far less active, and much less vocal opposition, offered by their traditionalist, or orthodox, opponents. The difference between the two sides was stressed at the opening of the first session, when the progressives addressed their own particular message to the world, to ensure that the Council 'started off on the right foot'.

The infiltrators, (3.3) "made up largely of German-speaking Bishops," were busy behind the scenes. They had the support of the press. "Progressives" were made to appear intelligent, well-meaning, and energetic. The old guard defenders of Orthodoxy - and they were aged and tired - were portrayed as dogmatic and stupid.

Pope John XXIII expired in June 1963, between the first and the second sessions of the Council. Charles Riandey, in a preface to a book by Yves Marsaudon, praised the Pope "who has deigned to give us his benediction, his understanding, and his protection." Both Riandey and Marsaudon were top Masons. (3.4) "A second preface to the book was addressed to 'his august continuer, His Holiness Pope Paul VI'."

Paul VI was Giovanni Battista Enrico Antonio Maria Montini (1897-1978). His succession in 1963 "was never seriously in doubt." Montini had been the first Cardinal appointed by John XXIII. The two men had been very close.

Montini had been born into a North Italian minor noble family "of likely Hebrew origin." His father had been an ardent Christian Democrat who "in all probability belonged to a secret society." The young Giovanni, a boy of weak constitution, had studied at home rather than at a seminary. (3.5) "Montini had long been an admirer of the works of the philosopher Jacques Maritain, whose system of 'Integral Humanism', with its rejection of authoritarian and dogmatic belief in favour of a worldwide fraternity which would include non-believers, had earned the approval of John XXIII." An obscure 1944 OSS document reported that Montini had conferred with Togliatti, the Communist Minister without Portfolio of the Bonomi Government. The two had sought "ground of understanding" between the Christian Democrats and the Italian Communists. Pius XII had not been happy about the meeting. Though he had been close to Montini until then, the Pope sent the wayward Bishop north to Milan. There would be no red hat (of Cardinalship) for Montini until 1958. Montini befriended the famous 1960s "revolutionary" Saul Alinsky, who was an ardent leftist. Alinsky, as we have seen, was another enigmatic Jew of the tradition of Parvus and, say, Armand Hammer. (3.5) "One of Alinsky's rich backers - and this advocate of the class warfare had several, including such odd combinations as the Rockefeller foundation and the Presbyterian Church - was the millionaire Marshall Field." While in Milan, Montini also established contact with the notorious Michele Sindona (1920-1986), the banker and mafioso with ties to the OSS, who would go down in flames in the early 1980s, dragging the P2 Lodge along with him.

The Council continued, marred by subversion and backroom dealings. The "progressive" elements consistently out-manoeuvred the orthodox Catholics.

But the most divisive subject of the Second Vatican Council was the new Mass proposed by Monsignor Annibale Bugnini. The latter was widely believed to be a Mason. Bugnini, the story goes, forgot his briefcase on a table in the Vatican on a day in 1975. Another priest examined the suitcase and discovered incriminating documents. The Pope, Paul VI, sent Bugnini to Iran, and covered up the scandal. Compton writes that (3.7) "the Italian Register reveals that [Bugnini] joined one of the societies on April the 23rd, 1963, and that his code name was Buan."

The case against Bugnini is watertight: 1) tempering with the Mass is sacrilege; 2) he must have committed a grievous faux pas to be banished to (or hidden in?) Iran of all places; 3) the Italian Register, published in 1976 by the *Borghese* journal, seems genuine and did contain Bugnini's name. A plethora of other prelates were on the list.

The Council adjourned on December 8, 1965. In general terms, the Council opened the Church to alien, in some cases openly anti-clerical, agencies.

In October 1965, Paul VI packed his bags and flew to New York to visit the United Nations. The press extolled the Pope's action to no end. The United Nations has always been rife with one-worlders and communists - it was created by those groups. For that matter, the Rockefellers literally built

the United Nations. It does not get clearer than that. In his speech to the UN, Paul VI

(4.1) ...made no reference to spiritual claims or the importance of religion. 'Behold the day we have awaited for centuries.... This is the ideal that mankind has dreamt of in its journey through history.... We would venture to call it the world's greatest hope.... It is your task here', he told the members of the Assembly, 'to proclaim the basic rights and duties of Man.... We are conscious that you are the interpreters of all that is permanent in human wisdom; we could almost say of its sacred character.'

Man had now come of age, and was qualified to live by a philosophic morality that, owing nothing to authority, was created by himself. The United Nations, destined to play the leading role in the world, was 'the last hope of mankind'.

Having thus unburdened himself, Montini repaired to the United Nations "meditation room," which is a New Age shrine endowed with a majestic holy stone. A second shrine of this type, called the Temple of Understanding, was founded in Washington in 1960 by Juliet Hollister, a propagator of something called the "Interfaith Movement." John XXIII, the Dalai Llama, Margaret Sanger, and the kookish Eleanor Roosevelt are among the luminaries who have supported the endeavour. The Temple has a Consultative Status at the UN. Other organizations and individuals involved in the creation of the UN "meditation room" were the Ford Foundation, Marshall Field the backer of Saul Alinsky, and the Lucis (Lucifer, New Age) Trust. The room is the *only* religious haven at the UN. Along the way, Paul VI had handed over some of his Papal regalia to the UN. The jewellery was auctioned and sold below its value. Later, Montini would surrender *his Papal Tiara* - the crown of the King of kings - to the Basilica in Washington, D.C. The message he was trying to convey, I feel, is fairly clear.

Paul VI also began to use the symbol of the broken cross - which had been a Satanic symbol in the days of yore. (4.3) "...not only Paul VI but his successors, the two John-Pauls, carried that object and held it up to be revered by crowds who had not the slightest idea that it stood for anti-Christ." The symbol had been officially banned by Canon 1279.

In New York, Paul VI also sported a copy of the breastplate worn by Caiphas who had called for the crucifixion of Christ. The Masons sometimes wear the same garment. Paul VI would wear the breastplate on a few more public occasions.

As mentioned before, a list of Masonic prelates emerged in 1976. That was a problem. The Church had been well aware of the anti-Catholic nature of Masonry since the cult's official appearance in the early 18th century. Pope after Pope had condemned Masonry in Bull after Papal Bull. (5.1) "The least condemnatory of those strictures referred to the societies as 'conspiracies of silence'. The most damning called them 'synagogues of Satan'."

The Superior General of the Jesuits himself, Pedro Arrupe (1907-1991), complained that (5.1) "A Fifth Column exists within the clergy and is steadily working in favour of atheism." Arrupe, a Basque, had been at the outskirts of Hiroshima when the nuke fell.

No massive crackdown, not even a quiet reshuffling save for the banishment of Bugnioni, followed the revelation of Masonic penetration. And no wonder - among the fingered priests were:

Agostino, Cardinal Casaroli (1914-1998), the Secretary of State, called the Kissinger of the Vatican, the most prominent Catholic after the Pope. He was initiated in 1957 under the codename Casa. In 1981, Casaroli advocated the rehabilitation of the notorious Teilhard de Chardin.

Leon Joseph, Cardinal Suenens (1904-1996) of Belgium was elevated into Cardinal in 1962, and was a major force at the Second Council. He was initiated in 1967 under the codename Lesu.

Jean, Cardinal Villot (1905-1979), Paul VI's Secretary of State, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes, and administrator of the Patrimony of the Holy See. (5.2) "He came of a family which has produced over the last two hundred years, from father to son, Grand Masters of secret societies including the Rosicrucians." He was initiated in 1966 and given two codenames - Jeani and Zurigo.

For the fuller list, look up Compton's work or the original *Borghese* article.

It is unlikely that those folks would have been eager to purge themselves.

In 1969, Montini made his pal Sindona a financial adviser to the Vatican. In the opinion of the folks at Skull&Bones's *Time*, Sindona was, at one point, (6.1) "the greatest Italian since Mussolini." Sindona was a high-level operative, with links to top banks and major world figures.

Tragically and significantly, the Vatican, for all its railing against usury, had been involved with the world's top banks since before Sindona's involvement. (6.2) "It had interests in the Rothschild Bank in France, and in the Chase Manhattan Bank with its fifty-seven branches in forty-four countries; in the Credit Suisse in Zurich and also in London; in the Morgan Bank, and in the Banker Trust. It had large share holdings in General Motors, General Electric, Shell Oil, Gulf Oil, and in Bethlehem Steel." The reality is that the Church has always been a political organization, and to exercise power in the modern world, it had to have money. This is another one of those explanations-rather-than-excuses that we offer; the Catholic readers must reconcile this issue with their own consciences.

Sindona's money-making endeavours were both shady and inimical to professed Catholic values. His extravagance drove Sindona to increasingly elaborate and ill-advised projects; his empire became over-extended; he - and the Vatican along with him - was sitting on a barrel of gunpowder. The explosion occurred in 1979. Following various shenanigans, including a murder and a kidnapping, Sindona was arrested, tried, convicted, and jailed.

The collapse of Sindona's financial empire brought the Vatican to the brink of bankruptcy. An emergency "agency of finance" was instituted to deal with the problem. Its head was Cardinal Vagnozzi, Apostolic Delegate in New York. His aides were Cardinal Hoeffner, of Cologne, and Cardinal John Cody of Chicago.

Soon thereafter, Cody became the center of another financial scandal. The question arises - were those men bunglers, or did they deliberately cause trouble to diminish the Catholic Church?

(6.3) There is, in the light of other strange happenings that have occurred, nothing extravagant in that suggestion; and it would seem to be borne out by a long report in *The Chicago Catholic* of September 29th, 1978. An Archdiocesan Liturgical Congress was held in order, as one of the jargon-crazed Modernists said, to keep the Church 'living, moving, changing, growing, becoming new, after some centuries of partial paralysis.'

As part of that process, dance groups frolicked under flashing multi-coloured lights, trumpets blared, people reached and scrambled for gas-filled balloons, and donned buttons that bore the message 'Jesus loves us'; while a priest, who was looked upon as an expert in the new liturgy, his face whitened like a clown's, paraded about in a top hat and with a grossly exaggerated potbelly emerging from the cloak he wore.

The background to all this was made up of vestments, banners, and the hotch-potch of a mural, all of which, in the approved style of 'modern art', revealed no more than casually applied splashes of paint. The Mass that marked the close of this truly ridiculous Congress (that, as we shall see, was only a faint reflection of what happened elsewhere, and which would never have been dreamt of before the days of 'Good Pope John') was presided over by Cardinal Cody.

At another time *The Chicago Tribune*, in a report describing what was said to be a 'Gays' altar', referred to a concelebration (meaning celebration of the Eucharist by two or more priests) at a church in that city: One hundred and twenty-two priests were present at what passed for Mass, and every one of them was a self-confessed moral pervert. Neither of these profanities called forth a word of protest from John Patrick, Cardinal Cody.

Other strange occurrences can be related; but let us move on to the crux of the matter.

That Paul VI pushed the Church in all manners of strange and unorthodox directions is given. He inexplicably supported various communist elements and regimes. In light of this, it should be of no surprise, that a high-level Jesuit report claimed that (8.2) "from 1936 to 1950 [Montini] was

prominent in a vast network of espionage that covered some of the countries, on both sides, involved in the Second World War.” He was also ”a principal shareholder, with a Maronite Archbishop, of a chain of brothels in Rome.”

Another bizarre move by Paul VI was his ”dialogue” with the World Council of Churches. The WCC was founded in 1948 in Geneva (where else?). Its goal is to, in effect, merge the world religions. It also has an ”environmental focus.” Its member-congregations preside over about 600 million people across the world. The Catholic Church is not a member of the WCC, though it has (Wikipedia) ”worked closely” with the organization for more than three decades.

(8.5) There is a more sinister note on which to end this summary of Pope Paul’s intransigence.

The name of a self-confessed devil worshipper, Cardonnel, is practically unknown here; but in other countries his writings excited a variety of feelings ranging from awed admiration to horror in those who read them.

As a member of the Dominican Order, he was given permission to speak in Paris Notre-Dame in mid-Lent 1968. Listeners were struck by his rabid anti-Christian expressions, on account of which he was called ’le théologien de la mort de Dieu’ (the God’s death theologian). He boasted of the title, left his Order and finally the Church, and became a hardened devil-worshipper. In a typical outburst he likened the Christian God to Stalin, to a beast, and finally to Satan.

Pope Paul admired his work; and although he ignored requests from Catholics who wished to safeguard their religion, he made a special point of writing to Cardonnel, congratulating him and sending good wishes.

But Paul VI’s greatest heresy, which tops everything listed so far, was his sabotage of the Mass. The Mass is the central rite of Catholicism, the backbone of the Church, the legacy of more than a millennium (since about the 7th century). (9.1) ”The Mass, as generally known, was to be preserved, unaltered and unalterable, for all time.” And yet Bugnini and Paul VI wrecked it at the Second Council. Paul VI fully instituted the ”New Order” (his term) Mass in 1969.

Who did Paul VI ask to redesign the mass?

(8.2) The experts called in to amend the Most Holy Sacrament of the Catholic Church comprised one or two Protestants; Canon Ronald Jasper; Robert McAfee Brown, a Presbyterian; Brother Thurion, who was a Lutheran; a Calvinist, a Rabbi, and a certain Joachim Jeremias, a one-time Professor of Gottingen University who denied the divinity of Christ.

The New Order Mass changed some symbols, some motions, and some expressions, and allowed the use of local vernaculars in the stead of Latin. It weakened the effect of the Mass and made it, shall we say, more ”accessible” - i.e. vulgar and profane.

(8.2) A more decisive battle was fought out in Rome, where Bugnini’s New Mass was celebrated in the Sistine Chapel. A large majority of the prelates who were present voted against it. The actual numbers were seventy-eight in favour, two hundred and seven against. The orthodox Cardinal Ottaviani, who never lost caste, examined the text of the vandalised version, and found that it contained some twenty heresies.

...

Ottaviani was head of the Holy Office, which exercised guardianship over faith and morals. Pope Paul clamped down upon the office, and clipped the Cardinal’s claws; and he was so annoyed by the adverse vote that he forbade the New Mass ever to be the subject of a ballot again. From then on it was given official, but not popular sanction.

Again, to be clear: Paul VI’s ”New Order Mass” was *sacrilege and heresy*. To me, this is the clearest indication - and, as we have seen, there are many more indications - that the man was an agent of

anti-Catholic forces.

Note that for the Catholic community, which tends to regard the Pope's word as law, the new Mass presented a terrible conundrum. They could either go against the will of the Pope, or practice the new and debased Mass. Many people lost their faith.

For himself, Montini announced that: "We moderns, men of our own day, wish everything to be new. Our old people, the traditionalists, the conservatives, measured the value of things according to their enduring quality. We, instead, are actualists, we want everything to be new all the time, to be expressed in a continually improvised and dynamic unusual form."

The new Mass came hand in hand with obscenities and acts of madness that I, personally, find near incomprehensible. Follows a selection of Compton's examples.

(9.3) There was a marked falling off from established ritual when such things as a communal supper took the place of a solemn Mass; when the priest, armed with a bread knife, had a large loaf placed in front of him which he proceeded to cut into chunks, helping the others and then himself until a general munching of jaws showed their appreciation of the Body of Christ. Such suppers, served in a parishioner's house, became a regular feature of Dutch family life. Sometimes the 'lady of the house', instead of a priest, officiated at Mass that was served in her 'best room'.

There were not a few places where the traditional office of priest was taken over by a woman, who walked among the congregation giving out the Sacrament to any who stood with gaping mouth and a nauseous display of tongue and teeth. Sometimes it was placed in the sweaty hand of a child, or between the trembling fingers and palm of a geriatric who promptly dropped it on the floor, where it could be trampled; or it might be self-administered.

One small girl came away from Mass, in one of the more 'advanced' quarters of Holland, saying that she had learnt more there than she ever had through seeing her brother in a bath. For the altar-boy who, in England, would have passed for a fourth former, had been naked.

Pope Paul, determined not to lag behind in the scurry for progress, signed a special edict whereby any who cared to help themselves to the Blood of Christ could suck it up through a straw. In that way some churches came to resemble a coffee bar, especially when the blare of a discotheque issued from the sanctuary, together with the shouting, strumming, and stamping of feet that accompany the celebration of a jazz Mass, a beat, and a 'yeah-yeah' Mass. There were teenage Masses where, instead of the sacramental Bread and Wine, hot dogs, buns, and coca-cola were served. At others, whisky and cream crackers took the place of the elements. Some priests found the wearing of an alb inconvenient when saying Mass, and so resorted to shirt-sleeves.

The new freedom offered a chance for political extremists to advertise their usually Left-wing tenets. One of the foremost seminaries in Canada was sold to Chinese Reds, who tore out the tabernacle and put in its place a portrait of the wholesale murderer Mao Tse Tung. It later became a training centre for revolutionary street fighters.

In September, 1971, the Catholic school at Vald'Or, Abitibi, Quebec, initiated a new game for boys. It consisted of spitting at the figure of Christ on the cross, and the one who covered the face with the biggest spit was declared winner. This was reported in the French-Canadian paper, *Vers Demain*, in September, 1971.

...

But a truly sinister scene was enacted at the basilica of St. Maria de Guadalupe in Mexico City, where a goat was sacrificed in front of the high altar. Now it is not only the fact of an animal being killed, and in church, that excites comment. It seems to have called for

none from the people there present who gaped, were astonished, and then walked away no doubt concluding that it was all part of the new order within the Church. And so it was. But Archbishop Gomez, who had charge of the basilica, knew more than that, as did the strange crowd of people to whom he actually rented it for the occasion. ... Hence it was no ordinary Mass but a Black Mass that was celebrated in Mexico City, with the use of an inverted cross, an event that was filmed and recorded by those who arranged it.

But such things marked only a beginning, as did a growing clamour, supported by priests, for abortion, and for sexual aberrations to be recognized as perfectly normal. There were priests who almost shouted from the housetops that they were glad to be homosexual, as it was a privilege that conferred the 'psychological fulfilment of one's personality'. It became accepted, in some parts, for perverts of the same sex to be married in church.

We need not continue with these monstrosities - the point has been made; let us only add one last brush-stroke to the panorama of degeneracy:

Even Rome was not immune from the sacrilegious parodies that followed the new religious freedom, the opening of the windows of the Church. The scene of one, in 1975, was the classroom of a Roman convent. Pope Paul was present, but the star turn was provided by Fred Ladenius, a gentleman from the Middle West who had acquired celebrity through appearing on Belgian television. He had furthermore been spoken of by an enthusiast as 'the born again spirit, whose God updated the Jesus of 1974 by being the God of 1975.' Fred set about his task right manfully, stripping off his jacket and giving voice to almost incoherent ravings for which, he said, he was in no way responsible. What they heard were some of the truths he had received, that very morning, from the Lord's mouth. For the Lord spoke and prophesied through him. Fred accompanied these revelations by flinging up his arms so violently that he broke into a sweat. But he was by no means exhausted. He rolled up his shirt-sleeves and invited all those who wished to receive the Lord, to come up 'rapido'.

Fred, though still in a state of undiminished perspiration, waved his hands frantically over the heads of those who accepted the invitation, and accompanied each gesture with a cry of 'Hallelujah!' At the end of these ministrations the school blackboard was moved to make way for a table, on which were placed two chalices, one holding wine, and the other wafers of the kind that are used to celebrate Mass.

Then everyone fell into line and followed the example of Fred, who took out a wafer and dipped it in the wine before transferring it to his mouth. The meeting broke up amid more and louder cries of 'Hallelujah!' in which the Pope joined, and with further manifestations that the spirit was indeed moving amongst them.

Fred was duly rewarded by being sent for by the Pope, who thanked him warmly for all the good work he was doing for the Church. Fred stayed on in Rome, where he acted for a time as the Vicar of Christ's Press Secretary.

...

It is well in place here, as part of our thesis, to look somewhat more closely ... at the word Hallelujah, which has never been in everyday use, as a spoken expression of praise, within the Seven Hills. As an offering of praise to Jehovah, it has always been commonly used by religious revivalists rather than by Latins. But now we find Pope Paul using it.

There is more, but let us stop. Compton provides examples of depravity that are even more "startling."

To me, the fact that the events related above occurred, clearly with the tacit (sometimes explicit) consent of the Pope, is the incontrovertible proof that the Vatican has been infiltrated by anti-Catholic elements. Without a doubt, the global conspirators have managed to get their dirty paws

on the Throne of St Peter's. This is a calamity of colossal proportions - no matter what one thinks of the Church, it is an integral - core - part of Western and World Civilization, and its denigration is an offence to humanity at large.

Even if we suppose that the Catholic Church is undesirable and obsolete, the prospect of Catholic might employed in the debasement of society is terrifying indeed.

The results of Vatican II and Paul VI's policies were cataclysmic. (10.1) "In England, between the years 1968 and 1974, it has been reckoned that some two and a half million people fell away" from the Church.

(10.1) In France, with eighty-six per cent of the population officially Catholic, ten per cent put in an appearance at Mass; while a similar figure from 1971 to 1976, applied even to Rome. During the same period, in South America, once regarded as one of the toughest nuts for anti-clericals to crack, and where the people were commonly regarded as being steeped in superstition, an estimated twenty-five thousand priests renounced their vows. Vatican sources reported that there were three thousand resignations a year from the priesthood, and that figure took no account of those who dropped out without troubling to get ecclesiastical approval.

The Catholic part of Holland, where the new teaching was paramount, was in a truly parlous condition. Not a single candidate applied for admission to the priesthood in 1970, and within twelve months every seminary there was closed. In the United States, in the seven years prior to 1974, one in every four of the seminaries put up their shutters.

In March 1981 (when Wojtyla was Pope John Paul II), the Vatican reiterated its excommunication of members of secret society. This was done in preparation for the incoming P2 scandal, which shook Italy and the Vatican to the core. Uncovered in the process of Sindona's trial, P2 (Propaganda Due outlawed Masonic Lodge) surfaced to the forefront of public attention. The cops stumbled upon a list of P2 members following an anonymous tip.

(10.2) There were many prominent politicians, including three Cabinet ministers and three under-secretaries; army generals and navy chiefs; leading bankers and industrialists, secret service heads, diplomats, judges, and magistrates; civil servants in foreign affairs, defence, justice, finance, and the treasury; top names in radio and television, and the managing director, editor and publisher of Italy's leading newspaper, *Corriere Della Sera*.

The Church was never officially implicated - but its reputation suffered nevertheless.

Elements within the Vatican had been quietly trying to get the Holy See to reconcile with Freemasonry before the P2 imbroglio. Pedro Arrupe of the Jesuits had complained in dismay. Indeed, (10.3) "For it has now to be accepted, according to a statement from the Holy See, that "The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has ruled that Canon 2335 no longer automatically bars a Catholic from membership of Masonic groups."

Various theories have been proffered in efforts to explain Paul VI's folly. Some said that he was a Masonic infiltrator, as simple as that. Others suspected that Montini was fundamentally good, but had fallen prey to blackmail from conspiratorial quarters. A Pinkerton detective even claimed that the true Montini had been hidden away, and an impersonator had been put in his place. Reasonable (and freely available) photographic evidence backed the claims, and some serious people believed them. Biometric voice recognition tests provided further food for thought. The conjecture is far-fetched - but then, who knows? When the stakes are high enough, and the scam bold enough to defy belief, it might work, it might just work...

For my part, the thesis that Paul VI was a Masonic agent rings true and suffices for operative purposes. Whether or not the Pope was Montini or an impersonator is a matter of curiosity rather than

substance.

The claims that John Paul I was assassinated I will leave unexamined. I have not researched the subject in detail; there are circumstantial indications of foul play, but it is conceivable that John Paul I died of a weak heart and old age.

His brief reign occurred in the fall of 1978. Karol Wojtyla would become the next Prelate of Rome.

Wojtyla was a strange choice. He was the only Pope of Polish or Slavic extraction, and the first non-Italian Pope since the early 16th century. Wojtyla had generally gotten along with the Polish communist authorities. Curiously, when it came to going to Rome for the Conclave of Cardinals, Wojtyla's superior, Cardinal Wyszynski, was denied an exit visa, while the future Pope was allowed to go unmolested. Upon assuming the Papal office, Wojtyla promised to uphold the reforms began by John XXIII and Paul VI.

What did John Paul II do during his lengthy (1978-2005) Papacy? But let us backtrack a bit.

Some people (e.g. Texe Marrs) say Wojtyla (1920-2005) was a crypto-Jew. There are some indications to that effect - Karol grew up in a city with a large Jewish population, and would join the team of the Jews when the children of the town divided into Catholics and Jews for their soccer games. Other examples of Karol's associations with Jews exist. Without going into the banalities of Jew-baiting or Holocaust religiosity, let us note that: 1) Wojtyla's support of Jews during World War II is creditable; and 2) unfortunately, Orthodox Judaism is a religion diametrically opposed to Christianity in general and Catholicism in particular. Orthodox Jews *revile* the Roman Church. Forget the propaganda - simply make the effort to research Israel's laws against Christianity.

Having proven his mettle at the Second Vatican Council, Wojtyla was made Archbishop of Krakow and later Cardinal by Paul VI.

As Pope, Wojtyla travelled the world and beautified and canonized more people than his predecessors of the last five centuries combined. In 1995, he wrote an encyclical on his commitment to ecumenism - the notion that there should be a single Christian Church. Did he pursue the idea of Catholic supremacy, or was he talking of something else? The ecumenical movement spawned in the wake of World War II, in tandem with the WCC.

In 1979, John Paul II became the first Pope to visit the White House. In 1982 he was the first Pope to go to the UK.

In 2001, he became the first Pope to pray in a Muslim mosque. This he did in Damascus, Syria. In 2000, he had become the first Pope to pray at the Western Wall in Jerusalem. There are good reasons, which we need not state, for the lack of enthusiasm in regard to Mosques and Western Walls exhibited by Wojtyla's predecessors. Let the Jews and the Muslims do their own thing; but surely it is a denial of the idea of the One Church to pray at the other fellows' temples. Wojtyla was also the first Pope to enter a Lutheran church.

The Pope was supposed to have "a special relationship with Catholic youth" and was known as the Pope of the Youth. Naturally, if you want to restructure a certain culture, you target its young. This is elementary.

In general, the Pope followed a policy, which we may fairly describe as an effort at gradually merging the Catholic faith with the other faiths of the world. He parleyed with representatives of various faiths, and even prayed in non-Christian temples, as we have seen.

For some reason, John Paul II went out of his way to propitiate Israel. He established formal diplomatic ties with Tel Aviv in 1994, and organized a commemoration of the Holocaust. Notably, in 2003 the Masonic mob-connected ADL congratulated the Pope on his entering his 25th year of Popedom. In January 2005, a bunch of rabbi's *blessed* John Paul II. Let the reader interpret the event for himself. In 1986, John Paul II had called the Jews the Christian's "elder brothers."

John Paul II also became the first Pope to visit a mainly Orthodox country when he flew to Romania in 1999. He received the Dalai Llama (of the virulently evil Tibetan theocracy) eight times.

Wojtyla also did his part in bringing down "communism" and ushering in the new era of Wall Street

rapine in Eastern Europe. At least this action of his was consistent with the justifiable Catholic opposition to Marxism.

Bush gave John Paul II a "Medal of Freedom" in 2004.

Wojtyla apologized left and right for the "crimes" committed by the Catholic Church.

John Paul II upheld the Catholic stances on abortion and contraception, and called for debt cancellation and social justice. At the same time, along with Ratzinger (the next Pope) he condemned the 1980s "Liberation Theology," which was generally leftist and favored active participation in social organization on the part of the clergy.

He opposed the Iraq War.

In 1996, John Paul II expressed a vague acceptance of the "theory of evolution."

The death of Wojtyla in 2005 attracted the largest gathering of heads of state in history. Ratzinger conducted the ceremony. Serious efforts have been made toward glorifying the late Wojtyla, clearly with the idea of cementing his unorthodox achievements. He was beautified on the fast track. An attempt has been made at calling him "the Great."

Soon after, Ratzinger became Pope - Benedict XVI. Whence Ratzinger (1927-)? Born in Bavaria, he was made Archbishop (of Munich) and Cardinal by the same Paul VI. The man is highly erudite and extensive in his learning - as was Wojtyla, for that matter.

Ratzinger was conscripted into the Hitlerjugend in 1941, but he was unenthusiastic about the outfit. A cousin of his was murdered for reasons of eugenics. In 1943, Ratzinger was drafted by the Wehrmacht into an anti-aircraft unit; he deserted toward the end of the war and went home. In the 1950s, Ratzinger completed a doctorate. He became a professor in 1959 in Bonn. During the Second Council, Ratzinger was in the reformers' camp. He has continually supported ecumenism and the notion of respect to other religions.

At his inaugural Mass, the new Pope had a mixed bunch of twelve greet him in the stead of the traditional twelve cardinals. In immediately starting the process of beautification of John Paul II, Ratzinger waived a long standing tradition, which dictated that five years should pass before a beautification begins. Notably, Paul VI had also violated the custom in order to quickly beautify John XXIII.

Ratzinger has correctly identified "relativism" as one of the major problems of our age. He was also accurate in pointing out that same-sex marriages and abortions are attacks on the familial structure. Ratzinger also made the sharp observation that Christianity and "reason" are by no means incompatible.

Responding to pressure from below, Ratzinger allowed the old ("Tridentine") Mass to be more easily permitted to congregations which request it. This move was a tactical retreat to prevent the prospect of schism; Ratzinger continues to support Vatican II and Paul VI's Mass. The New Order Mass is still the official Catholic Mass. By allowing greater freedom in regard to the old Mass, the current Pope has let off some traditionalist steam, and has, obliquely, reaffirmed the validity of the New Order Mass.

Like his predecessor, Benedict XVI has engaged in "dialogue" with other religions. The ADL - who are in the know - welcomed his election. Some Jewish elements have criticized the Pope for being "insensitive" to Judaism. Ratzinger's laxity in regard to the Tridentine Mass - which, apparently, is "anti-Semitic" - has invoked the ire of some rabbis. Overall, the top Jewish organizations tend to like Ratzinger. He visited Israel in 2009, the third Pope to do so after Paul VI and John Paul II.

After offending the Muslims with an ill-advised off-hand remark, Benedict XVI repaired to Turkey and prayed in a Muslim mosque. He instigated a "Catholic-Muslim Forum," which first met in 2008. The ubiquitous Dala Llama visited Benedict in 2006.

In general, Ratzinger has followed in Wojtyla's footsteps in criss-crossing the world to pursue the joys of ecumenism.

It seems that Ratzinger had been selected for his role some time ago. The man had repeatedly tried

to retire, only to find his resignations refused by Wojtyla. Ratzinger's election had been relatively easy and painless. He had been the favorite, and he had won.

The Pope's health is relatively frail and the man is old; the world will likely see another Pope in the near future. One wonders who will next gain the Throne of St. Peter's.

In general, the media's attitude toward a person reflects the Oligarchs' level of tolerance toward that person. John Paul II enjoyed excellent publicity - and therefore he did what he was supposed to do. Ratzinger also seems to fare well, and in any case, he has not been subjected to concerted media barrages.

A few words on the issue of child abuse and homosexuality in the Catholic Church: I strongly suspect that the pederasty scandals were deliberately promulgated to diminish the Church. In the light of the one-worlder attack on the Holy See and established religion in general, the above thesis suggests itself. I can not see how the logistics of such a subversive operation would work, and I have not had the time (or the desire) to research the issue in any serious detail.

The Church, naturally, has to cover up the scandals to defend itself, while taking grave measures to purge aberrant prelates and the causes of the sub-normal abusive behavior. At the same time, anti-clerical agents inside the Catholic church may be quietly doling out portions of scandal at appropriate times. If there is a deliberate campaign of sabotage by pederasty - and it looks like such a campaign exists - it has been successful. Talk to any anti-clerical person and you will immediately hear about the child abuse.

It is less well known that Protestant denominations are also having problems with paedophilia and related evils.

The West's schizophrenic "entertainment," with its 24 hours schedule of 16 year old girls singing about sex on the TV, is causing enough paedophilia as it is. Be that as it may, there can be no excuse for the pederasty in the Church.

We will see glimpses of proof for the above thesis when we look at the case of Kinsey.

Also pertinent to our discussion are the works of Father Malachi Martin of Ireland. Martin (1921-1999) was an erudite man, conversant in more than a dozen languages, and the bearer of three doctorates (Semitic languages, archeology and Oriental history). He joined the Jesuits at the age of 18. At 33, he became a Jesuit priest. He was a member of the Vatican intelligence network. The precocious Martin attracted the attention of the powerful prelate Augustin Bea, who made Martin his private secretary. Bea was the confessor of Pius XII and was made cardinal under John XXIII. Notably, Martin attended all sessions of Vatican II, as well as the 1958 and 1978 Conclaves, where he was present as an interpreter.

Frustrated by the developments in the Catholic Church, Martin sought and received a release from his vows in 1965. He remained fanatically pro-Catholic (though not pro-Vatican), and a priest, for the rest of his life. Along with his faith, Martin retained his insider connections with the Vatican. After 1965, he settled in New York, where he gradually established himself as an author. Unable to state certain things plainly, he resorted to the medium of fiction.

Martin was an exorcist of some experience; his stories of exorcism are fascinating enough to make even convinced secularists wonder.

In his works and interviews, Martin said that, yes, there is a "New World Order" conspiracy by the various elements we have discussed. The conspirators have taken over education and banking and many nations states and so on. In regard to the Vatican, Martin independently made the arguments related here: that John XXIII, Paul VI and Bugnini were Masons, that the New Order Mass was a centerpiece in the campaign against Catholicism, that the Vatican Church as an organization is in decline, that John Paul II is doing the bidding of the cabal more out of resignation and poor strategy than out of anti-Catholic convictions, that Satanism and sexual perversions are proliferating, including in the Vatican, that the world is going down the drain and that there will be times of trouble. Martin also claimed that John Paul I was indeed murdered by Villot. He also stated that

(anti-Vatican II) Cardinal Siri had been elected Pope twice in 1958 and 1978, but had been forced, through blackmail, to refuse the Papacy. Apparently, an FBI investigation has confirmed that Siri was elected Pope in 1958. It is a fact that on October 26, 1958, white smoke billowed from the chimney of the Sistine Chapel for five minutes - and yet no Pope emerged.

Martin must have either had some protectors, or performed certain services, to find a mainstream publisher for his works, to enjoy favorable publicity, and to receive two Guggenheim fellowships back in the 1960s. In matters tangential to Catholic dogma (demons, Heaven and Hell), his ramblings are hard to take seriously from the lay perspective. Without a doubt, the man was playing some game - but what?

In conclusion, we have incontrovertible evidence of two developments: 1) as we have seen, a plethora of somewhat integrated secret societies have waged war against the Vatican and traditional organized religion in general for more than two centuries; 2) the Vatican has behaved in a strange and self-destructive fashion since 1958. Two pronounced recent trends of Vatican policy are: the perversion of the ancient Mass, which was the backbone of Catholicism; and the strange and ambiguous insistence on ecumenicism and inter-faith "dialogue." In light of the one-world agenda, ecumenicism looks like an attempt to gradually merge the world's religions - or, to be more accurate - to somehow bring them under a single roof.

The P2 and the 1976 *Borghese* revelations debacles, along with various other indicators, strongly suggest that the "Masons" (meaning some subset of the global network of secret societies) have indeed taken over the Vatican. It should be understood that: 1) even a convinced one-worlder agent can only accomplish so much within the confines of his post and two thousand years of tradition - in an operation as sensitive as the take-over of the Vatican, extreme caution must necessarily be exercised; 2) it is hard to distinguish between full-blown agents, and true believers elevated into power for professing ideology acceptable to the puppet masters - Wojtyla and Ratzinger likely fall in the latter category. Then there is the spectre of blackmail. Do what we say or we will kill you or your family or we will reveal your dark secret. Chantage is a potent tool.

Finally, to reiterate a crucial point, the decay of the Vatican is potentially bad enough in itself. Worse yet is the prospect of the redirection of the great power of the Vatican toward malicious ends. In principle, non-Catholics opposed to the global cabal should support a revival of true Catholicism, and true Catholics should stand up for their faith.

Chapter 9

False Creeds

In this section we examine a variety of false creeds. Humans act on the basis of beliefs; and therefore it is necessary to combat and resist the pernicious ideologies, which infest modern society.

The point that must be stressed is that the worst false ideologies we face are *fundamentally religious* in nature, in the sense that they have 1) a notion of God, usually unstated; 2) a canon of prophets and saints; 3) a dogma consisting of a set of basic axioms, some of which, for certain ideologies, are obviously false in the empirical sense of the word; 4) a catalogue of symbology; and 5) a priesthood and some form of church.

A patent example we have covered in detail is Communism. Its God is the *communist state* (as opposed to the merely sovereign state), its prophets are Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and its dogma is the Communist Manifesto and other such pieces of demagoguery, and its symbols include the hammer and sickle and the red banner.

Another obvious example, which hardly requires any elaboration, is the religion of nationalism. Its God is the "nation" (which need not even be a state), its prophets are the "founding fathers," its dogma may be, for example, a Constitution, and its symbols feature a flag and an anthem.

9.1 A Few Words on Religion

Continuing in the same vein, and keeping this section brief, since there is no sensible limit on discussion on the topic, let us consider a few aspects of what is called "religion."

I suppose I should provide a disclosure of my personal beliefs. Nominally, I am an Orthodox Christian - meaning that I was born in a historically Orthodox nation - but I have gone to church only a handful of times in my life, and have only a vague idea of the differences between the Orthodox and the Western churches. I grew up as an "atheist," meaning that the very notion of God seemed absurd to me. At one point I realized that I did not know what "believing in God" meant, and therefore dropped atheism. "Agnosticism" did not work for the similar reasons. Agnosticism suggests resolve in claiming that truth can not be known. Instead, I intend to think about God and religion for the rest of my life - and if at some point I decide that God does or does not "exist" - fine. I must assume that if God exists, and has given me a mind, he must want me to use that mind to reach Him.

I can not say that I "believe in God," and I do not regard the Bible as literal truth, but I have grown to guardedly respect Christianity. Moreover, I have realized that during my childhood and education, I was exposed to a variety of differing value systems - and now, in my early adulthood, the Christian values seem the most acceptable. At the same time, I remain aware of the fact that religion has long been used as a method of control, and that the political manifestations of Christianity has committed great sins over the ages.

This must suffice. To the "atheistic" minded I say - check your base assumptions. To the Christians (and Muslims and so on) I say - what is more important: Making the vacuous statement that you believe in God and sitting in church, or making the effort to live according to the "will of God"?

Two considerable problems in examining religion are conflation and definition.

In regard to the latter, observe that "religion" can be defined in a number of ways, some contradictory to each other. Thus, if one insists on associating religion with a supernatural quasi-anthropomorphic God (Zeus, Odin, Jehovah, etc), it follows that, say, Marxism, is not a religion. One can get out of this conundrum by labelling Marxism a "secular" religion - but why not call a spade a spade? Therefore, let us define God, loosely, as a manifestation of self-inherent power. Thus, the "invisible hand of the market," the communist state, "natural selection," and various other concepts, become, in effect, manifestations of divinity.

We can illustrate the problem of conflation via the following example: take Catholicism. In theological terms, Catholicism is cornucopia of doctrines, accumulated over more than two millennia. Then there is the Catholic Church, which is a political organization erected by and composed of humans, who, by their own doctrine, are prone to sinning. Attempts have been made at reconciling the problem stated above, for example by the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, stated at Vatican I in 1870 - but those are patches on a garment composed of thin air.

Thus the standard critiques of Catholicism - crusades, inquisition, pedophilia, etc - can be interpreted as attacks on the Catholic Church, divorced of the bulk of Catholic dogma. In other words, Christianity is quite clear about loving your neighbour and abstaining from, among other things, sodomy - and therefore those who have perpetrated wanton massacre and vile pederasty are ipso facto excommunicated heretics. That some of them have worn priestly garments is an indictment of the earthy political Church, but not of the religion itself.

It is also worth pointing out that the Crusades had much to do with the Venetian attempt at highjacking the Oriental spice trade routes, with the defence of Christian Civilization from the Muslim offensive, and with the redirection of the energies of idle battle-loving disinherited members of the nobility. These reasons were political rather than ideological. The "Deus Vult!" slogan was mere window dressing designed to garner popular support for the endeavour. The Crusaders crusaded not out of mere loathing for the "infidels" - though they carried plenty of that - but because the politico-military super-structure of Christendom was under attack by elements of the politico-militarily organized Islam.

The Inquisition must also be examined in political terms. On the one hand, it was something like a police force engaged in the pursuit of Satanists, mass murderers, and other particularly virulent criminal elements; on the other hand, the Inquisition was an enforcer of the Church's political power. Again, it is possible to examine the functions of the Inquisition in disjunction with theological dogma. Modern inquisitions include the Soviet NKVD, the FBI, and the ADL.

It is thus necessary to separate the *political* and the *ideological* manifestations of a given religion. One can have a religion that sounds good on paper, but whose church is totally corrupt. This type of situation leads to utter confusion and contradictory behavior. For example, those modern Catholics who practice the New Order Mass would be considered heretics by the Catholic standards of but a century ago. Patriots who kill on the orders of Washington for love of their country, are in fact doing America harm. Communists like Bella Dodd who follow the orders of the communist hierarchy in order to help the "proletariat" are actually harming the cause of the working people. And so on.

The next point is subtler. I used to think of myself as an atheist, in the sense that 1) I did not believe in the existence of "God"; and 2) I thought that atheism was rational, in the sense that it supposed one's beliefs lay on credible, "scientific," provable grounds.

Gradually, I came to realize that the significance of a "belief of God" is extremely shifty, and that fundamentally, *it may be impossible to base one's beliefs on wholly "rational" grounds*. In other words, one's system of beliefs has to rest on axioms - and those, by definition, are not necessarily subject to proof. They are taken as granted. One must, then, try to dissect one's various beliefs, and other perceptible existing belief structure, and examine them with the first principles, with the

foundations, with the underlying axioms.

And so the proponents of atheism as commonly understood deny "God," whatever that means, and go along their merry way without necessarily examining the assumptions of supposedly "scientific," or "secular" belief systems like Free Market Fundamentalism and Communism. It follows that atheism is not necessarily the antithesis of irrationalism. So it is useless and pernicious and amounts merely to anti-Christianity, anti-Islam, and so on.

Furthermore, what exactly does a "belief in God" amount to? *Ceteris paribus*, by itself, believing in God does not mean anything. What difference does it make? Believing in God in the context of an established theology, on the other hand, goes hand in hand with a plethora of axioms, which should be examined on their own merit.

For example, consider the basic question of existence: Whence everything? Three possible answers are: it was all created by some kind of a conscious higher power - "God" (monotheism); there are various Gods all over the place (polytheism); it is "self-existing," i.e. "God" is everywhere and everything (this is sometimes called "pantheism"); it all only has any meaning through the senses of Man, who is God unto Himself (anthropotheism?). Now these three interpretations are mutually incompatible, and, for all that I see, axiomatic. It is conceivable (one could say likely) that neither of these three axioms can be proved to hold.

Two questions arise: Can one get by without accepting an axiom similar to the ones listed above? And are some of the axioms listed above "better" than the rest in some sense?

This leads to the problem of *petitio principii* in regard to value systems, which must have been discussed endlessly across the ages. Namely, labelling a value system "good" or "bad" is senseless, since to have "good" and "bad" one needs a value system to begin with. And so one must accept a value system as given, absolute, and not subject to proof - hence the inherent necessity for what can be termed "religion." Thus, theology, defined as the study of value systems (in conjunction with the related field of "ethics"), is a perfectly useful and valid field of human thought. Moreover, "science" and "theology" are obviously not incompatible and can be complementary.

Having stated all that, let me warn against the idea that we can never truly know anything. Of course we can know things! We can even show that certain axioms reflect reality better than others. We want to be circumspect rather than cowardly in our studies.

From what I can tell, traditional Christianity follows, among others, the following doctrines:

The world was created by a God who is omnipotent and good. Man was created in the image of this God, meaning that 1) man holds a special place in the universe; 2) in a certain sense, man is already perfect; 3) man can strive to understand the world to try to understand God. The last point means that Christianity is fully compatible with science. 4) Because of the Fall, man is prone to erring. Humility trumps hubris. Observe that the classical Greeks also repeatedly warned against hubris. 5) The whole world was created by the good God, and so the whole world is good and lovable and needful of human care. 6) The goal of life is to live well so one can go to Heaven when one dies. This means avoiding sin. But life is complex, and men fallible - and so men almost invariably sin. Then they must seek absolution. This develops people's conscience and forces them to internalize the accepted rules of social behavior. A stable society *requires* such an internalization. 7) Traditional Christianity poses that human life is absolutely sacred. This is a central doctrine of the creed. Observe that the pantheistic Darwinism and Gaia Worship (ultra-environmentalism), and human-hive religions like Communism, *do not* regard human life as sacred. Darwinism regards the demise of the "unfit" as a matter of course absent of moral connotation; the Gaians put the well-being of the "planet" above all, and would be willing to sacrifice human individuals for the "benefit" of Earth; and the Communists want the best for the collective, and are perfectly willing to butcher millions in pursuit of their goals. 8) Christianity tends to encourage strong familial ties. Local churches strengthen local communities. 9) "Thou shalt not steal" means private property exists under God. At the same time, the monasteries and the religious Orders used to act like corporations, and the

vast properties of the Church were something like "public" (state) property. 10) Usury is bad. So is greed. 11) The poor and the weak are "blessed" and there is nothing shameful in being poor or weak. 12) God likes men so much he sent his son to die for their sins. Jesus provides a monolithic archetype for the Christian way of life. 13) God gave his will to mankind by *revelation*, and his orders are *set in stone* - meaning that certain aspects of Christianity are immutable and constitute Law. 14) Christians have extolled art and beauty as a tribute of God - just take a look at the gorgeous cathedrals of Old Europe.

It is paramount to understand that the above doctrines are not the whimsical thoughts of some ignorant overfed priest. The doctrines of traditional Christianity *are the essence of the painful lessons of multiple millennia*. They are the product of the concentrated thought of the succession of the brilliant men of Christian civilization over the ages. One can argue that some of the doctrines of Christianity are political in nature - but certainly not all are.

One must therefore try to determine if the doctrines of the newly concocted religions and cults do not constitute reversions to old barbarisms.

There also is a thing called "Deism," which tries to have God without organized religion. In principle, the political manifestation of religion is merely a form of social organization.

In summary, 1) religion is much more than "belief in God"; 2) there are countless "secular" religions out there; 3) in studying creeds, one must ballast fancy window dressings, and focus on underlying axioms.

One last critical point: politically powerful elements can and will always use creeds for the purposes of social control. Of course Christianity, and to a far greater extent Judaism, have been used for control! And so have Communism and the National Religion. The simple lesson is that *creeds will always exist, and those with knowledge and power (and knowledge is power) will always use the creeds for political control*. People can defend themselves by 1) maintaining strong communal and familial ties; 2) reasoning through scams; 3) striving for a just government (or, if necessary, local self-government bereft of higher orders of government).

I must apologize to those readers well-versed in theology, ethics, and the ideas discussed above. My grounding in theology is non-existent, and I have not had the time to study the subject.

But let us proceed to the specific examples.

9.2 Secular Humanism

Follows the original 1933 *Humanist Manifesto*, reprinted in full.

The time has come for widespread recognition of the radical changes in religious beliefs throughout the modern world. The time is past for mere revision of traditional attitudes. Science and economic change have disrupted the old beliefs. Religions the world over are under the necessity of coming to terms with new conditions created by a vastly increased knowledge and experience. In every field of human activity, the vital movement is now in the direction of a candid and explicit humanism. In order that religious humanism may be better understood we, the undersigned, desire to make certain affirmations which we believe the facts of our contemporary life demonstrate.

There is great danger of a final, and we believe fatal, identification of the word religion with doctrines and methods which have lost their significance and which are powerless to solve the problem of human living in the Twentieth Century. Religions have always been means for realizing the highest values of life. Their end has been accomplished through the interpretation of the total environing situation (theology or world view), the sense

of values resulting therefrom (goal or ideal), and the technique (cult), established for realizing the satisfactory life. A change in any of these factors results in alteration of the outward forms of religion. This fact explains the changefulness of religions through the centuries. But through all changes religion itself remains constant in its quest for abiding values, an inseparable feature of human life.

Today man's larger understanding of the universe, his scientific achievements, and deeper appreciation of brotherhood, have created a situation which requires a new statement of the means and purposes of religion. Such a vital, fearless, and frank religion capable of furnishing adequate social goals and personal satisfactions may appear to many people as a complete break with the past. While this age does owe a vast debt to the traditional religions, it is none the less obvious that any religion that can hope to be a synthesizing and dynamic force for today must be shaped for the needs of this age. To establish such a religion is a major necessity of the present. It is a responsibility which rests upon this generation. We therefore affirm the following:

FIRST: Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.

SECOND: Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as a result of a continuous process.

THIRD: Holding an organic view of life, humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected.

FOURTH: Humanism recognizes that man's religious culture and civilization, as clearly depicted by anthropology and history, are the product of a gradual development due to his interaction with his natural environment and with his social heritage. The individual born into a particular culture is largely molded by that culture.

FIFTH: Humanism asserts that the nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values. Obviously humanism does not deny the possibility of realities as yet undiscovered, but it does insist that the way to determine the existence and value of any and all realities is by means of intelligent inquiry and by the assessment of their relations to human needs. Religion must formulate its hopes and plans in the light of the scientific spirit and method.

SIXTH: We are convinced that the time has passed for theism, deism, modernism, and the several varieties of "new thought".

SEVENTH: Religion consists of those actions, purposes, and experiences which are humanly significant. Nothing human is alien to the religious. It includes labor, art, science, philosophy, love, friendship, recreation—all that is in its degree expressive of intelligently satisfying human living. The distinction between the sacred and the secular can no longer be maintained.

EIGHTH: Religious Humanism considers the complete realization of human personality to be the end of man's life and seeks its development and fulfillment in the here and now. This is the explanation of the humanist's social passion.

NINTH: In the place of the old attitudes involved in worship and prayer the humanist finds his religious emotions expressed in a heightened sense of personal life and in a co-operative effort to promote social well-being.

TENTH: It follows that there will be no uniquely religious emotions and attitudes of the kind hitherto associated with belief in the supernatural.

ELEVENTH: Man will learn to face the crises of life in terms of his knowledge of their naturalness and probability. Reasonable and manly attitudes will be fostered by education and supported by custom. We assume that humanism will take the path of social and mental hygiene and discourage sentimental and unreal hopes and wishful thinking.

TWELFTH: Believing that religion must work increasingly for joy in living, religious humanists aim to foster the creative in man and to encourage achievements that add to the satisfactions of life.

THIRTEENTH: Religious humanism maintains that all associations and institutions ex-

ist for the fulfillment of human life. The intelligent evaluation, transformation, control, and direction of such associations and institutions with a view to the enhancement of human life is the purpose and program of humanism. Certainly religious institutions, their ritualistic forms, ecclesiastical methods, and communal activities must be reconstituted as rapidly as experience allows, in order to function effectively in the modern world.

FOURTEENTH: The humanists are firmly convinced that existing acquisitive and profit-motivated society has shown itself to be inadequate and that a radical change in methods, controls, and motives must be instituted. A socialized and cooperative economic order must be established to the end that the equitable distribution of the means of life be possible. The goal of humanism is a free and universal society in which people voluntarily and intelligently cooperate for the common good. Humanists demand a shared life in a shared world.

FIFTEENTH AND LAST: We assert that humanism will: (a) affirm life rather than deny it; (b) seek to elicit the possibilities of life, not flee from them; and (c) endeavor to establish the conditions of a satisfactory life for all, not merely for the few. By this positive morale and intention humanism will be guided, and from this perspective and alignment the techniques and efforts of humanism will flow.

So stand the theses of religious humanism. Though we consider the religious forms and ideas of our fathers no longer adequate, the quest for the good life is still the central task for mankind. Man is at last becoming aware that he alone is responsible for the realization of the world of his dreams, that he has within himself the power for its achievement. He must set intelligence and will to the task.

The signatories were a set of academics, Unitarians, literati, and a rabbi.

Below is the introduction to *Humanist Manifesto II* (1973):

The next century can be and should be the humanistic century. Dramatic scientific, technological, and ever-accelerating social and political changes crowd our awareness. We have virtually conquered the planet, explored the moon, overcome the natural limits of travel and communication; we stand at the dawn of a new age, ready to move farther into space and perhaps inhabit other planets. Using technology wisely, we can control our environment, conquer poverty, markedly reduce disease, extend our life-span, significantly modify our behavior, alter the course of human evolution and cultural development, unlock vast new powers, and provide humankind with unparalleled opportunity for achieving an abundant and meaningful life.

The future is, however, filled with dangers. In learning to apply the scientific method to nature and human life, we have opened the door to ecological damage, over-population, dehumanizing institutions, totalitarian repression, and nuclear and bio-chemical disaster. Faced with apocalyptic prophecies and doomsday scenarios, many flee in despair from reason and embrace irrational cults and theologies of withdrawal and retreat.

Traditional moral codes and newer irrational cults both fail to meet the pressing needs of today and tomorrow. False "theologies of hope" and messianic ideologies, substituting new dogmas for old, cannot cope with existing world realities. They separate rather than unite peoples.

Humanity, to survive, requires bold and daring measures. We need to extend the uses of scientific method, not renounce them, to fuse reason with compassion in order to build constructive social and moral values. Confronted by many possible futures, we must decide which to pursue. The ultimate goal should be the fulfillment of the potential for growth in each human personality - not for the favored few, but for all of humankind. Only a shared world and global measures will suffice.

A humanist outlook will tap the creativity of each human being and provide the vision and courage for us to work together. This outlook emphasizes the role human beings can

play in their own spheres of action. The decades ahead call for dedicated, clear-minded men and women able to marshal the will, intelligence, and cooperative skills for shaping a desirable future. Humanism can provide the purpose and inspiration that so many seek; it can give personal meaning and significance to human life.

Many kinds of humanism exist in the contemporary world. The varieties and emphases of naturalistic humanism include "scientific," "ethical," "democratic," "religious," and "Marxist" humanism. Free thought, atheism, agnosticism, skepticism, deism, rationalism, ethical culture, and liberal religion all claim to be heir to the humanist tradition. Humanism traces its roots from ancient China, classical Greece and Rome, through the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, to the scientific revolution of the modern world. But views that merely reject theism are not equivalent to humanism. They lack commitment to the positive belief in the possibilities of human progress and to the values central to it. Many within religious groups, believing in the future of humanism, now claim humanist credentials. Humanism is an ethical process through which we all can move, above and beyond the divisive particulars, heroic personalities, dogmatic creeds, and ritual customs of past religions or their mere negation.

We affirm a set of common principles that can serve as a basis for united action - positive principles relevant to the present human condition. They are a design for a secular society on a planetary scale.

For these reasons, we submit this new Humanist Manifesto for the future of humankind; for us, it is a vision of hope, a direction for satisfying survival.

The singers were a greater yet gaggle of academics, Unitarians, and alleged artists.

Humanist Manifesto III (2003):

Humanism is a progressive philosophy of life that, without supernaturalism, affirms our ability and responsibility to lead ethical lives of personal fulfillment that aspire to the greater good of humanity.

The lifestance of Humanism - guided by reason, inspired by compassion, and informed by experience - encourages us to live life well and fully. It evolved through the ages and continues to develop through the efforts of thoughtful people who recognize that values and ideals, however carefully wrought, are subject to change as our knowledge and understandings advance.

This document is part of an ongoing effort to manifest in clear and positive terms the conceptual boundaries of Humanism, not what we must believe but a consensus of what we do believe. It is in this sense that we affirm the following:

Knowledge of the world is derived by observation, experimentation, and rational analysis. Humanists find that science is the best method for determining this knowledge as well as for solving problems and developing beneficial technologies. We also recognize the value of new departures in thought, the arts, and inner experience - each subject to analysis by critical intelligence.

Humans are an integral part of nature, the result of unguided evolutionary change. Humanists recognize nature as self-existing. We accept our life as all and enough, distinguishing things as they are from things as we might wish or imagine them to be. We welcome the challenges of the future, and are drawn to and undaunted by the yet to be known.

Ethical values are derived from human need and interest as tested by experience. Humanists ground values in human welfare shaped by human circumstances, interests, and concerns and extended to the global ecosystem and beyond. We are committed to treating each person as having inherent worth and dignity, and to making informed choices in a context of freedom consonant with responsibility.

Life's fulfillment emerges from individual participation in the service of humane ideals.

We aim for our fullest possible development and animate our lives with a deep sense of purpose, finding wonder and awe in the joys and beauties of human existence, its challenges and tragedies, and even in the inevitability and finality of death. Humanists rely on the rich heritage of human culture and the lifestance of Humanism to provide comfort in times of want and encouragement in times of plenty.

Humans are social by nature and find meaning in relationships. Humanists long for and strive toward a world of mutual care and concern, free of cruelty and its consequences, where differences are resolved cooperatively without resorting to violence. The joining of individuality with interdependence enriches our lives, encourages us to enrich the lives of others, and inspires hope of attaining peace, justice, and opportunity for all.

Working to benefit society maximizes individual happiness. Progressive cultures have worked to free humanity from the brutalities of mere survival and to reduce suffering, improve society, and develop global community. We seek to minimize the inequities of circumstance and ability, and we support a just distribution of nature's resources and the fruits of human effort so that as many as possible can enjoy a good life.

Humanists are concerned for the well being of all, are committed to diversity, and respect those of differing yet humane views. We work to uphold the equal enjoyment of human rights and civil liberties in an open, secular society and maintain it is a civic duty to participate in the democratic process and a planetary duty to protect nature's integrity, diversity, and beauty in a secure, sustainable manner.

Thus engaged in the flow of life, we aspire to this vision with the informed conviction that humanity has the ability to progress toward its highest ideals. The responsibility for our lives and the kind of world in which we live is ours and ours alone.

HMIII was published by the American Humanist Association. The organization's "Humanist of the Year" prize-winners include: Richard Dawkins, Ted Turner, John Kenneth Galbraith, the hopeless hack Joyce Carol Oates, Betty Friedan, B.F. Skinner, Julian Huxley, and Margaret Sanger. John Dewey, one of the major pernicious influences on American education, and Bertrand Russell, were "humanists" of great renown.

Wonderful manifestos, but what does it all mean? Many of the points are vague or vapid aphorisms. For example, this: "humanists aim to foster the creative in man and to encourage achievements that add to the satisfactions of life." What is this supposed to mean? Who does not want creativity, achievements, satisfaction, beauty, and apple pie? The humanists purport to "affirm life rather than deny it." What kind of a statement is that? It stinks of the guilty fleeing unpursued.

Or take "Humans are social by nature and find meaning in relationships." Yes, and water is wet. They continue: "Humanists long for and strive toward a world of mutual care and concern, free of cruelty and its consequences, where differences are resolved cooperatively without resorting to violence." How nice! But of course, these lofty sentiments are little more than double-talk for the Brave New World.

Ponder on the meaninglessness of "Life's fulfillment emerges from individual participation in the service of humane ideals." What is "humane"? Eugenics and communism?

The aim of the three manifestos is quite clear. The "humanists" seek to: 1) abolish the old religions, particularly Christianity; 2) install a new mutable religion based on the pantheistic doctrines of Darwinism and Gaian worship ("environmentalism"); 3) promote the notions of man-as-God, and try to create the quasi-communist human hive.

Point one is blatant. The second point needs stressing, because the humanist babble of "science" and "secularism" and empiricism may lead some to believe that humanism is somehow not a religion. Of course humanism is a religion! The first document even says so explicitly. Some try to distinguish between "secular" and "religious" humanism, but the distinction is balderdash.

What "humanism" really aims to do is to supplant the old values with new ones. The vague statements about empiricism imply that values are no longer set in stone: "Ethical values are derived from human need and interest as tested by experience" - this means that values change as "experiences" change. In a sense, this is a truism; in another sense, it implies a desire on the part of the "humanists" to manipulate values as they will.

The humanist accent on "science" is also something of an absurdity: "Humanists find that science is the best method for determining this knowledge [of the world]..." But what is "science"? Observation, experimentation, and thought? People have been doing that for ever. It is not as if there was no "science" before Bacon and Newton. The babble about "science" is an attack on the ideas of "revelation" of the old religions. Those ideas are a recognition of the fact that you need a set of basic postulates to work with. In effect, Christianity says: "Many axioms have been tried, and these ones seem to work, so we say they are built in stone and proceed from them. We re-interpret our doctrine as we go, but certain core principles must stay for good." By and large, 'science' can not really challenge base assumptions and value systems, and so the "humanist" glorification of science amounts to a call for a technocratic priesthood endowed with the power to arbitrarily change the core values of society.

One particularly revolting doctrine of "humanism" is the reductionist credo that a human is nothing more than a mix of chemicals: "Holding an organic view of life, humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected." This flies in the face of 1) the full extent of the human experience, 2) reason, and even 3) available facts. First, man has assumed the existence of the spirit for millennia. Second, I challenge the reader to try to explain "beauty" in evolutionary (or materialistic) terms. What does evolution care about the aesthetic considerations? And third, the testimonies of people who have undergone 'near-death experiences' strongly suggest that man does have a "spirit." Look up, for example, the latter chapters of Richard Heinberg's *Memories and Visions of Paradise* (1989). There are countless other arguments in favor of the dualistic (or even triune) view of human nature.

The notion that man is nothing but chemicals is the logical conclusion of the mechanistic, reductionistic, empiricist world-view which many unconsciously associate with "science." The spirit is impossible to measure and observe, and therefore it can not exist, even though reason dictates - by virtue of its existence! - that man does have a spirit. Such "scientists" proceed from the base assumption, *equivalent to a revelation*, that everything that exists can be measured and observed and quantified and thus understood.

Humanism directly attacks the sanctity of life: (*HMII*) "The right to birth control, abortion, and divorce should be recognized." Abortion is infanticide. Allowing abortion undermines the sanctity of life. Divorce undermines the sanctity of marriage and the familial structure. Whether or not abortion and divorce should be legal is an entirely different question. Women who undergo abortion should be pitied and protected, not punished. As for divorce, perhaps people should apply more care in choosing partners, and should try harder at making connubial life work. I feel it is indisputable that even in the best of circumstances, marriages can fail completely, in which case it is for the best that the two parties should go their separate ways. Men and women complete each other, and there is about an equal amount of men and women out in the world. Thus traditional marriage makes sense. Whether mad partner swapping, the glorification of sex as an end unto itself, and in vitro reproduction are a better way of doing things, is debatable.

Euthanasia is another humanist ideal: "[Civil liberty] also includes a recognition of an individual's right to die with dignity, euthanasia, and the right to suicide." The expression "right to suicide" is an oxymoron - barring pathological circumstances, anyone can kill himself at will. *Johnny Got His Gun* type situations involve complex issues best discussed elsewhere.

It should be understood that when the sanctity of life goes, the prospect of genocide opens. The communists denied the postulates of Christianity and proceeded to massacre millions for some higher ideal. The Nazis embraced eugenics and decided that if they could cull the weak off of their own ranks, they could also wipe out and take over the Ukraine. The Young Turks were secular - and

genocidal. The reader must ask himself: Is life sacred? And if not, is the reader ready to be killed for some higher "good"? Not asked to sacrifice himself, but slaughtered like a pig.

Of course, the dogma of the sanctity of life can exist outside of Christianity - as can all other dogmas. It is also obvious that anyone who campaigns for the sanctity of life should consider an alliance with established champions of the doctrine.

Man is not so special in the opinion of the humanists: (*HMI*) "Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as a result of a continuous process." In other words, man is just another animal - a uniquely hairless type of monkey. This is the height of absurdity. Of course man is special! No rhinoceros has ever proved the Pythagorean theorem, no dolphin has ever written a book, and no beaver has ever built an Eiffel Tower. Denying the obvious - that man, for some reason, holds a special place in the known world - is ludicrous. Man is not a monkey!

The humanists are avowed one-worlders: (*HMII*) "We deplore the division of humankind on nationalistic grounds. We have reached a turning point in human history where the best option is to transcend the limits of national sovereignty and to move toward the building of a world community in which all sectors of the human family can participate." In fact, Humanism is one of the pillars of the semi-official religion of the United Nations. Other pillars are the New Age religion, hardcore-environmentalism, and Darwinism. A glance at the proponents of the Humanist Manifestos suffices to reveal who stands behind the whole thing: the Malthusian Darwinist British imperialists and their American and global counter-parts; various Communist and Fabian-type control freaks; and a good deal of well-meaning individuals who were seduced by the pleasant language and the platitudes of Humanism.

Where was modern Secular Humanism born? At the Rockefeller University of Chicago. The International Humanist and Ethical Union was founded by Julian Huxley in 1952.

Four to five million people worldwide, predominantly from the Western-educated, globalized class, consciously identify themselves as "humanists."

There exists an older historical "humanist" movement, started by, say, Petrarch in the 14th century - but that is totally different, and beyond our scope.

Perhaps here we may quote Teddy Roosevelt's granddaughter:¹

The Theocratic State by Edith Kermit Roosevelt

The Spokesman-Review for Oct 28, 1962

The international apparatus is working to set up a universal theocratic state.

Already the high priests, pray ers and temples of the universal cult are with us. Curricula are being drafted to indoctrinate our children in what John D. Rockefeller Jr. calls "the church of all people."

**

The first step is to break down loyalty to a single religious faith. In June 1959, the Women's International Religious Fellowship (WIRF) was founded by representatives from 14 nations. ... Participants in WIRF programs have included representatives from the embassies as well as Mrs. Marietta Tree, American delegate to the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

**

Plans are being made to set up regional world universities whose objectives would include "to instruct in all religions but will not make religion its aim," "build a world outlook" and "teach the physiological, psychological and spiritual aspects of sex."

...

¹Thanks to <http://www.seekgod.ca/rockefeller.htm> for providing the reference; Google carries a scan of the original newspaper article. Accessed on Dec 30, 2011.

Incidentally, a founding member of the Santa Barbara Center is Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara who along with Dr Zitko is a sponsor of the Temple of Understanding, the \$5 million "Spiritual U.N." for the six major faiths.

Like all world government projects the Temple's "Project of Understanding" just happens to coincide with a similar drive in Great Britain where fabian socialism was hatched under the wing of theosophy.

Voice universal is the chief organ for "Theocratic Union"... The Dec. 1961, Jan., Feb. 1962 issue of the Voice Universal features an international prayer or "Invocation of the United Nations," which our rulers may wish to substitute for the Christmas prayers no longer permitted in our schools. It reads in part,

"May the Peace and the Blessing of the Holy Ones pour forth over the worlds - rest upon the United Nations, on the work and the workers..."

May the chalice the United Nations is building become a focal point for the descent of spiritual force..."

May the consciousness of the United Nations become ever more at-one, the many lights One Light is the Light of the Self."

Will the new universal cult take root among the peoples of the world? If so, probably not for long. No faith based on man-made institutions can survive. Nevertheless, since the days of the "Mystic Temples" of the Greek Elusian mysteries "wisdom" cults have been used as a means of recruitment for revolutionary groups as well as to influence politicians and statesmen at the highest level. Remember Rudolph Steiner and kaiser Wilhelm and, more recently, former vice president Henry A. Wallace and his guru Nicholas Roerich?

Recognizing the "goofy network" to be a source of power and influence, U.N. officials lecture at meetings of the Arcane School, the international "group of New World Servers," who form "Triangles" to work for UNESCO.

**

A few months ago Dr. Huston Smith, professor at philosophy at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology - a sponsor of the Temple of Understanding - visited Sydney, Australia and lectured on "Is a New World Religion Coming" at the Blavatsky Lodge.

The name Blavatsky refers to the late Madame Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, the Russian cult leader known as "H.P.B." whose writings are used in the secret courses of instruction at the Arcane School.

In a moment of frankness, Madame Blavatsky explained the influence of magic on history: "What is one to do, when in order to rule men, it is necessary to deceive them? ... For almost invariably the more simple, the more silly, and the more gross the phenomenon, the more likely it is to succeed.

9.3 Behaviorism

Wikipedia provides a serviceable definition of behaviorism: "Behaviorism (or behaviourism), also called the learning perspective (where any physical action is a behavior), is a philosophy of psychology based on the proposition that all things that organisms do - including acting, thinking, and feeling - can and should be regarded as behaviors, and that psychological disorders are best treated by altering behavior patterns or modifying the environment." In other words, there is no free will, no spirit/soul, not even a mind, and all human activity is environmentally (rather than genetically) deterministic. The patent absurdity of this doctrine was discussed above.

The founders of behaviorism were Wundt of Germany, Pavlov of Russia, and the Americans Thorndike, Watson, and the mad doctor B.F. Skinner. Wundt was the key person, the fountainhead from which the poisoned spring of behaviorism flowed. For a wonderful brief overview of the Illuminist grandson Wundt's influence, look up Paolo Lionni's booklet *The Leipzig Connection* (1980).

Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920) studied at Tübingen, Heidelberg and Berlin, and later set up shop at the University of Leipzig. He "discovered" that the soul is irrelevant and probably does not exist, and that one should study humans in the light of observable behavior. Many of Wundt's students became highly influential psychologists: for example Charles Hubbard Judd (1873-1946), the Director of the School of Education at the University of Chicago; G. Stanley Hall (1844-1924) the child psychologist; James McKeen Cattell (1860-1944) the first professor of psychology in the United States; Edward Bradford Titchener (1867-1927) who founded the first American psychology laboratory at Cornell; and others. The influence of Hall and Cattell beggars belief. Notably, Cattell also studied under Galton.

As related earlier, Wundt's grandfather was an Illuminatus.

Ivan Pavlov (1849-1936) was really a mathematician who harbored a hatred for physiology. The son of a priest, Pavlov opted for a career in science rather than in the church. Having visited the wonderful Wundt in Leipzig, Pavlov began his famous dog experiments in the 1890s. In 1904, Pavlov won the Nobel in medicine. The Soviets liked Ivan Petrovich and left him alone. In turn, Pavlov loathed the Soviets and told them so. Pavlov's main discovery was that you can "condition" creatures. Bertrand Russell was ecstatic about this great scientific advancement. John B. Watson popularized the method in the States.

John B. Watson (1878-1958) had a troubled youth marred by a drunken father and a controlling mother. Young John got in trouble with the law and had poor grades, but his mommie got him in college, where he completed a Masters by the age of 21. A year after graduating, Watson made his way to the University of Chicago, where he studied under John Dewey (1859-1952), the guru of American education. Watson got his PhD in 1903, with a dissertation on Pavlovian conditioning. The name of the work epitomizes the Watsonian approach: *Animal Education* (i.e. animal conditioning).

Watson went on to become the father of American Behaviorism and was made the head of the John Hopkins psychology department around 1908. In 1920, Watson got the boot because of his seduction of a graduate student. In 1913, Watson had published his Behaviorist Manifesto (*Psychology as the Behaviorist Views It*). The introduction and the conclusion of that document will suffice for our purposes:

Psychology as the behaviorist views it is a purely objective experimental branch of natural science. Its theoretical goal is the prediction and control of behavior. Introspection forms no essential part of its methods, nor is the scientific value of its data dependent upon the readiness with which they lend themselves to interpretation in terms of consciousness. The behaviorist, in his efforts to get a unitary scheme of animal response, recognizes no dividing line between man and brute. The behavior of man, with all of its refinement and complexity, forms only a part of the behaviorist's total scheme of investigation.

...

Summary

1. Human psychology has failed to make good its claim as a natural science. Due to a mistaken notion that its fields of facts are conscious phenomena and that introspection is the only direct method of ascertaining these facts, it has enmeshed itself in a series of speculative questions which, while fundamental to its present tenets, are not open to experimental treatment. In the pursuit of answers to these questions, it has become further and further divorced from contact with problems which vitally concern human interest.
2. Psychology, as the behaviorist views it, is a purely objective, experimental branch of natural science which needs introspection as little as do the sciences of chemistry and physics. It is granted that the behavior of animals can be investigated without appeal to consciousness. Heretofore the viewpoint has been that such data have value only in

so far as they can be interpreted by analogy in terms of consciousness. The position is taken here that the behavior of man and the behavior of animals must be considered on the same plane; as being equally essential to a general understanding of behavior. It can dispense with consciousness in a psychological sense. The separate observation of 'states of consciousness', is, on this assumption, no more a part of the task of the psychologist than of the physicist. We might call this the return to a non-reflective and naive use of consciousness. In this sense consciousness may be said to be the instrument or tool with which all scientists work. Whether or not the tool is properly used at present by scientists is a problem for philosophy and not for psychology.

3. From the viewpoint here suggested the facts on the behavior of amoeb have value in and for themselves without reference to the behavior of man. In biology studies on race differentiation and inheritance in amb form a separate division of study which must be evaluated in terms of the laws found there. The conclusions so reached may not hold in any other form. Regardless of the possible lack of generality, such studies must be made if evolution as a whole is ever to be regulated and controlled. Similarly the laws of behavior in amb, the range of responses, and the determination of effective stimuli, of habit formation, persistency of habits, interference and reinforcement of habits, must be determined and evaluated in and for themselves, regardless of their generality, or of their bearing upon such laws in other forms, if the phenomena of behavior are ever to be brought within the sphere of scientific control.

4. This suggested elimination of states of consciousness as proper objects of investigation in themselves will remove the barrier from psychology which exists between it and the other sciences. The findings of psychology become the functional correlates of structure and lend themselves to explanation in physico-chemical terms.

5. Psychology as behavior will, after all, have to neglect but few of the really essential problems with which psychology as an introspective science now concerns itself. In all probability even this residue of problems may be phrased in such a way that refined methods in behavior (which certainly must come) will lead to their solution.

Of course, this is not "science," but a quasi-religious philosophy based on pantheism, the rejection of the special status of man, the rejection of the existence of the soul (and even the mind), and so on.

Realize that when Watson says he wants to "predict and control behavior," he means it. The entire American, and increasingly worldwide, educational system is built upon behaviorist principles. This is documented in heartbreaking details in the works of Gatto and Iserbyt.

Watson's daughter from his first marriage became suicidal later in life. Her husband killed himself. Her daughter, Watson's grand-daughter, was a depressive who considered suicide before managing to overcome the Watson Effect. The son from the first marriage was no good and died relatively young. His next son, from the marriage with the graduate student, did commit suicide. Another son managed to have a decent life.²

If your children went to public school in North America - and perhaps even elsewhere - they also got a taste of the Watson Effect. No, it is not genetic.

It is behavioristic.

To be fair, Skinner's daughters grew up all right.

Edward Thorndike (1874-1949) was another key American educator and behaviorist who taught at Teachers College, Columbia University for a good half-century. He was protege of Judd the pupil of Wundt. To get an idea of Thorndike's pernicious influence, consider these quotes from Gatto's *Underground History*:

[In 1929,] the famous creator of educational psychology, Edward Thorndike of Columbia

²<http://robothink.blogspot.com/2005/09/long-dark-night-of-behaviorism.html>, Dec 30, 2011.

Teachers College, announced, "Academic subjects are of little value."

...

The entire academic community here and abroad had been Darwinized and Galtonized by this time and to this contingent school seemed an instrument for managing evolutionary destiny. In Thorndike's memorable words, conditions for controlled selective breeding had to be set up before the new American industrial proletariat "took things into their own hands."

...

Back at the beginning of the twentieth century, the monstrosly influential Edward Thorndike of Columbia Teachers College said that school would establish conditions for "selective breeding before the masses take things into their own hands."

...

The true believers we call great educators - Komensky, Mather, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Mann, Dewey, Sears, Cubberley, Thorndike, et al. - were ideologues looking for a religion to replace one they never had or had lost faith in.

...

According to Thorndike, the aim of a teacher is to "produce and prevent certain responses," and the purpose of education is to promote "adjustment." In *Elementary Principles of Education* (1929), he urged the deconstruction of emphasis on "intellectual resources" for the young, advice that was largely taken. It was bad advice in light of modern brain research suggesting direct ties between the size and complexity of the brain and strenuous thought grappled with early on.

Thorndike said intelligence was virtually set at birth - real change was impossible - a scientific pronouncement which helped to justify putting the brakes on ambitious curricula. ... Thorndike soon became a driving force in the growth of national testing, a new institution which would have consigned Benjamin Franklin and Andrew Carnegie to reform school and Edison to Special Education. Even before we got the actual test, Thorndike became a significant political ally of the semicovert sterilization campaign taking place in America.

It goes almost without saying that eugenicism and behaviorism - which both stemmed from Darwinism - went hand in hand from the beginning.

Thorndike was a major influence of the maddest doctor of them all - B. F. Skinner (1904-1990), who wanted to put children in boxes ("Operant conditioning chambers"). After matriculating from Harvard in 1931, Skinner went through stints in Minnesota and Indiana. In 1948 he returned to the Alma Mater to stay for good. It is worth noting that one of the other great nuts of American pseudo-science - Kinsey - was hard at work in Indiana when Skinner went there in 1946.

Not satisfied with the feeble conservativeness of Watson and Thorndike, Skinner labelled his activities "radical behaviorism." The man's research amounted to the torture of mice and other critters and some human infants. His "research" was extremely influential in the field of education.

One notable critic of Skinner was Chomsky. But let us enjoy Carroll Quigley's review of Skinner's philosophico-utopian manifesto *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* (1971). I stress that I had formed my opinions on behaviorism and Skinner before I encountered Quigley's article. I reprint the piece mostly for its quality of hilarity.

Beyond Reality With B. F. Skinner by Carroll Quigley³

The Sunday Star, Washington, D.C. October 3, 1971

Although John B. Watson's "Behaviorism" was a best seller in 1925, I did not get to read it until 1926. I was not impressed favorably but regarded it as simplistic, naive,

³<http://www.carrollquigley.net/book-reviews/Beyond-Reality-with-B-F-Skinner.htm>, accessed Dec 30, 2011.

dogmatic, confused, and ambiguous. Burrhus Frederic Skinner probably read Watson about the same time when he was a senior at Hamilton College, but he was captured by it. His latest book, "Beyond Freedom and Dignity," is an inferior version of Watson, despite the fact that he insists that it is the latest word in up-to-date psychology. A great deal has been learned about human psychology in the past 45 years, but not much of it has rubbed off on Skinner, who has spent much of that period successfully peddling a slightly inferior brand of Watsonian behaviorism.

In this book Skinner repeats, with the boring monotony of an Asiatic fever-bird, the same range of assumptions and slogans for which he has been so richly rewarded since he took his Ph.D. in experimental psychology at Harvard 40 years ago. These assumptions were stated in his widely read "novel," "Walden Two," published in 1948, the year in which he became professor of psychology at Harvard. In that "novel" Skinner portrays himself, under the name "Professor Burris," visiting a contemporary utopian commune operated by a certain T.E. Frazier, who is Skinner himself under a different name. Most of the novel consists of Skinner talking to Skinner under these two pseudonyms. The book ends, appropriately enough, when Burris decides to stay at the commune with Frazier.

Much of Skinner's writings are in this form in which he provides both sides of the discussion: He begins with a statement of what he intends to discuss, but never gets to do so, because, instead, he is immediately diverted into an attack on any version of psychology different from his own. These are presented in Skinner's words and are refuted by dogmatic statements of his own assumptions which are presented as experimentally demonstrable facts. His attacks are directed at any version of psychology which attempts to deal with what goes on inside of a person, such as perception, thoughts, feelings, ideas, or conflicts. Since these are what most of us mean when we say "psychology," Skinner's version of this subject makes it possible for him to pose as a psychologist without ever concerning himself with the subject. If any reader is confused about how a man who never concerns himself with psychology can be regarded as an authority on the subject, the explanation is that most people simply assume that a professor of psychology at Harvard must be talking about psychology when he says he is and must know something about the subject. These mistaken assumptions result from the prevalent ignorance about the Alice-in-Wonderland world which has conquered most higher education and much intellectual life (including publishing) today.

Skinner is concerned in his writings and teachings, not with human psychology, but with human behavior; this, he insists, is always a response to an external trigger to the environment which surrounds the person. Since he has no interest in what goes on inside the person, he ignores everything which intervenes between the trigger and the response, both of which are external to the person, and pours scorn on any belief that there is anything between these two. Any such belief he assumes to be concerned with fiction or myth and refers to it as "mentalism" or "autonomous man." Equally mythical are associated ideas, such as "freedom" or "dignity."

In his discussion of these "myths," Skinner begins by saying that our lives and our society are in terrible shape. This, he insists, is because we know so little about human behavior. What we need is "a technology of behavior." Although this is the title of the first chapter in this book, discussion of this panacea never gets beyond this admonition, and there is no further mention of the need or nature of this technology. Instead, in his usual fashion, Skinner reverts to pastime of knocking down all the strawmen of his own versions of the past efforts of psychology. We lack a technology of behavior, says Skinner, because we have not tried to make one but have, instead, wasted our time for 2,500 years trying to understand human psychology by introspection and by discussing the problem in terms of mind, perception, consciousness, feelings, purposes, human nature, causes, and such "unscientific" ideas.

To Skinner none of these things exist, and we must discard them and ignore all internal

and subjective processes. Instead, we should concern ourselves only with "objective" phenomena, especially with how to obtain "desirable" behavior by manipulation of the individual's external experience, above all by limitation and deprivation of experience, to the point where a desirable response can be elicited by a specific external trigger. This process by which men will be reduced to robots responding to signals is called by Skinner "operant conditioning." He would resent our calling this "brainwashing," not only because the brain is one of the things which Skinner refuses to recognize, since it is internal and not part of behavior. Skinner does not tell us what he means by "desirable" behavior, but it is quite clear that he means submissive and unresisting response to the established triggers.

According to Skinner, any way of dealing with human or social problems other than by operant conditioning is "pre-scientific," while his way is "scientific," and is, indeed, in advancing edge of scientific advance, a kind of wave of the future in human development and the only possible protection against approaching social disaster. Any criticism of Skinner's ideas is dismissed by him with contempt as based on ignorance, old-fashioned, pre-scientific prejudices and must be consigned to the rubbish heap of discarded superstitions. This attitude is widespread among other contemporary charlatans peddling nostrums, like Robert Ardrey, Marshal McLuhan, and C. D. Darlington. The subsequent chapters of this volume also bear titles which have little relationship to their contents: chapters 2 to 6 are called "Freedom"; "Dignity"; "Punishment"; "Alternatives to Punishment," and "Values." It is clear that Skinner does not like the first three although there is no evidence that he understands the meaning of the first two and the last. In each case, unsupported dogmatic statements are made, the real issue is avoided almost totally, and the chapter consists very largely of examples of the things Skinner refuses to recognize, interspersed with numerous quotations from or references to famous writers (but almost never to psychologists). These are mostly irrelevant to the subject, but are included, it would seem, to impress us with Skinner's erudition. Although the volume has neither index nor bibliography, it does have numerous notes, many to eight books by Skinner himself. The first such note, on page 1, is to C.D. Darlington's "The Evolution of Man and Society," but Skinner has not read the book and took the quotation from a review of it in *Science* for June 12, 1970. Darlington is about the last person Skinner should quote, for he is a believer in genetic determinism, while Skinner is an environmental determinist, who quotes Darlington on environmental damage, something which has quite different meaning to the two men. But perhaps they find kinship in their common belief that man is unfree in a deterministic condition.

The quality of Skinner's thought may be seen in the opening words of his chapter on "Freedom," "Almost all living things act to free themselves from harmful contacts. A kind of freedom is achieved by the relatively simple forms of behavior called reflexes. A person sneezes his respiratory passages." To most of us sneezing would be an example of freedom if only we had some control over it and some choice as to whether we sneeze or not. The quotation is a good example of Skinnerian thought for three reasons: First, because it refers to an involuntary unfree action as an example of "a kind of freedom"; second, because he makes this error partly because of his bias for reflex actions and from his constant tendency to use words in incorrect meanings; and third, because the opening sentence is obviously untrue, but Skinner's experience and frame of reference is so remote from the real world that he is unaware of its falseness. It may be true of amoebas or rats that they avoid harmful contacts, but it is obvious to anyone who comes out of the laboratory to look at the actual world that men would not avoid, but, on the contrary, seek out, "harmful contacts" like drugs, alcohol, cigarettes, speed, violence, over-powered cars, and all kind of disturbances, and existents. In fact, the central problem of psychology today is why men seek these things. The obvious answer is that they are frustrated and bored, but Skinner's assumptions have no place for these ideas (being internal they

are "unscientific"), so he has to deny they even occur.

Untruthful, dogmatic statements of this kind are all through Skinner's work. In support of his assumptions about the effectiveness of conditioning, he says, "A parent nags a child until the child performs a task; performing the task the child escapes nagging." I wonder where Skinner has been for the last 20 years, in a permissive society, where children who feel ignored by their parents refuse to perform tasks because their desire to attract the parent's attention is more powerful than their desire escape nagging or even punishment. Here again Skinner assumptions do not admit the possibility of a child's inner psychology having the autonomy to make such a choice, so his own perception fails to notice a condition which is blatant. And, of course, Skinner is quite unable to notice his own failure of perception, because to him perception is a purely mechanical thing, without any active role. That is why this "scientist" fails to see masochistic and self destructive behavior, or disobedient children, in a world which is full of them. The reason is that Skinner is not a scientist at all, but a conditioned professor who has discovered that he gets rewards for doing things, including writing and speaking nonsense, and continues to do them.

Skinner's ideas are not new as he insists, but very old. His theory that men seek pleasant experiences and avoid unpleasant ones is explicit in Jeremy Bentham (died 1883) and has been discarded from the toolbox of psychology for a century. It is still used by Skinner as his basic tool because he has no concern with psychology but only with the behavior. The only innovation Skinner has made with this tool is that he has rejected the use of punishment in conditioning and would rely only on rewards. But this fails because his rewards are too weak, and he ignored the fact that people can get surfeit with materialist rewards, especially weak ones. In the laboratory, a rat which is kept hungry may continue indefinitely to do what Skinner wants in return for an inadequate food pellet after each success, but a human being can become surfeit with any reward or success and can leave the laboratory, the game, or the world. Throughout history, from ancient Sparta to recent Nazi Germany and contemporary Russia, efforts to create a society based on operant conditioning have shown the impossibility of preventing men from adopting the kind of behavior which Skinner ignores, such as opting out, walking away, or self-destruction; the very things which are sweeping over our society and are doing so just because our society is already moving in those dehumanized, materialistic, technological, and impersonal directions which Skinner advocates as a cure for these conditions.

Some measure of his misconception of the nature of man and of our present crisis is to be seen in his suggestion that a solution to our problems could be found by replacing inter-personal relations with relationships with things (pages 89-90). He says, "A world in which all behavior is dependent on things is an attractive prospect." At a time when the world is being swept by a growing hatred of artifacts, with irrational vandalism of things increasing everywhere, while people desperately try to replace their relations with unresponsive things by almost any kind of relationships with nature and persons, it is difficult to believe that any responsible person could advocate replacing inter-personal relationships by more "dependence" on things, but there it is.

This profound lack of contact with reality is evident in almost all Skinner's speeches and writings. It is most obvious in his use of words in way almost directly opposed to their usual meanings. We have seen that his "psychology" has almost no psychology in it. He used the words "scientific" and "unscientific" (or "pre-scientific") in ways distinctively his own: what he does is "scientific"; what he refuses to recognize is "unscientific." The present book has nothing to do with either freedom or dignity except to indicate, rather indirectly, that Skinner has no use for either of them. The word "beyond" in the title does not refer to the future or to any development of men toward any higher degree of manliness, but of his desire to return man to some past condition in which men will be deprived of their human dignity by reducing them to the status of trained animals. When Skinner speaks of "education," he means training, especially memory training. When he

talks of men, he is constantly thinking of laboratory animals. Thus if Skinner announced a lecture on "recent discoveries in human education," he would talk about "traditional knowledge of animal training," although, as likely as not, neither he nor his audience would recognize the fact. The best commentary on Skinner's use of words is in the analysis of "doublethink" and "Newspeak" in George Orwell's novel "1984."

And that is what behaviorism is all about. The Bentham reference is significant, because Behaviorism is a development of P&P, and also of the "free market in nature" doctrine which really is Darwinism - and Bentham verbalized P&P and co-founded the 19th century "classical liberalism" ("free-market") movement.

It is also worth noting that behaviorism has corrupted modern psychology for about a century. When people say that "psychology" is a pseudo-science, they are really talking about behaviorism, and they are correct. Real psychology has always been a fruitful field of study and has been researched for the duration of human literate civilization. The theologies of all major religions, and all major literary and philosophical works, concern themselves with psychology in some way.

9.4 Free Market Fundamentalism

The religion of the "free-market" was formulated in the late 18th-early 19th centuries by Adam Smith (1723-1790), Thomas Malthus (1766-1834), Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), David Ricardo (1772-1823), and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). These are the original messiahs of the Free Market Religion, which puts its God in money. Free-marketeers worship Mammon, whether they know it or not. The "invisible hand of the market" is of course the hand of Mammon. This means that Free Market Fundamentalism is not merely non-Christian, but is indeed antithetical to Christianity, it is anti-Christianity.

Lest the reader accuses me of deriding the Free Market out of a doctrinaire position, let me point out that I bring up Christianity mostly because so many "Christian" "conservatives" in the United States worship the "invisible hand" with fanatic zeal. The American Patriot Movement, which is extremely sensitive to the New World Order shenanigans, has unfortunately fallen for the free-market baloney - a mistake that severely undermines their efforts.

To make matters worse and also funnier, let us observe that in the 19th century, the Free Market Religion was called Classical Liberalism, and today it is called Neo-Liberalism. The free-market cult is a liberal, in fact radical, concoction. It is the opposite of conservative. Conservatives are for protection and for regulation, for anti-trust laws and for chaining the banks so that they do not demolish the economy. But then, let us not drown in vague terms - after all, it is said that the liberals of today are the conservatives of tomorrow.

Now, I rather like Christianity, though I am not fanatical about it and I do not go to church, but the crux of my argument has nothing to do with the religion of Jesus. Economic Liberalism fails on its own terms. It is not merely a pernicious ideology in the sense that it rests on disgusting postulates - though it certainly is that - Economic Liberalism is also plain wrong. It is anti-scientific, anti-philosophical, anti-human, and heroically stupid.

This is not to say that every single statement free-marketeers make is wrong. The problem lies in their base assumptions. Given those, their reasoning and theorizing is usually internally consistent. Furthermore, such concepts as supply-demand make sense and apply to reality in some degree. But the main issue is that the core assumption of Free-Market Fundamentalism - that economic prosperity is the result of "natural" forces - is absurd.

Briefly, Economic Liberalism postulates that if we leave everything to the "market" (i.e. "nature"), manna will start falling from the sky, and we will drown in a deluge of iPods, Fords, golden vibrators,

and gorgeous fifty-pound pieces of jewellery composed of solid blocks of platinum. The key principles of pure Free-Marketism are: 1) everything - including, ultimately, human life, water, and air - should be monetized and money should be treated as something real and holy; 2) contracts are sacred and should be enforced absolutely to ensure the "free-market" functions; 3) any government intervention in the economy is counter-productive and the government's only role should be the enforcement of contracts via police power; 4) man ("homo economicus") governs his actions on the basis of greed (i.e. P&P), and that is good.

All four principles are ipso facto, or at least obviously, wrong. Money clearly is and always has been a political fiction. As for contracts, where is the "freedom" in forcing people to fulfil contracts, when a contract 1) may have been forced upon one party under conditions of misfortune or fraud, and 2) may fail to reflect pragmatic reality at the time when it matures? The notion that governments can not positively influence the economy contradicts thousands of years of history. It does not even make sense in the abstract sense - government is power - and power can do work. Last, greed is not good, and men do not always obey greed. I can think of at least two personal acquaintances of mine who worked simple jobs without any complaint, and who were uninhibited and unrepentant in their generosity. Surely the reader has met other people of that type. People *do not* always act out of self-interest - or casinos, lotteries, and world wars would not exist. People act according to their beliefs, which run the gamut. Of course, self-interest is perfectly natural and necessary - to the extent that one recognizes the right of self-interest in others.

That is the dogma of Free-Market Fundamentalism, which is a religion, and not a "science." Its God is Mammon - the infernal prince of money, greed, and usurious rapine. Its prophets are Malthus et al. Its scriptures are the writings of said "saints." Its symbols are the dollar bill, the golden coin, and the banker temple. For obvious reasons, Free-Marketism is the religion of bankers, and since the bankers have had great power in the last two-three centuries, they have managed to impose their religion on the larger society.

Mammonic worship is highly barbaric. In claiming that "nature" knows best, it really argues for the supremacy and recognition of raw power - as opposed to power channelled through justice and moral principle - as the absolute foundation of human society. As is obvious on reflection, and as Ruskin correctly pointed out, money is only valuable if it can procure obedience. If you can not exchange money for goods or labor, it is useless. One can not eat gold, paper, or electronic bits. Thus the deification of money and the insistence on the enforcement of contracts is the insistence on the recognition of the "natural" right to rule of the masters of money. Herein lies the fundamental clash between pantheism and Christianity: in claiming that the "market" ("nature") is just, the bankers say that "nature" has ordained them to rule. The Christian God, on the other hand, said that the poor are blessed and the usurers are damned - and therefore the poor have the right to protect themselves with laws, regulations, etc, in concord with God's Will. Of course, this discussion can be carried out in abstract terms. But the crux remains - do we postulate that the rich deserve to do whatever they want at the expense of everyone else, or do we say that the rich are abusing the poor and the latter have the right to defend themselves? And when we say "rich," we are not talking about the Kulaks, but about the Rothschilds and the Rockefellers.

The parallel to Darwinism is obvious and will be made explicitly.

After the Second World War, Economic Liberalism experienced an evangelical revival, led by two groups: the "Austrian" "economists" (Austrians), and the (Rockefeller) Chicago-school "economists" (Chicago Boys). Notable "Austrians" include Ludwig von Mises (1881-1973), Friedrich Hayek (1899-1992), Joseph Schumpeter (1883-1950), Murray Rothbard (1926-1995), and Hans Sennholz (1922-2007). The main Chicago Boy is Milton Friedman (1912-2006). His colleagues include Ronald Coase (1910-), George Stigler (1911-1991), Robert Fogel (1926-), and Gary Becker (1930-). *All* of the listed Chicago Boys have won the Noble Prize, as have Mises and Hayek.

The main haunts of the new wave "economists" were the University of Vienna, the Fabian-Round

Table LSE (London School of Economics), and the Rockefeller University. Unfortunately, many serious and informed New World Order researchers have failed to see this obvious connection.

Now let us take a look at the scripture of economic liberalism. The opening salvo, Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), is an interesting piece of work, full of tidbits which undermine the standard free-market dogma. Smith made wonderful observations - that money and gold are just tools; that the rich conspire against the poor; that menial servants do not create wealth whereas craftsmen do; that the rich get richer and that the tough part on the road to private wealth is to obtain a sizeable batch of money to begin with; that greed is short-sighted; that national prosperity increases population; that merchants tend to be internationalistic in outlook; and that (3.4) "All for ourselves, and nothing for other people, seems, in every age of the world, to have been the vile maxim of the masters of mankind."

Unfortunately, and for reasons that will become obvious if they are not already so, the most lasting observations of Smith's have been his specious (and misunderstood) recommendations on political economy (i.e. state economic policy). For example:

(4.2.9) But the annual revenue of every society is always precisely equal to the exchangeable value of the whole annual produce of its industry, or rather is precisely the same thing with that exchangeable value. As every individual, therefore, endeavours as much as he can both to employ his capital in the support of domestic industry, and so to direct that industry that its produce may be of the greatest value; every individual necessarily labours to render the annual revenue of the society as great as he can. He generally, indeed, neither intends to promote the public interest, nor knows how much he is promoting it. By preferring the support of domestic to that of foreign industry, he intends only his own security; and by directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention. Nor is it always the worse for the society that it was no part of it. By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it. I have never known much good done by those who affected to trade for the public good. It is an affectation, indeed, not very common among merchants, and very few words need be employed in dissuading them from it.

This, by the way, is the source of the famous "Invisible Hand." Now what is Adam Smith saying? 1) Supporting domestic industry is a good idea; 2) people will do that anyway out of self-interest; 3) and therefore attempts at regulation are useless. Smith continues to say that people know what their immediate community needs better than statesmen. He then notes that

(4.2.11-12) It is the maxim of every prudent master of a family never to attempt to make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy. The taylor does not attempt to make his own shoes, but buys them of the shoemaker. The shoemaker does not attempt to make his own clothes, but employs a taylor. The farmer attempts to make neither the one nor the other, but employs those different artificers. All of them find it for their interest to employ their whole industry in a way in which they have some advantage over their neighbours, and to purchase with a part of its produce, or what is the same thing, with the price of a part of it, whatever else they have occasion for.

What is prudence in the conduct of every private family can scarce be folly in that of a great kingdom.

I.e. division of labor and trade are wonderful. Ricardo (and Pareto) built on those notions during the 19th century. Smith, who was no idiot, also observed that:

(4.2) There seem, however, to be two cases in which it will generally be advantageous to lay some burden upon foreign for the encouragement of domestic industry.

The first is, when some particular sort of industry is necessary for the defence of the country.

...

The second case ... is, when some tax is imposed at home upon the produce of the latter. In this case, it seems reasonable that an equal tax should be imposed upon the like produce of the former.

In other words, yes, protection is necessary.

Absurdly and tellingly, many Liberal "economists" have abandoned Smith's caveats, and bravely say that *any* protection is bad, and that the "invisible hand" *always* knows best. The obvious example are the IMF conditionalities - the usurers drive some country into "debt," often with the help of the internal corrupt oligarchy; the IMF barges in demanding "privatization" and "deregulation" on the assumption that such policies constitute good economics; rapine and looting occur and the nation plunges into poverty while the bankers count dollar bills. The point here is that mainstream "economists" support this madness, because they *really do think* that it is a good idea. The top honchos, on the other hand, know exactly what they are doing, and babble about long-term prosperity and short-term sacrifice with unabashed hypocrisy.

The ideas that protection is always bad and that self-interest always works suffer from at least three obvious faults, all of which, incidentally, were mentioned by Smith. 1) Decision-making requires information and a capacity for dispassionate reasoning, which rarely occur in sufficient degrees; 2) with no regulation and total enforcement of contracts, the already wealthy acquire an almost insuperable advantage; 3) calamities occur and power-shifts sometimes take place unexpectedly - the problem being that self-interest tends to be short sighted.

In regard to the first point, says Smith (3.2) "Avarice and injustice are always shortsighted, and they did not foresee how much this regulation must obstruct improvement, and thereby hurt in the long-run the real interest of the landlord." Correct (even though Smith speaks in a different context) - and this is why, abstractly speaking, Americans buy cheap Chinese goods rather than the relatively more expensive American goods. The people simply buy the cheapest good, according to their short-term interest. They do not realize that in this way, they undermine their national economy - because factories close in America while new ones open in China - and that in the long run, Americans will be out of jobs and at the mercy of the Chinese. In general, *individuals value their short-term interest more highly than they value their long-term interest*. It is therefore *the duty* of the government, in recognition of the above fact, to pursue the long-term interest of its people.

In regard to the second point, wrote Smith: 1) (1.9) "A great stock, though with small profits, generally increases faster than a small stock with great profits. Money, says the proverb, makes money. When you have a little, it is often easier to get more. The great difficulty is to get that little."; 2) (1.10) "Whenever the legislature attempts to regulate the differences between masters and their workmen, its counsellors are always the masters. When the regulation, therefore, is in favor of the workmen, it is always just and equitable; but it is sometimes otherwise when in favor of the masters."; and 3) (1.10) "People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices. It is impossible indeed to prevent such meetings, by any law which either could be executed, or would be consistent with liberty or justice."

Thus, under a "free-market" system, the ones who already possess wealth have the advantage. Factories are expensive, and under the "entrepreneurial" system, a few fellows will end up possessing the few factories in a given region. Though the free-marketeers assume that the owners will compete against each other, the opposite tends to happen, and rather than destroying themselves, the owners combine. Since they own the factories, they get to have the profits, and they end up controlling the money supply. Thus, no one else can build another factory - and if he does, the richer old owners buy him off and maintain control. Since they own the factories, given a bit of unemployment, they

can dictate wages - thus making sure the laborers always stay in their place. In this way, the system perpetuates itself and remains stable until political or technological developments - both resisted from the top - bring about change. The standard historical example are the Robber Barons.

To drive the point home, let me note that in kindergarten Economics 101, they teach you that "competition" lowers prices and so on and so forth and prosperity occurs. What they usually fail to mention is what happens next. In a game, there are winners and losers. And so after a period of "competition," someone wins, and monopoly occurs. That is what happens in reality! The "competition" of the "free market" ends with a monopoly. That is what Vanderbilt and Rockefeller said! Accused of undercutting a competitor, Vanderbilt replied (Josephson, *Robber Barons*, 1.2) "you are probably in a business that you don't understand." As for Rockefeller, he famously remarked that "competition is a sin." Take Bill Gates - he is the epitome of the monopolist! The last stage of the "free-market" is the monopoly, which, given sanctity of contracts, can dominate a society - as the history of the last century has proved.

That is how "big business" operates under the "free-market." With craftsmen (i.e. trained workers), the situation is similar. There are more of them, but they are wealthy enough, few enough, and usually concentrated enough (in the cities) to be able to organize in guilds. The guilds proceed to bribe the higher-ups and to rip off the peasants, the tenants, and the laborers.

At the bottom, the laborers (untrained workers) have little leverage. Since they are many, and since, possessed of no special skills, they are interchangeable, the laborers easily succumb to divide-and-conquer type tactics, and have a hard time organizing. Dispersement and lack of communication exacerbates the situation. This is the "competition" free-marketeers idealize. The steel workers and the auto workers in America managed to build strong unions, in part because they were concentrated (in the North East), and in part because of modern communications. Naturally, they proceeded to use their unions to bribe the higher-ups and to pillage the non-unionized segments of society. Their strength and example allowed other portions of working America to unionize, to the benefit of the entire society, and to the resentment of the bankers and big businessmen, who lost a degree of the power they took for granted.

So the solution remains - workers of the world, unite! Not for the benefit of Mad Marx, but for your own good. Realize that by conflating the lunacy of Marxism with the notion of unionization, your masters scammed you. Remember that the Soviet Communists effectively banned the Russian trade-unions (membership was compulsory, there was no right to strike, and the government directly held control). The fascists also banned the unions. Anti-unionism is a trait of fascism. Observe that the American principle of the division of power endorses unionism - the big businessmen have their clubs, the professionals have their associations, and so the workers should have their unions. Note that the workers have no one to rip off, because they are at the bottom of society. The notion that class warfare from below will destroy society is absurd, except from the perspective of the rich looters. In fact, the opposite tends to happen - with a powerless underclass, extreme wealth accumulation at the top undermines the economy (since people become too poor to buy goods) and destabilizes society (because people resent being raped), and tends to lead to economic and social collapse. Cultural decay accompanies the process of disintegration, since people who have to work 16 hours per day just to eat can not develop their better qualities, and since the powerful elements of society deliberately push drugs, booze, and enticing but degrading "entertainment" (pornography, gladiatorial combat, organized sports) to defuse popular fury.

The same principles apply on the international scene. Under a "free-market" (i.e. a ban on protection), the developed nations dominate and can economically colonize undeveloped nations. Consider the following scam, which the British essentially perpetrated upon the world from Latin America to India. The British had the fortune to have tons of coal, a defensible island, and an inquisitive (and acquisitive) outlook. For those and other reasons, they were the first to properly industrialize. So they built their textile manufactures, and started to flood select countries with cheap clothing. The people bought the cheap British goods, destroying their domestic textile industries, which tended to be at the craftsman stage. Impoverished, such nations started selling those raw materials the British

demanded. Since clothing is essential, and raw materials, unlike cheap manufactured textiles, were relatively abundant around the world, the British could pick and choose. The targeted nations suffered from unemployment, underdevelopment, and poverty, and sunk into quasi-colonial status. Rich with plunder, the British could develop powerful armed forces and spy networks, which they used whenever a nation objected to the "free-market." The point is that by monopolizing the production of necessary manufactured goods, the British could afford to insist on a "free-market" - since they could procure raw materials across the world (and in their empire), but few could afford not to buy the goods of the British. The whole thing was a monstrous scam of stupefying proportions and a classic example of the mendacity of the British Oligarchy. America, as the heir of Britain, has resurrected the scam, and, as we discussed, has even fallen in its own pit, surely by design. And so, one core problem of Free Market Fundamentalism, is that the "free-market" favors the rich and tends to exacerbate class inequalities to the point where society sinks into a caste system - or collapses.

The third point was that calamities occur. When making decisions, people tend to assume that things will remain as they are. In reality, discrete, extreme events can have tremendous effect on society. For example, Europe in June 1914 was proud, peaceful, and prosperous. A few days later, in August, Europe was at war. Life changed *totally*, and for most people *unexpectedly*, in a period of a few days. Or take Haiti on January 11 2010. It was poor, but life went on. Then the quake struck, and everything went to hell. Or suppose a nation has allowed its agriculture to decay, and relies on imports from another nation. But what if the trading partner enters a war? It may restructure its industry to wage war, and it may fall under a blockade. In either case, the food trade ceases.

As in the earlier case, governments have the duty to anticipate and defuse emergencies. They have to stockpile strategic reserves, forbid the construction of nuclear plants in tsunami-prone areas, protect domestic agriculture, and so on.

Agricultural protectionism is particularly vital. Free-marketeer "economists" tend to regard food as just another consumer good. It is all the same to them - food, viagra, steel, bicycles, guns, it does not matter - let the free market figure it out. It knows best. Fine - but a nation which can neither produce its own food nor demand food at gunpoint, *can not possibly be an independent nation*, since it will always depend on whoever provides its chow. Thus, Britain, which is a great military power with nukes, can afford to import food. No small country in the world, which desires sovereignty, however, can neglect to develop its domestic agriculture. The West has been highly aware of this fact. American food aid comes with strings attached. What happens is the following: the IMF comes in and demands that the target nation drops agricultural tariffs. The subsidized crops of the Western hypocrites flood the target and annihilate its farmer/tenant class. The IMF also insists that the nation uses pesticides and fertilizers, which, of course, the West - meaning a few large corporations - produces. In its kindness, the IMF loans money to the nation so it can buy fertilizer and get hooked. When the nation's agriculture fully collapses, the Western governments generously dole out food aid - which is the ultimate tool of blackmail, since men have to eat.

Engdahl discussed some of his stuff in *Seeds of Destruction*.

These are obvious faults of Free Market Fundamentalism - and they are not the only faults.

But let us continue with our brief examination of free-market "thought." Malthus and Bentham we have considered in detail. The latter wanted to legalize usury and jail its victims, while the former desired to kill people once in a while to pacify the free-market. Such wonderful fellows! One of their prominent pupils was David Ricardo (1772-1823). David had been born a Jew, but converted to Unitarianism later in life. He made a wad of dough at the stock market, and, having thus benefited society, retired at the age of 43. He wrote his first article at the age of 37, and became world famous within ten years.

Ricardo's main contribution was his theory of comparative advantage. He noticed the problem mentioned above, namely that a developed nation dominates the "market" by possessing an "absolute

competitive advantage.” Even given that, protection is still bad, argued Ricardo - a nation ought to produce what it can produce most easily, and shut up. With this logic, Britain, since it has coal and iron, will produce gunships and trains and textiles, and the other nations can produce coffee and cotton, and everybody will be happy. And of course, Ricardo’s British Oligarch class would rule supreme, but that goes unmentioned. And so Ricardo went around and argued against tariffs. Wages also, in Ricardo’s sage opinion, Ricardo who had never drawn a laborer’s wage in his life, should be left to “free competition.”

Like many of his fellow “economists,” Ricardo theorized at great length in order to “prove” preconceived assumptions. Immune to reality, he theorized and verbalized and wrote, and since he said what the Oligarchs wanted to hear, he now infests textbook of “economics” and the minds of brainwashed policy makers.

Another notable Benthamite was John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), the author of *On Liberty* (1859). Mill’s father deliberately brainwashed and moulded his son into a “genius” promulgator of utilitarianism and “free-trade.” Bentham and Ricardo were intimate family friends. The regiment of genius worked, but also harmed the young John, who had a mental breakdown at the age of twenty. He eschewed Oxford & Cambridge, of which, given his strenuous education, he had no need anyway, and served the BEIC until 1858. Note that the Sepoy Mutiny occurred in 1857.

Though deserving of much unkindness, J.S. Mill seems to have had genuine ideals of benevolence: he wanted to give women the vote, to ease the British rape of Ireland, and to allow unionism. At the same time, I find it extremely hard to figure out whether *On Liberty* is heartfelt or double-talk; it also seems to me that Mill was something of a true believer. He was a fanatic free-marketeer and utilitarian. Thus, he was against progressive taxation, because he thought that it penalized those who worked harder - but of course, that has never been the point - the point is that those who do not work but collect rents/ profits/ yields amass mountains of wealth. In modern terms, Bill Gates could not care less about a tax of \$30,000 (though he may object on principle), while, with a purported median income in America of about \$31,000, the per-individual confiscation of such a sum would starve the better part of the American population.

At the same time, to be fair to him, Mill favored the inheritance tax, since it provides a level ground for everyone.

Naturally, Mill was a Malthusian.

As with Smith’s work, the Oligarchs took what they liked from Mill’s writings, and forged ahead.

Another standard mistake of the “free-market” doctrine is the treatment of money as a good. It should be understood that not all Market Liberals think alike, and that I focus on a trend that seems prevalent to me. Money is a good just like marble and steel and lumber, the argument goes, and so to build a bridge you need wood and nails and also *capital*. In reality, you just need wood, nails, and a few eager men. Instead of receiving wages, they can build the bridge in their spare time - for fun, or because they need it. Money is only a conduit for the movement and direction of goods (materials) and labor (really energy). By insisting on the commodification of money, the free-marketeers insisted on the concentration of the power to move goods and labor into the money-owning classes - i.e. the bankers and the industrialists, who are *private* individuals. The problem is that if a relatively few people wield great power, they will dominate the government, and any talk of “democracy” or pluralism will be a joke. One way around this, it seems, is to put the power of money/credit creation in public hands. For example, there are about 3,100 counties in the United States - meaning that a county has an average of 100,000 people. Give each county the power to print money (i.e. dish out cheap loans - say, to people who need mortgages) within certain limits (fixed, say, by population, unemployment rate, and other factors). Also give the state and federal governments the same power for larger projects. This will put the power of money creation in public hands, as much as possible. The point is that the government will always be more responsive to the will of the public than would be Rockefeller or Bill Gates.

In 1843, the free-market fanatic, banker, and industrialists James Wilson (1805-1860) founded *The Economist*, which to this day remains a staunch bastion of free-marketeering.

But let us get to the Austrians. They started out in fin-de-siècle (19th siècle) Vienna, and constituted the second wave of free-market "thought." The Austrians drew from the continental rationalist tradition and worked from first principles, eschewing excessive mathematics, statistics, and modelling - while Anglo-American economists naturally drift toward number-crunching and empiricism. And yet somehow they all managed to come up with the same baloney. The Austrians engaged in a bitter epistemological argument with the proponents of the German Historical School of Economics, who thought that history can teach people a thing or two about how things work. The Historical School was dominant in Germany and (academically Prussianized) America in the late 19th century, when America and Germany happened to be the fastest growing, most vibrant economic powers in the world. The Historical School economists also disliked the Classical Economists of the British tradition.

The founder of the Austrian School was Carl Menger (1840-1921), who was born in a minor but wealthy Polish noble family. He studied in Prague, Vienna, and the Jagiellonian University in Krakow. His 1871 *Principles of Economics* became the founding text of the Austrian School. In 1873 he became chair of economic theory at the University of Vienna, where he got to tutor the Crown Prince of Austria - Rudolf - in 1876. The story of Rudolf's life is high tragedy but beyond our scope. In 1878, Franz Joseph gave Menger the chair of political economy at the University of Vienna.

Menger's *Principles* tackle the rather technical issue of marginal (perceived) value. Briefly, the argument says that if you have no water, you value a glass of water highly, while if you have plumbing and a faucet, you place next to no value in water - even though in abstract terms, the glass of water always has the same value.

Given marginal value, the "free-market" argument generally says that people will start producing that which they value the most (at the margin), and stop producing that which they no longer value, and everything will be hunky-dorey. The problem with this wonderful state of affairs is the human propensity toward short-sightedness and mass psychosis. Humans are impressionable. Thus they over-indulge in present fads far beyond the point of sanity, and create boom & bust cycles. A classic example is the Dutch Tulip Bubble of 1637, during which, at one point, tulips were as "valuable" as houses (the specifics of the affair have been disputed). Luckily for the Dutch, the courts regarded tulip debts as gambling debts and therefore not enforceable by law.

Observe that even in the terms of the Economic Liberalists, the "free-market" is only a reflection of the mindset of the general population (composed of specimens of the family of "homo economicus"). It follows that the free-market is about as rational as is the population. So if you have a poorly educated population, or if you have mass madness, the market goes insane and needs, shall we say, doctoring.

A more famous Austrian "economist" was Ludwig von Mises (1881-1973). He was the son of a recently ennobled railroad magnate. Mises studied at the University of Vienna, where he fell under the spell of Menger. During the interbellum, he was an advisor to Dollfuss the Austrian chieftain. In 1934, Mises went to Geneva, where he worked at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, which was formed in 1927 by the League of Nations at the behest of Woodrow Wilson. Evidently, the GIIS is a one-worlder think-tank. Alfred Zimmern of the Round Table Group was a major influence on the GIIS. Rockefeller Foundation grants fuelled the project. Afraid that the Nazis would take over Switzerland, Mises - who was a Jew - went to New York in 1940. There, he settled at the New York University, where he depended upon the patronage of big businessmen, who for some reason loved his work, rather than upon a university salary. In 1947, he co-founded the ultra-free-market Mont Pelerin Society, whose members include Karl Popper and Milton Friedman. Walter Lippmann, John Chamberlain the editor of *Life*, Henry Hazlitt the financial editor of *The New York Times*,

and Felix Morley the Pulitzer winner of the *Washington Post*, have been members of this learned semi-secret society.

We might as well mention that some people seem to distinguish between the "Austrians" and the "Chicago Boys." The distinctions are perfunctory and methodological. When it comes to core doctrine, the two groups preach the same gospel.

Mises's work focused on the fetishization of money, methodological arguments, and propaganda in favor of Classical Liberalism. One of Mises's more idiotic "discoveries" was the notion that the "consumer is king" - meaning that the capitalists merely helplessly and efficiently satisfy the whims of the self-important masses of "consumers," who know best. Of course, in reality, in the modern era, the "consumer" is not a king but a slave. With advertisement, supply trumps demand. People buy what they are convinced they want, not what they need.

To gauge the insanity of Mises, observe that he called Friedman a "socialist," because the latter, with perhaps a few toes in the plane of reality, toyed with some ideas heretical to the Free-Market orthodoxy - for example the progressive tax. In another instance, Mises broke with one of his disciples when the latter dared question the wisdom of the holy gold standard.

A succinct overview of Mises's doctrine can be found in his 1973 (reprinted in 2002) booklet *Economic Policy: Thoughts for Today and Tomorrow*. In summary,

The ideal economic policy, both for today and tomorrow, is very simple. Government should protect and defend against domestic and foreign aggression the lives and property of the persons under its jurisdiction, settle disputes that arise, and leave the people otherwise free to pursue their various goals and ends in life. This is a radical idea in our interventionist age. Governments today are often asked to regulate and control production, to raise the prices of some goods and services and to lower the prices of others, to fix wages, to help some businesses get started and to keep others from failing, to encourage or hamper imports and exports, to care for the sick and the elderly, to support the profligate, and so on and on and on.

Ideally government should be a sort of caretaker, not of the people themselves, but of the conditions which will allow individuals, producers, traders, workers, entrepreneurs, savers, and consumers to pursue their own goals in peace. If government does that, and no more, the people will be able to provide for themselves much better than the government possibly could. This in essence is the message of Professor Ludwig von Mises in this small volume.

... Bettina Bien Greaves, 1995.

Descriptive terms which people use are often quite misleading. In talking about modern captains of industry and leaders of big business, for instance, they call a man a "chocolate king" or a "cotton king" or an "automobile king." Their use of such terminology implies that they see practically no difference between the modern heads of industry and those feudal kings, dukes or lords of earlier days. But the difference is in fact very great, for a chocolate king does not rule at all, he serves. ... This "king" must stay in the good graces of his subjects, the consumers; he loses his "kingdom" as soon as he is no longer in a position to give his customers better service and provide it at lower cost than others with whom he must compete.

Two hundred years ago, before the advent of capitalism, a man's social status was fixed from the beginning to the end of his life; he inherited it from his ancestors, and it never changed. If he was born poor, he always remained poor, and if he was born rich - a lord or a duke - he kept his dukedom and the property that went with it for the rest of his life.

...

This is the fundamental principle of capitalism as it exists today in all of those countries in which there is a highly developed system of mass production: Big business, the target

of the most fanatic attacks by the so-called leftists, produces almost exclusively to satisfy the wants of the masses.

...

The development of capitalism consists in everyone's having the right to serve the customer better and/or more cheaply. And this method, this principle, has, within a comparatively short time, transformed the whole world. It has made possible an unprecedented increase in world population.

... Ludwig von Mises, circa 1959.

And so on in the same spirit. Mises's mistakes are countless, endless, and great. The industrial and financial barons do not *serve* the population, they *pursue profits*. If they can obtain profits without doing anything productive, they do exactly that, as the notorious recent practices of Wall Street have proved. For a standard example, take HFT - High-Frequency-Trading. HFT is the practice of using supercomputers to sneak-in on a transaction to reap a minute "profit." This is pure speculation with no conceivable benefit to society - yet it fits perfectly with the for-profit principle of deregulated "free-markets." The problem of advertisement-driven creation of demand has already been discussed. Another spectacular misconception is the notion that industrial barons do not wield power. In the idealized "free-market" society, money is power - and the avowed goal of the financial and industrial barons is to amass as much money as possible. Moreover, the most perfunctory acquaintance with modern history instructs one of the power of the financial and industrial overlords and the technocrats who have taken over the management of the large corporations. These people do not *serve*. They *rule*.

Then there is the gross error in claiming that "capitalism" has resulted in economic prosperity and even "freedom." "Capitalism" is a form of social organization. The real cause of the economic prosperity of the last two centuries has been the harnessing of non-human energy for the production of goods. This discovery was accomplished partly in the British *caste* society, where a few of the more ingenious members of the leisure class, along, perhaps, with a few academics, came up with and implemented the steam engine and other similar gadgets and techniques. The point is that technological advancement can occur perfectly well in a caste society, whose ruling class, for one reason or another, desires technological progress.

Proponents of Mises like to laud the man's prediction of the failure of "socialism," i.e. Soviet Communism. Mises did say that Soviet Communism will fail, but his reasoning was utterly wrong. He completely ignored historico-geographico-political factors, and focused on his first-principles mumbo jumbo. The difficulty of transport and communication in the vastness of Russia, the terrible Russian winter and thaws, the Russian vulnerability to foreign attacks and the historical instability caused thereby, and the notorious Russian inefficiency that was, in part, the product of the previous factors, made no impression on Mises. His whole argument amounted to - government intervention is bad, and therefore "Communism" will fail. In his "work," Mises pretended to *prove* that government intervention is bad, when in reality he always *assumed* that intervention was bad to begin with. Circular reasoning is a hallmark of the Austrian School.

Another vicious fallacy propounded by Mises was the notion that *social* and *economic* freedom are positively correlated, perhaps even semi-equivalent. The Austrian system rests on complete "freedom" within the context of the total enforcement of contracts and the total protection of "private property" on the part of the governmental police force. Mises, who lived in his own beautiful mental world, assumed that big businessmen *compete*, when in reality they cartelize (i.e. co-operate). With such co-operation and without government or popular intervention, wealth concentrates in a tiny segment of society. With total enforcement of contracts, money is raw power. And so in the perfect Austrian society, you have the "freedom" of choosing between coke and pepsi, between a movie and a pop-"music" compact disc, and also between eating or paying the rent. You can not complain, since "freedom" means the "freedom of making mistakes," and you made a mistake by not receiving enough wages to pay the rent contract, which you mistakenly signed. And if you complain that the overlords of industry conspired to drive wages down and hike rents - which they obviously did - you

are a "communist," an ignoramus, and a knave.

When one points out that 19th century Britain, Robber Baron America, post-Reagan-Thatcher Anglo-America, and nowadays the whole world, resemble societies of the type described above, free-marketeers complain about "crony capitalism" and "corporate welfare." Crony capitalism does exist and is a problem - but rather than an aberration of the "free-market," it is its logical conclusion. Concentrating wealth tends to snowball, and money is power - hence the moneyed class will, in the long run, influence the government for its own benefit. The way to combat this is wealth redistribution, trust busting, and the popular governmental controls of key sectors of the economy - concepts regarded by the free-marketeers as anathema. It does not seem to occur to them that if the measures necessary for the solution of the given "problem" contradict their theory, then perhaps the "problem" fits in it.

Or take Mises's view on the freedom of the press:

Let us take one freedom, the freedom of the press. If the government owns all the printing presses, it will determine what is to be printed and what is not to be printed. And if the government owns all the printing presses and determines what shall or shall not be printed, then the possibility of printing any kind of opposing arguments against the ideas of the government becomes practically nonexistent. Freedom of the press disappears. And it is the same with all the other freedoms.

It does not seem to occur to Mises, who insists that bosses "serve" the "consumers," that Big Business can monopolize the major channels of mass communication, and ban any criticism of itself; or that the "government" can own all printing presses and still allow its citizens to print whatever they want, as long as it is not completely demented. In a sense, there always existed censorship of some sort, since printing was constrained by the availability of paper and presses. In America, the editors and owners of the big publishing houses decided what went to print. Today we have the Internet, and the problem has shifted from managing to get one's writings out there, to finding a large enough audience. Without a doubt, the Internet is more meritocratic than anything we have ever had before - but it still has limitations.

Enough of Mises. The man was not a scientist, but an ideologue. His doctrines were easily as pernicious as those of Marx, though it appears to me that whereas Marx lied deliberately, Mises was a true believer-useful idiot. Naturally, Mises won the Noble Prize.

Mises's heir was Friedrich Hayek (1899-1992). The man was another Hapsburg noble, this time of Bohemian extraction. He studied in Vienna, where he encountered Mises and other Austrian "economists." Hayek went to the Fabian-Round Table LSE in 1931, where he got to tutor David Rockefeller. Friedrich became a British subject in 1938. He lived in the States between 1950 and 1962. In his old age, he retired to Germany and Austria.

Hayek's 1944 *The Road to Serfdom*, which kindly explained that fascism is in fact "socialist" rather than "capitalist," proved extremely popular, and found an American publisher in 1945 in the form of the University of Chicago. Like his mentor, Hayek thought that any government intervention and planning is bad and leads to no "freedom," while Classical Liberalism - with certain caveats, for Hayek had a firmer grasp of reality than some of his colleagues - leads to great "freedom."

Let it be clear that I do not endorse the Soviet system of forced labor. That is not the point. The issue is that if a nation wants to develop its own industry, it needs protection, and can well benefit from governmental subsidies and tax-breaks, and government projects. For two standard examples of government projects, take nuclear energy and computers. Both were developed by the American government (in the case of computing, the British and German governments had their own projects). Microprocessors were developed by ostensibly "private" firms, funded in reality by

massive government contracts.

In 1955, Hayek founded the Institute of Economic Affairs. This institute claims to be Britain's top "free-market" think-tank.

During his stint in the United States, Hayek head-quartered at the University of Chicago. Ironically, though he influenced the Chicago Boys, they did not let him teach at their department.

In 1974, Hayek got the Noble Prize in reward for his services for Big Business.

The man was a great influence on Maggie Thatcher, the ruiner of the British economy, and Reagan, the annihilator of the American economy. Hayek also influenced the gaggle of Eastern European lunatics who brought about the 1990s collapse. Elizabeth II made Hayek a member of the Order of the Companions of Honour in 1980. Bush I gave him a Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1991.

Again, one has to marvel at the blindness of the Patriot Movement to the fact that Hayek, one of the top two Austrians, 1) served at the New World Order LSE and University of Chicago; and 2) was a favorite of prominent New World Order leaders and a recipient of their top prizes.

Let us examine one last Austrian "economist" - Joseph Schumpeter (1883-1950). Schumpeter was another University of Vienna cadre. Between 1920 and 1924, he managed the Biedermann Bank, which collapsed in the post-war disintegration of the German-speaking world. Schumpeter moved to the States in 1932. He taught at Harvard.

His main "contribution" is the theory of "creative destruction." The idea is that entrepreneurs come up with new stuff and their inventions cause the destruction of old industries - and that is OK. That invention causes obsolescence is a truism. The problem with "creative destruction" is that doctrinaire and malevolent "economists" and policy makers argue against any attempts at curbing recessions and depressions, under the assumption that the bust periods of the "economic cycle" are a natural occurrence, a product of divine will, and therefore no intervention could possibly help the economy in any way. My impression is that while most free-marketeers say that "government intervention" is to blame for "market inefficiencies," which the market in its wisdom tries to "correct" by collapse and depression, the Schumpeter line of thought implies that even in perfect "free-market" conditions, boom and bust cycles may occur, and that is just fine. The moral of the story is that no matter what, government intervention is bad - even when there is 30% unemployment and mass poverty, and the people contemplate revolution and cannibalism.

It is worth observing that the Austrians postulate that booms occur when "governments" dole out too much (more than the market "wants") credit, and that the inevitable contraction caused by "market forces" causes the busts. It is true that "irrational exuberance" (as the ghoulish Greenspan put it) does cause cataclysms. But the problem lies in the issuance of cheap credit for purposes of speculation rather than the real necessary production of useful goods. Thus certain Austrians (Hayek in 1929, Peter Schiff more recently) "predicted" the great crashes by a fluke. Wasting credit on speculation will obviously lead to trouble. The Austrians, however, object to the issuance of cheap credit for useful production during depressions, because they feel that the market ought to decide how much credit it wants by itself. Unfortunately for the Austrians, the market really is an expression of popular opinion, and in times of mass psychosis, the market experiences schizophrenia and depression. Continuing, with a tongue in cheek, to treat the market anthropomorphically, we observe that in market, as in human, depressions, one must alleviate the underlying cause of the depression to better the condition of the subject.

To appreciate the lunacy of the sacrosanct creative destruction of the boom and bust cycle, try to apply the doctrine in other contexts. Suppose you fall and break your leg. You need not set the bone or disinfect the wound - just leave it to nature. In a more extreme sense, what need do we have of cultivation, when we can let the "free-market" grow berries for us? A rabid free-marketeer would misconstrue the last examples, and say that, no, Classical Liberalism favors invention and enterprise! But that is not the point - the point is that Classical Liberalism forbids the conscious and deliberate adoption of pragmatic solutions to vital, tractable problems. Thus, Classical Liberalism is a thoroughly barbaric and obscurantist religion (or school of thought, or ideology - whatever you

prefer).

Another absurd Austrian notion is that the government is some sort of an abstract quasi-anthropomorphic personification of evil - the opposite of the market, which is good. That is nonsense - the government is a tool in the hands of the dominant castes in society, and its actions reflect the rulers' mindset. If you have a profit-obsessed ruling class, you will have a crony capitalist government. That is elementary.

Or take the bizarre assumption that "free-trade" increases production. No! Suppose you have a steel mill in a nation where coal is hard to get, and a steel mill in a nation where coal is easy to get. The first nation protects its mill with a tariff. The Anglo-Americans arrive, bomb the first nation's capital, and demand Free Trade. The tariff vanishes. Cheap steel from the second nation's mill floods the markets of the first nation. The formerly subsidized factory goes bankrupt. Its workers, unemployed, can no longer afford to buy steel products. The second nation's factory's output, after a brief expansion, collapses to below its original levels, since the first nation's population can not import as much as it could before. The total production of steel has declined by more than a half. This is exactly what happens in the real world - take a look at the effects of NAFTA and GATT.

I have repeatedly made the point that "free-trade" favors the strong. Chauvinistic minded people conclude that since their country stands to benefit from a war or a looting, they themselves will also profit. Unfortunately for these bloody-minded fellows, that is not how things work. Under total "free-trade," the oligarchical elements at the predator nation receive the opportunity to *undercut domestic wages at will*. A strike? Off goes the factory to China. A strong union of textile workers? Plenty of maquiladoras down in Mexico! That is how the process develops in the real world. "Free-trade" does favor the strong - in your society as well as on the international scene.

It follows from the above reasoning that the free-market can only really work *given a level playing ground*. Something like the "free-market" worked in 19th century America, because the states and the people were relatively equitable in wealth. When the South fell behind, the system collapsed. When wealth concentrated during the Gilded Age - as it will, under the Classical free-market - and no real measures were taken, the system collapsed again, and Roosevelt had to instate the New Deal *in order to save America and Wall Street both*.

That's the **real** free-market. It is absurd (barring disasters and other pathological developments) to have tariffs between Ohio and Illinois. It is likewise absurd to have no tariffs between the United States and Mexico.

Enough about the Austrians; let us look at the Chicago boys. For lack of space, we will only examine the guru Milton Friedman.

Milton Friedman (1912-2006), was a New York Jew. He studied mathematics at Rutgers, and then enrolled in the University of Chicago graduate program. In the early stage of his career, Friedman regarded Roosevelt's New Deal as "an appropriate response," but protested against price and wage controls. After stints at the government and Columbia, Friedman landed at the University of Chicago in 1946. After winning the Nobel in 1976, Friedman retired and moved to the west coast, where he worked with Stanford and the Hoover Institution. In the 1980s, Friedman acted as Reagan's economic guru, for which Ronnie gave him a Medal of Freedom.

Friedman was a convinced monetarist (i.e. money fetishist), and believed that the job of the economists and the policy makers amounts to taking care of the money supply. In this, he contradicted the Austrians, who wanted to leave the money supply to the market. In this sentiment of his, Friedman approached reality, inasmuch as money supply and credit are related. In times of plenty and inflation, Friedman would contract the money supply to prevent a bubble, and during a deflationary depression, he would expand the money supply to stimulate economic activity. Such

moves were the domain of the central bank, which regulated the interest rate. To contract the money supply, the central bank raises the interest rate, and vice versa.

The problem with this silly theory is that: 1) it only cares about there being the right amount of money - where that money goes is left to the "market."; and 2) one can have an inflationary depression ("stagflation"), in which curbing the money supply halts the inflation but exacerbates the depression.

So for example, Helicopter Ben (and the one to coin the "dropping money from a helicopter" gag was Friedman) has been pumping money into the economy at (near) zero percent interest rates to little effect, because the banks are still afraid to lend (as of January 2012), and because much of the money goes toward covering unpayable unreal debt, and toward new speculative efforts.

And in regard to the first point, Jimmy Carter appointed the monetarist Paul Volker as head of the Fed in August 1979. The unemployment rate in the United States at that time was at a relatively low 5.7-5.8% level. But there was inflation, and so Volker contracted the money supply with sky-high interest rates. When inflation finally fell to about 3% in 1983, the U.S. unemployment had hit a high of about 10.5%. Thus, in about four years, Volker had managed to double the U.S. unemployment rate, bringing untold evils to millions of Americans. Volker's monetary imbecility also emaciated the American steel industry, reducing output from 124 million tons in each of 1978 and 1979, to 68 million tons in 1982. After he relaxed the insanity, employment and steel production gradually picked up.

The evil Margaret Thatcher conducted the exact same process in the United Kingdom.

So, no, sorry, monetarism does not work, and Friedman was a doctrinaire anti-scientist.

Apart from his monetaristic heresy, Friedman was a more-or-less orthodox Classical Economist: government intervention bad, "free-trade" good, et cetera.

Friedman advocated the creation of a school voucher system, in which private schools operate with public funds. This notion is not necessarily as bad as it may sound to the more liberal-minded reader, since it may allow idealistic teachers, who value freedom from restrictive curricula better than pecuniary compensation, to breathe some fresh air into the educational system. Unfortunately, the most likely outcome of such a voucher system would be the complete corporatization of education.

And in general, it should be understood that Friedman and his likes were misguided rather than deliberately evil or dumb. By and large, they meant well. The true villains are the men behind them, the men who elevated the crackpot Liberal economic doctrine into a full-blown cult. The reality is that Economic Liberalism does not work in the sense that it does not benefit the larger society. It does, however, work perfectly fine as far as the wealthy elements of society are concerned. That is, and always has been, the crux of the matter. The oligarchical elements semi-consciously search for doctrines which work for them, and whenever they find something, they use their power of foundation grants and private media outlets to popularize the new creed. Most academics, subjected to brainwashing, and hungry for prestige, conveniently fail to examine their base assumptions, and build elaborate yet patently false theories and receive Noble Prizes and have great fun.

In conclusion, Classical Liberalism with its Austrian and Chicago branches, is a plutocratic religion of greed, invented under the influence of the British and American Oligarchies of the late 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries. As a "science," Classical Liberalism is a total failure. As a "road to freedom," it is a fraud. But as a tool of Oligarchical control, Free Market Fundamentalism has proved most excellent.

9.4.1 Consumerism

We continue our analysis with a look at one of the main logical products of for-profit free-marketeering - consumerism.

Consumerism is the natural culmination of P&P (utilitarianism) and Mammon (Classical Liberalism). The goal of the profiteer is to make profit. To do that he has to peddle stuff. For him to sell stuff, someone has to buy the stuff. At the same time, under P&P, the commoner is supposed to want to satisfy his greed for possessions by buying and accumulating stuff, and enjoying services. Just to make sure the "consumer" gets the point, advertisement informs him of his duties day and night and also in the evening.

This state of affairs leads to casual monstrosity and endless trouble. A few obvious problems caused by consumerism are: 1) the perversion of people's value systems - they can no longer distinguish between what they want and what they need, and they want the silliest things; 2) the introduction of planned obsolescence; 3) the introduction of planned destruction; 4) the systematic mis-allocation of resources, which, even if not scarce, need not be wasted; 5) the destruction of the environment and other such evils, described by the free-marketeer theoreticians as "negative externalities."; 6) the institutionalized brainwashing of the public via the "free speech" of advertisement. The first three points also imply an addiction to novelty for novelty's sake.

The first point is fairly clear and needs no elaboration. When you have people buying new clothes every few months just to look fashionable (instead of to replace worn garments), and when you have people buying tamagochis of all things, and when you have people buying elaborate gadgets which they discard after one use, you have a society in deep existential ("spiritual" has become an even more hackneyed word) malaise.

Then we have planned obsolescence. It so happens that one can sell more stuff and make better profits by making things that break and by constantly introducing new fashions. Hence we buy shoddy products which constantly need replacing. Apple's shenanigans offer an instructive example. The early Apple iPods had atrocious batteries, which wore out in about a year.⁴ Angry customers were advised to invest in the next generation of iPod. A class action lawsuit ensued. Perhaps this was an honest mistake! But in light of a second incident, one has to suspect foul play. The 2010 Apple iPad had no USB port. Now, as we all know, the USB port has become as ingrained in modern computers as the network adapter or the mouse (or equivalent contraptions). A few months later, Apple released their iPad2, which had USB ports. One can only suspect a planned-obsolescence scam.

Understand that the economic thinkers and policy makers of the early 20th century were terrified of the prospect of "over-production." What if they made too much of something, and its price fell, and they went bankrupt? The horror! At that time, the problem, really, was one of income distribution - people could not afford to buy all the stuff, because they did not receive enough dough. After the war, it is conceivable that the problem truly became one of satiation - Americans simply had enough, say, cars. The heroic American can, through strenuous effort, consume ten apple pies when he only wants one, and he can fill two wardrobes with clothes, but, in the end, he can only really drive only one car. The "Third World" markets could only take so many cars, and the Europeans and the Japanese were making their own. What to do? The solution was, of course, to make shoddy cars, and market new automobile looks every few years. Which is what happened.

Two references on the subject which look interesting, but which I have not had the time to procure and read, are: Vance Packard's *The Waste Makers* (1960), and Giles Slade's *Made to Break* (2006). I have read Packard's *The Hidden Persuaders* (1957), and it is an excellent expose on the advertisement scam. Planned obsolescence is extremely prevalent, has been going on for about a century, and is burying us in garbage.

As far as planned destruction goes, we have wars like the ones in Vietnam and Korea. The old model of warfare amounted to marching to the enemy's capital, smashing his army along the way,

⁴<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/fr/1075389/posts>, Jan 1, 2012.

and then demanding realistic tribute in the form of a province or two, some economic concessions, and some payable reparations. With the advent of fanatical nationalism and industrial warfare, say by about the time of the American Civil War (1861), the goal became, when possible, the total annihilation and utter subjugation of the defeated party. It is generally possible to subjugate and assimilate a culturally similar society, the way the Americans assimilated Germany after 1945. But the Americans could never swiftly integrate the Vietnamese or the Afghans (though they have gained some ground in Vietnam *since* the war). Neither did they seriously try to defeat North Korea and North Vietnam, as the reader will find if he researches the wars, which we can not do here. It follows that the wars were waged for purposes other than the defeat of the opposition. Now, there were many of those purposes, and we have discussed plenty of them. An obvious reason for waging and prolonging the war was the fact that it produced an outlet for the American excess industrial capacity / "over-production." The Americans could produce bombs and dump them in the jungle. To see how this could possibly "work," one must look at the world through the topsy-turvy lens of the for-profits crowd. The goal of the free-marketeer is to make profits. Does making bombs (bought via taxpayer money) and dropping them on Vietnam make profits? Yes. Does it benefit America or Vietnam? Hardly, but that is beside the point. It is as simple as that.

It is worth mentioning that many Liberal Economists since the time of Smith have conjectured that mercantile inter-dependence will lead to world peace. They have a point, in the sense that, obviously, peaceful *mutually beneficial* trade beats waging war as far as the population is concerned. When the trade really only benefits one side, however, quasi-colonialism occurs, and that is not peaceful. Moreover, the pure for-profit mindset *regards war as a business opportunity*. Zinn's Civil War examples and Smedley Butler's classic rant provide us with excellent examples of the above phenomenon.

The next point is that the "free-market" is anything but efficient. As we already observed, the free-market is the reflection of popular opinion. And if you have a population convinced that it must pay good prices for raw sewage, the market will give you raw sewage. Planned obsolescence suffices for this argument. Since planned obsolescence is intrinsic in a "free-market" for-profit economy, it follows that free-marketeering is not efficient. Then there is the issue of advertisement-driven consumption. A classic example here is the mania for (plastic) bottled tap water. There used to be a time, when public place had faucets and water fountains and people who got thirsty had a drink. And if they had to go out in the bush, people filled a few old bottle of soda with tap water, and thus armed embarked on their journeys.

At some point in time (around 1980, if memory serves me correctly), it was decided to get Americans to drink bottled water. A massive campaign began. The impression was created that tap water is unsafe, that people are chronically dehydrated, and that bottled water is healthy and necessary. People start buying the stuff. Observe that: 1) most bottled water is tap water; 2) plastic bottles release estrogen-like chemicals; and 3) the mark-ups on bottled water are extreme. These days (circa 2010), North Americans drink \$15 billion worth of bottled water per annum.⁵ For comparison, the GDP of Guatemala, a nation of 15 million souls, is about \$25 million.

So instead of drinking water from public water fountains, Americans manufacture plastic bottles, fill them with tap water, ship the stuff all over North America, and then carry the leftovers to the garbage dump - or, nowadays, to the recycling depot. This is a natural consequence of the unholy union of for-profit free-marketeering, and brainwashing through overt advertisement, and other, subtler, channels.

So, no, the "free-market" is not efficient. The fanatical free-marketeer may say that after all, the free-market only satisfies the whims of the public. But the reality is that: 1) big business makes dough; 2) they use that dough to brainwash the public into buying garbage; 3) and big business makes more dough.

The combination of waste and perverted values sometimes lead to an extreme reaction against

⁵See, for example this: <http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/10164/1064953-109.stm>, Jan 1, 2011.

consumerism. Disgusted with the emptiness of the so-called "consumer lifestyle," people turn to asceticism, sometimes coupled with the zealous dedication to some spiritual/social outlet. The main problem is that this reaction sometimes leads to pronounced anti-industrialism, typified by many dedicated environmentalists. Let it be clear that *the problem is not industry in itself*, but *senseless waste*. I feel that it is fair to say that plumbing, electric light, efficient transport, instant communications, refrigeration, and other such amenities, serve to diminish the concerns with the more mundane, *necessary* aspects of life, and allow people to turn to the uniquely human joys of useful work, original thought, interpersonal decency, and the appreciation of "nature." The basic negators of hardship, we can use - and industry provides them. Planned obsolescence and the degradation of consumerism are destroying us, and we ought to abolish them. Thus the problem is not over-population or over-industrialization, but the senseless waste of human effort and the bounty of "nature" (or "God").

Of brainwashing, we have said enough. Still, let us point out that since at least the time of John Stuart Mill (say, 1850), many Classical Liberal Economists have strongly advocated free speech. In itself, free speech is wonderful. The problem, of course, is brainwashing. Since they began advertising around, say, the late 19th century, the corporations have insisted that advertisement is a manifestation of free speech. They have the right, you see, to promote their products.

Unfortunately, it is hard to distinguish between "brainwashing" and the genuine defence of worthwhile points. Thus, many may regard the current work as "propaganda." What are we to do? I feel that, in many cases, it should nevertheless be possible to make a clear distinction between valid free speech and blatant propaganda. Thus, the unabashed advertisement of a commercial product we may regard as undesirable propaganda. This should probably be regulated by the government. Proponents of free speech will justifiably say that once you get the ball rolling, who knows what will happen. At the same time, between the corporate control of the media, and the ridiculous control-freak-socialism notion of "political correctness," we do not really have free speech anyway. The subject merits debate in its proper place.

The question also arises, are advertisement and the free-market really compatible? After all, does not advertisement interfere with the "natural" propensities of the free-market? Should not the word of mouth be the method of propagation of the holy will of the free-market? Luckily, the Internet has begun to allow people to rely on the opinions of other "consumers" rather than on propaganda when it comes to making purchases. Internet-savvy people are abandoning television and printed newspapers en masse. It is possible to control the amount of online advertisement at the user's end.⁶ And in making purchases, people can consult user reviews, which tend to be quite accurate when it comes to goods that serve utilitarian rather than esthetic purposes.

In summary, consumerism is a pernicious outgrowth of the lunatic religion of Free Market Fundamentalism. The ways to combat consumerism are obvious - figure out what you really need and buy only that, and make stuff that is durable and elegant. Unfortunately, if we were to kill consumerism this instant, 1) the world economy would collapse, and 2) people would riot, because they would feel deprived of what they feel they need. What we need is not only a general restructuring of the world economy toward saner ends, but also an overall change in the current Western outlook. Ironically, the forces in charge of the world may push toward exactly those two goals, 1) because the world economy will likely collapse anyway, and 2) for purposes of Malthusianism. Serious people with some influence over popular opinion or policy making should strive to high-jack the Oligarchical effort.

9.4.2 "Objectivism" (Ayn Rand)

Of all the branches of Free Market Fundamentalism, the worst is Ayn Rand's anti-human creed of so-called "Objectivism." The name of the cult should alert the reader to Rand's heroic egotism.

⁶Try AdBlock for Mozilla.

Ayn Rand (1905-1982), nee Alisa Zinov'yevna Rosenbaum, was the daughter of a prosperous (rich enough to hire servants) pharmacist in Russia. Her mother loathed her and her sisters. During the Revolution, the Bolsheviks took her father's pharmacy. The family fled to White Crimea and then to St Petersburg, where they struggled with poverty. By her early adulthood, Rand had become an "atheist" and purported to believe in "reason." After things settled in Russia, Rosenbaum enrolled at the Petrograd State University, where she studied philosophy. She liked Aristotle and hated Plato. As is obvious from her writings, she adored Nietzsche. By around 1924, when she managed to graduate, Rosenbaum had decided to adopt the pseudonym "Ayn Rand." In 1925, she was allowed to visit her relatives in the States. She spent a few months in Chicago, where her folks owned a movie theater, which she frequented. Next came Hollywood, where Rand managed to get a job as a screen writer. She married young actor Frank O'Connor in 1929, and two years later she was an American citizen.

Rand's first published novel was the 1936 anti-Soviet effort *We the Living*. In that book, Rand professed an admiration for the methods though not the ideals of the Reds: "I loathe your ideals. I admire your methods. If one believes one's right, one shouldn't wait to convince millions of fools, one might just as well force them." Next came *Anthem*, published in England in 1938. Both works sold poorly in their first printings, but went out like hot bread when re-released in the 1940s and 1950s at the peak of Rand's popularity.

Sometime in the 1940s, Rand met Ludwig von Mises. Though she could not fully agree with him, inasmuch as he was not she, Rand approved of the Austrian school's general mode of "thinking."

The woman's breakthrough came in 1943 with *The Fountainhead*, the first of her two key novels. Rand finished the novel while high on bennies. She stayed on those for years, and likely fried her already volatile brains, which would explain the nonsense she wrote.

In 1951, Rand switched coasts, flying east to New York. There, she organized a cult around herself. Her circle she dubbed "The Collective." Notable specimens included Nathan Blumenthal (1930-), who would later rename himself to Nathaniel Branden; and the notorious Alan Greenspan, the future wrecker of America.

The sexually insatiable Ayn Rand, who exhibited all of the symptoms of sociopathy, seduced the quarter-of-a-century younger Nathan, who happened to have a wife - Deborah. Both Deborah and Rand's husband gave the hot couple the go-ahead.

Ayn's greatest work, the renowned hackjob *Atlas Shrugged*, hit humanity like a ton of fertilizer in 1957. Rand insisted that rather than a second-rate overlong fantasy novel, her piece was a profound work of theretofore unfathomed philosophical depths. Now, it is debatable whether Rand had the faintest understanding of either *philos* or *sophia*. It is certain, however, that she was a master of sophistry.

With her book, the hack Rand had managed to strike some chord of American hubristic hypocrisy. She became rich and famous, and hit the lecture circuit to build up her cult.

Young Branden found himself a Hollywood starlet in 1964. Rand, who had stolen Branden from his wife Deborah, did not enjoy being on the loser's side, and dumped her former lover in 1968, though the two had not been physically intimate for a while, perhaps because of Rand's age, or possibly on account of the woman's "atrocious personal hygiene."⁷ Ayn Rand was a consummate hypocrite - and proud of it, as we will see. Branden apologized for being a Randist. The cult declined along with Rand by the late 1970s. The woman died in her apartment, alone save for a hired nurse, in 1982.

As a convinced Austrian and a proud self-made woman, Rand would never have resorted to the evils of welfare - except that she did.⁸

(Joshua Holland for *Alternet*) ...Her books provided wide-ranging parables of "parasites," "looters" and "moochers" using the levers of government to steal the fruits of her heroes'

⁷<http://www.forbes.com/sites/booked/2010/04/01/booked-bio-who-is-ayn-rand/>, Jan 1, 2012.

⁸http://www.alternet.org/teaparty/149721/ayn_rand_railed_against_government_benefits,_but_grabbed_social_security_and_medicare_when_she_needed_them/?page=entire, Jan 1, 2012.

labor. In the real world, however, Rand herself received Social Security payments and Medicare benefits under the name of Ann O'Connor (her husband was Frank O'Connor). As Michael Ford of Xavier University's Center for the Study of the American Dream wrote, "In the end, Miss Rand was a hypocrite but she could never be faulted for failing to act in her own self-interest."

...

"Morally and economically," wrote Rand in a 1972 newsletter, "the welfare state creates an ever accelerating downward pull."

Journalist Patia Stephens wrote of Rand:

(She) called altruism a "basic evil" and referred to those who perpetuate the system of taxation and redistribution as "looters" and "moochers." She wrote in her book "The Virtue of Selfishness" that accepting any government controls is "delivering oneself into gradual enslavement."

Having worked her entire life, Rand had paid Social Security, and was entitled to benefits. A fellow "Objectivist," Isabel "Pat" Paterson, had avoided paying SS on principle, and had died a pauper. Rand, who had gotten sick and had encountered the wonders of for-profits medical care (which is indeed crony capitalism), opted for letting the evil government save her hide.

Indeed, not only was Rand a sociopath, as Mark Ames correctly observes below - but she also worshipped a mass murderer.⁹

(Mark Ames for *The Exiled*) One reason why most countries don't find the time to embrace her thinking is that Ayn Rand is a textbook sociopath. Literally a sociopath: Ayn Rand, in her notebooks, worshiped a notorious serial murderer-dismemberer, and used this killer as an early model for the type of "ideal man" that Rand promoted in her more famous books - ideas which were later picked up on and put into play by major right-wing figures of the past half decade, including the key architects of America's most recent economic catastrophe - former Fed Chair Alan Greenspan and SEC Commissioner Chris Cox - along with other notable right-wing Republicans such as Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, Rush Limbaugh, and South Carolina Gov. Mark Sanford.

...

Back in the late 1920s, as Ayn Rand was working out her philosophy, she became enthralled by a real-life American serial killer, William Edward Hickman, whose gruesome, sadistic dismemberment of 12-year-old girl named Marion Parker in 1927 shocked the nation. Rand filled her early notebooks with worshipful praise of Hickman. According to biographer Jennifer Burns, author of *Goddess of the Market*, Rand was so smitten by Hickman that she modeled her first literary creation - Danny Renahan, the protagonist of her unfinished first novel, *The Little Street* - on him.

What did Rand admire so much about Hickman? His sociopathic qualities: "Other people do not exist for him, and he does not see why they should," she wrote, gushing that Hickman had "no regard whatsoever for all that society holds sacred, and with a consciousness all his own. He has the true, innate psychology of a Superman. He can never realize and feel 'other people.'"

...

(*The Fountainhead* is Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas's favorite book - he even makes his clerks learn it.)

Ames quotes an Alan Greenspan tidbit from the pinnacle of the Randian era of the 1950s: "Parasites who persistently avoid either purpose or reason perish as they should." And that was the man in charge of the economy of America during the cataclysmic 1987-2006 era. He did manage to bail ship

⁹<http://exiledonline.com/atlas-shrieked-why-ayn-rands-right-wing-followers-are-scarier-than-the-manson-family> Jan 1, 2012.

at the right moment, though.

A number of interviews with Rand can be found online, including ones with Mike Wallace (during the fifties), Tom Snyder, and Phil Donahue (both in the Carter era). Those are the sources of the Rand protestations listed below.

To get a quick idea of what Rand was about, consider the plots of her two major novels. I have to admit that I could not read the things. I tried to tackle *Atlas*, but the stuff is unreadable - its literature is weak and its "philosophy" is revolting. As far as *Fountainhead* goes, some years ago I read a good deal of Terry Goodkind's writings. Goodkind is a fantasy writer who stole from the fantasist Robert Jordan and from Ayn Rand in about equal proportions. His *Faith of the Fallen*, which I read, is a rip-off of *The Fountainhead*. But one does not need to subject himself to the torture of reading Rand to get her message.

Now, *The Fountainhead* tells of the architect Howard Roark (who is a male idealization of Rand), a Promethean genius who suffers in the hands of evil socialists and other vermin at every turn. After a good deal of hanky panky and other romantic fun, Roark ends up designing a (dastardly socialist) housing project. But someone changes his design, and Roark goes and blows up the housing project. At his trial, Roark tells us the jury about the joys of selfishness, and they acquit him, and Roark gets the girl (whom he has raped earlier, in Rand's opinion "justifiably") and builds a skyscraper for her (to borrow some Randian imagery). And that is Rand's ideal - the sociopathic egomaniacal terrorist.

But wait! *Atlas* is even better! In *Atlas*, the Oligarchical industrial overlords of society, who, in Rand's opinion, have built everything worth caring about, decide to go on strike. Before we continue, we observe that to build a skyscraper, one needs architects, plumbers, construction workers, a steel industry, and a great many other things. The skyscraper is a great example of human cooperation. But that did not seem to matter to Rand.

And so the smart fellows go to strike, led by the indomitable superman John Galt (who is a taller, prettier, smarter, maler Ayn Rand). They are striking against the collectivisation of society, evil socialism, and the progressive tax. To drive their message home, the brave individualists tank their corporations, bringing about the collapse of society, and therefore megadeath. So if anyone asks you "Who is John Galt?", you can reply that "John Galt is an evil genocidal psychopath." The idea is that the pathetic insects of humanity would realize their folly, and would learn to obediently serve their masters. How this arrangement would differ from Communism, it is hard to see. The masturbatory culmination of the thousand-plus page book is John Galt's seventy-page long diatribe on "Objectivism."

It is worth pointing out that, judging by what they are doing, our banker friends seem to have read *Atlas Shrugged*. The strange New World Order denouncer John Todd, who claimed to have been an "Illuminati witch," said that Phillip Rothschild, who according to Todd had been Rand's lover, had commissioned *Atlas Shrugged*. Whether that is true or not, it is conceivable that the top honchos may try something along the lines given by Rand. Then again, they might be bunglers.

As for Objectivism, it is a half-baked mix of Austrian "economics," Nietzsche, Dostoyevsky's Raskolnikov (who was a Nietzschean archetype, and whom Dostoyevsky vehemently denounced), Darwinism, and the Talmud. In her arrogance, Rand claimed that her only influence was Aristotle - a patent lie, though she did appreciate Aristotle's oligarchical notion of there being a few intrinsically superior people and a horde of inferior types destined for slavery.

Whereas most Liberal economists from Smith on say that greed is bad, but that fortunately it leads to good via the free-market, the Randists proclaim that greed is not only good, but also the only basis of morality. Altruism, for Rand, was the ultimate evil. The only moral thing to do was to take care of Number One. The woman was extremely proud of being self-made - except that her parents had pawned their jewelry to smuggle her out of Russia, which she loathed, to Chicago, where her other relatives helped her out.

Thus, Objectivism is, of course, to a large degree, nothing but a rehash of the old Luciferian religion of Albert Pike et al.

Though she could never have had the guts to admit it, Rand had stumbled upon the eternal truism that if you tell people what they want to hear - and particularly if you tell the powerful what they want to hear - you will be rewarded. Licking boots and making compliments works. That is what Rand did, and she had the fortune of believing the drivel she put to paper. Young, sharp, insecure people in a for-profit infested society are particularly vulnerable to Rand's pernicious dogma. One finds it endlessly curious how most Randian fanatics are no captains of industry, but helpless opinionated drones (this is necessarily true by the pigeon-hole principle, there being many Randists and few captains of industry). That is how it goes. "Objectivism" is a textbook example of the building of a cult. Combine a dominant, ruthless personality with vague promises of the secret to Power, and a comfortable all-encompassing worldview, work at it for a few years, and you will obtain a cult.

In Rand's opinion, her philosophy was radically new and the only way forward for humanity. Of course, there was nothing new about her stuff. People have always known Rand's ideas, and have consistently labelled them "evil." Christianity in itself was a revolt against doctrines like "Objectivism." Rand denied Christianity, insisting on founding her beliefs on "reason." She could, in her opinion, prove her axioms - a patent absurdity. Fundamentally, in all likelihood - though I would love to be proven wrong - no existential philosophy (and that includes Darwinism) can be *proved*. That is the whole point - you take something for granted, and proceed from there. One can not build edifices out of thin air. Sure, you can lead your life according to Rand's principles. If you are smart, lucky, and ruthless enough, you may become "successful," and you may find a few admirers along with many who think you a heel. More likely, you will antagonize too many people with your delusions of grandeur, and will become an embittered failure. It is also possible to build an entire society on Randian principles. The society would not work particularly well - there will be violence, corruption, narrow-mindedness, and all other evils. But you can have one. Perhaps the reader can think of the real-life example of Randland.

An able double-thinker, Rand realized that religion is merely a set of postulates, that Communism really is a religion, and that people always need a belief system - and yet regarded her own petty line of thought as original, "rational," and unarguable.

Tellingly, Rand greatly admired the Romantic movement, perhaps without realizing that it stemmed from the German occult tradition, but surely aware that Romanticism offered the prototype for Nietzsche's superman. To Rand, Romanticism was objectively, provably the best artistic movement. She correctly observed that the American Oligarchs are pushing toward collectivism. In this vein, she expressed a thorough hatred for crony capitalism and condemned the "government" for supporting the crony capitalists - and yet she also said that it is evil to hate people for their "virtues," i.e. their material success. In reality, crony capitalism is the epitome of looking out for number one. Government is a tool, and it reflects the mindset and the interests of the dominant social class. Hence, by using the government to their advantage, the crony capitalists practised Randian virtue. The woman in her hypocrisy envied them for their privilege, while never admitting her own privileges.

The victim of a severe childhood, Rand experienced terrible depressions. She was a classic "bipolar" type.

But let us close this farce with three egregious examples of what Ayn Rand really was about.

Apart from appreciating Lenin's methods, she said that to her, plotting against any government, which expropriates her hard-earned money, is justifiable and a natural expression of self-defence. At the same time, she said that she expected the government to protect her, and that she deplored physical violence. More doublethink.

In regard to post-Shah Iran, Miss Rand opined that "naked savages" should never be allowed to nationalize the stuff built by "us." Murdering and enslaving those one can murder and enslave seemed perfectly natural to Rand, as it had to Karl Marx some years earlier. Savages, she felt, have no right over their soil if they do nothing with it - an almost verbatim quote of Marx & Engels. It is also curious how when it comes to building stuff in Iran, Rand becomes a part of the collective ("we"), but when it comes to paying progressive taxes, she is the violated "I."

And last, when challenged, Rand explained that she never argued her beliefs, and that she had never met an "honorable" adversary. In other words, she was a prophetess, the carrier of "nature's" divine pantheistic message, or perhaps even a demigod. Who knows with that Rand.

The real problem with Rand is her enduring popularity. In a certain sense, psychopaths will always find lit candles to circle around. Rand's bolderdash is about as pernicious as Marx's garbage, but from the opposite direction. Marxism tends to attract the altruist true believers, those who really want to help, and Rand attracts the pure psychopaths, and the neurotics - most of them fundamentally decent - who mistake a craving for attention with "individualism."

Rand's writings have consistently won book popularity awards. Some rankings put *Atlas Shrugged* second only to the Bible in world literature. Such rankings have been, most likely, doctored.¹⁰ While serious people, by and large, correctly regard Rand as a kook, she has a small hardcore following in influential positions. Pertinently, though the current 2012 Republican presidential candidate Congressman Ron Paul, popular among the anti-NWO crowd, is "merely" Austrian in his views, his son Senator Randal Howard "Rand" Paul is a fanatical Randist.

The influential Cato Institute advocates a Rando-Austrian position. Notorious Oligarchs such as the Koch brothers support (and indeed co-founded) the institute. These Koch brothers were among the main railroaders of the ill-fated American Tea Party movement of the early Obama presidency. Their Koch Industries is the largest privately held American company by revenue. Sixty of the major foundations also back the Cato Institute.

But as Johann Hari remarked in his November 2009 overview of two biographies of Rand for *Slate*, Alisa Rosenbaum was a trainwreck of a woman who deserved the one thing she craved but pretended to deride: compassion.

9.5 Multiculturalism

This section focuses on the problem of migration and cultural disruption. We focus on the effects on Mexico and America derived from the Mexican immigration into the United States, and the results of the Muslim migration to Europe.

In general, "left-wingers" regard migration as good and say that in any case the migrants are not to blame for anything, and the "right-wingers" regard migration as bad and blame the immigrants for various problems. In reality, migration *is* a problem, and the migrants *are not* to blame for their and their hosts' plight.

Disclosure: I am myself an immigrant. My parents took me with them when I was a child. I hold European and Canadian citizenships. My impression is that the education I was given attempted to internationalize me so that I would be able to serve in the expanding international bureaucracy. People I know who share my predicament tend to have integrated in their new societies to a very great degree - for better or for worse - in both personal and social terms.

Before we get to the causes for migration, let us briefly summarize the problems it causes. Migration hurts the emigrant nation by emaciating the vitality of its labor force and by "brain-draining." Old people do not emigrate except to join their children and grandchildren. Thus, most emigrants are people in their prime. Moreover, since the Western nations understandably prefer to naturalize educated people, the emigrant stream hurts the intelligentsia of the nation of origin. The immigrant nation can conceivably benefit from immigration. As we all know, America is an "immigrant nation." The crux is that the historical American immigrants were *culturally aligned*.

¹⁰Take a look at the website <http://www.librarything.com/>. It contains a large statistical sample of people's preferences. As of Jan 2, 2012, the most popular books of our time appear to be J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* romances. *Atlas* is at number 116, and *Fountainhead* at 140. Ayn Rand is the 108th most popular author, and her disciple Terry Goodkind is number 136.

They were Christian, mostly Protestant; European, mostly from the North (including Poland); and white. The black slave "immigrants" have been a serious enough problem for American society - and let the reader not misconstrue what I say - the legacy of the slave trade has been a source of discontent for *both* the whites and the blacks of the United States. Culturally, the blacks have assimilated well enough, and have contributed significantly to the American tradition. Unfortunately, their color singled them out for segregation, which led to their developing a separate - though reasonably compatible - subset of American society. The Irish could integrate with white America, the Italians could integrate, even the Jews managed to integrate to some degree - but the blacks have always remained in the margins of America. At the same time, it is both more correct and more politically astute to regard the blacks as a subset of the larger American underclass, which consists, also, of Hispanics, the rednecks (in the positive, Joe Bageant sense of the word), and the urban booboisie (Mencken's term).

Hence, an integrable immigrant population can be a boon for an expanding nation. The problem is that these days, America is not expanding too quickly, and that the current wave of immigrants to America is not particularly assimilable. The largest immigrant group is that of the Mexicans and other Latin Americans. They are Catholic, and thus at least Christian, but not Protestant. They are brown, which is a serious problem for a historically white-dominated society endowed with a sizeable black minority. And they are non-English speaking, which, when they arrive in large enough numbers, creates awful difficulties in assimilation.

That is because sudden influxes of linguistically separate groups result in ghettoization and segregation. Note that it is not, necessarily, white America's fault that immigrants segregate. They segregate on their own volition! They go to the people they understand - what else could they do? With ghettoization comes cultural clash and social tension, which, when present in sufficient proportion, may capsize society. I can not think of a good enough example, except perhaps Israel, because mass migration of this type is a relatively recent phenomenon. Mass migrations did occur back in the nomadic days of thousands of years ago, but then the planet was sparsely populated, and nationalism and the state did not exist.

Another new group of migrants to America are the Chinese. Since they have been arriving in small numbers, they tend to assimilate excellently, but as their numbers swell, segregation and clannishness will begin to occur. It is worth pointing out that in some places (say, Indonesia), the Chinese play the role that the Jews had in Europe - middlemen between the population and the ruling oligarchy. The British got the Indians to play the same role in, say, Kenya.

Then there is the Muslim immigration to America, which, I feel, is unwise, and indicative of high-level foul play. In principle, the Muslims are people like other people. The problem is that they are brown, non-Christian, and non-English-speaking. To top it all, America has been destroying the Muslim world for about half a century, and with particular vigor in the last two decades. This creates "blowback." Why on Earth would the US policy makers invite Muslims over to the States? Fortunately - for both the Americans and the Muslims - the Muslim immigrant pool is still fairly limited and can be assimilated in the long run. As for the Muslims - they are people just like other people. There are some crazed "Sharia" Muslims, but there also are uniquely American crazies like the fundamentalist Mormons, of whom one can read in the references already provided. And there are crazed "Christians."

Speaking of which, integration into North American society usually takes only one generation. The American school system is particularly geared toward ensuring assimilation. The problems tend to arise when the children of immigrants study in segregated schools and drop out before integrating. Forceful de-segregation does not work in either practical or moral terms; nor can the government create what would be, in effect, re-education camps. Thus, we are dealing with a potentially insoluble existential problem.

Moreover, in times of prosperity, cultural antagonisms tend to retreat to the shadows. In times of trouble, however, the various ethnic groups, encouraged by the oligarchy which usually causes the suffering in the first place, jump at each others' throats.

It should be stressed that people who have immigrated as children younger than, say, 10-12, tend to integrate more-or-less seamlessly, and should be awarded citizenships under certain light conditions. I know that some would disagree, but what else could be done? The children can not be blamed - and if they have grown up in America, they are Americans. Let them fully participate in society.

The same arguments apply in regard to the Muslim immigration to Europe.

Eastern Europeans are not that much of a problem, since they are white, Christian, and linguistically compatible with their western neighbors. Moreover, Eastern Europe suffers dreadful demographic collapse, and would be well advised to resist emigration - though that is easier said than done. The Eastern European gypsies, on the other hand, are nothing but trouble. They have not even integrated in Eastern Europe, though they have resided there for centuries. Should the reader itch to accuse me of racism, I advise him to acquaint himself with the gypsies ("Roma"). I do not say that they should be gassed or treated like second hand citizens or hated - I merely point out that they are unassimilable, culturally alien to their host nations, and hence a source of social friction.

Another point is that the educated, language-savvy immigrants have a far easier time finding a common language with their hosts. There being relatively few of them, the educated immigrants integrate relatively easily. The problem they cause is twofold: they deprive their motherland of leadership; and they may displace the host population from high-level academic and professional positions.

Then again, the migrant - educated or not - may benefit both his new homeland, for which he works, and his old homeland, to which he sends dough. Unfortunately, you can hardly build a nation with the helpings sent by emigrants.

Which brings us to the question: what are the driving forces of migration? There always will be a few adventurers out in the world, who want to see new things and explore strange lands. But even they, in their older years, want to settle. Most people, however, only leave their hearths and motherlands *under extreme duress*. Thus it is a truism that people migrate from one place to another in search of a better life. Anti-immigration Westerners tend to argue that the nasty barbarians want to invade the West to scam its welfare system. This is true to a small (perhaps tiny) extent, but does not present the whole picture. People migrate, because the situations in their nations become unbearable. The anti-immigrant argument says that the barbarians are to blame for their own troubles. This is practically never true. America has always had the benefit of security in isolations. The Europeans, in between their fratricidal orgies, managed to exploit a good part of the world. Since 1960, they have abated their plunders, though the looting continues in less obvious economic forms. Thus, the IMF and Anglo-American imperialism, have ruined, at one time or another, many of the world's nations. That is why people emigrate.

But there must be two for tango, and so one has to ask why the Western nations demand (or accept) immigration. One reason is their inability to keep immigrants out. That is what Americans have on their Mexican borders, though to a lesser degree than generally thought. The Europeans do not have that problem. Ostensibly, the only reason for *inviting* immigrants in a modern nationalistic society, is lack of labor. Europe is in an acute demographic crisis. At the same time, it is not like the European nations are in a neverending losing battle with full employment. Something is not right. Under the for-profits model, inviting desperate manual laborers who are willing to do the dirty work in a society makes sense. In the long run, this collapses wages, but that is not an issue for the profit-seekers.

Then there is the Oligarchical conspiracy side of the issue. As we know, the Oligarchs want their New World Order, and to have that, they want to destroy nationalism and merge the world's cultures into one synthetic mess. By all indications, they are employing mass immigration to destroy the historically homogeneous and powerful white European societies. I suspect that they seethe at Japan's resistance to immigration, and plot God knows what against the Japanese.

To legalize and excuse this mass immigration, the Oligarchs have invented the silly ideology of multiculturalism. Cultures are nice, the idea goes, and people are nice, and racism is bad, and so to show that they are not racist, and to enjoy the benefits of other cultures, the Westerners should invite millions of peoples of all sorts of faiths, languages, cultures, and colors.

Multiculturalism is patently wrong, since, nice though cultures may be, they are not necessarily compatible. North Americans and Europeans have their own cultures to work on. Let them appreciate other people's cultures - at a distance. Compromising and tolerating others means suppressing, rather than solving, conflicts. It is best if there are no conflicts to begin with. In light of the fate of the "indigenous" (an absurd appellative) population of America, and of the black slaves, it is blatantly clear that cultural clashes will inevitably occur when immigration outpaces a nation's capacity for assimilation. Moreover, the assimilation of culturally alien elements will inevitably change the overall outlook of a nation. But what about the natural-born inhabitants of the multicultural nation? What if they do not feel eager to change their outlook?

Another problem is that it is hard to qualitatively evaluate an outlook. Without going into details, observe that the Japanese and the American cultures differ from each other, but are both "successful," in the sense that they are prosperous, internally peaceful (though America has sank in the last three-four decades), and stable. Who is to say which of the two cultures is "better"? How can one even compare them? And more pertinently, if a mad alchemist were to mix the two cultures, how do we know that the result will not manifest the least desirable rather than the most appealing of their aspects?

Multiculturalism is a mad gambit. It has led to trouble, and it will lead to more trouble in the future.

What can be done to halt pernicious migration? The easiest way is to make sure that people have opportunities in their homelands. It should be understood that the prospect of tripling one's wages will not necessarily tempt a person, who makes a decent living, to leave his home. To illustrate this point, and to clarify the situation in the States, let us examine the issue of Mexican immigration to America.

The following employment figures are from Carnegie's Sandra Polaski's February 2004 "Brief Submitted to the Canadian Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs" on *Mexican Employment, Productivity and Income a Decade After NAFTA*.¹¹

(A more thorough 2004 document, entitled *NAFTA's Promise and Reality*, can be found at the Carnegie website.)

NAFTA struck Mexico, the United States, and Canada, on January 1, 1994. Tariffs and protection went out the window, and "free-trade" flowed about like a merciless tsunami. In particular, cheap subsidized US-Canadian crops descended upon the Mexican market. Fertilizer-fuelled agricultural techniques - which increase "productivity" by dumping "fossil"-fuels on the soil - followed. Increased productivity means a smaller labor force. Overall, the Mexican increase in the use of fertilizers has been negligible; but the Mexican fertilizer industry has collapsed.

Polaski's findings were, in sum:

- NAFTA has produced a disappointingly small net gain in jobs in Mexico. Data limitations preclude an exact tally, but it is clear that jobs created in export manufacturing have barely kept pace with jobs lost in agriculture due to imports. There has also been a decline in domestic manufacturing employment, related in part to import competition and perhaps also to the substitution of foreign inputs in assembly operations. About 30 percent of the jobs that were created in the maquiladora assembly plants in the 1990s have since disappeared. Many of these operations were relocated to lower- wage countries, particularly China.
- Mexican agriculture has been a net loser in trade with the United States, and em-

¹¹ Available here: <http://carnegieendowment.org/2004/02/25/mexican-employment-productivity-and-income-decade-after> ste, Jan 2, 2012.

ployment in the sector has declined sharply. U.S. exports of subsidized crops such as corn have depressed agricultural prices in Mexico. The rural poor have borne the brunt of adjustment to NAFTA and have been forced to adapt without adequate government support.

- Productivity has increased in Mexico over the last decade. NAFTA likely played a significant role, because Mexico cut tariffs deeply and was exposed to competition from its giant neighbors. The desirable growth in productivity may have had the unwanted side effect of reducing the rate of job growth, since fewer new jobs were created as workers already on payrolls produced more.

- Real wages for most Mexicans today are lower than when NAFTA took effect. The stunning setback in wages is mainly attributable to the peso crisis of 1994-1995. However, during the NAFTA period, productivity growth has not translated into wage growth, as it did in earlier periods in Mexico. Mexican wages are also diverging from, rather than converging with, U.S. and Canadian wages.

- Income inequality has been on the rise in Mexico since NAFTA took effect, reversing a brief declining trend in the early 1990s. Compared to the period before NAFTA, the top 10 percent of households have increased their share of national income, while the other 90 percent have lost income share or seen no change. Regional inequality within Mexico has also increased, reversing a long-term trend toward convergence in regional incomes.

- The experience of Mexico confirms the prediction of trade theory, that there will be winners and losers from trade. The losers may be as numerous as, or even more numerous than, the winners, especially in the short-to-medium term. In Mexico, farmers are still struggling to adapt to NAFTA-induced changes.

- The short-to-medium-term adjustment costs faced by the losers from trade can be severe, and in Mexico the losers are often those segments of society least able to cope with adjustment, due to insufficient skills, meager savings, and limited mobility. It must also be recognized that there may be permanent losers from trade, due to these limitations.

In other words, as anyone with a grain of sense could have seen, and as James Goldsmith the British tycoon (who left school at the age of 16 to succeed spectacularly...) warned the US Senate, NAFTA has demolished the Mexican economy. It has also hurt the American economy, though that is another issue. GATT has had the same malevolent effect, except globally.

As expected, NAFTA: crushed the Mexican rural population; sank wages on both sides of the border; and made the rich richer and the poor poorer.

According to their custom, certain free-marketeers claim that NAFTA is not real "free-trade." To them, NAFTA is crony capitalism. In general, any action that does not lead to the phantasmagorical outcomes expected by the Austrians is deemed crony capitalism. Sorry, but no. "Free-trade" means no tariffs, no quotas, no subsidies. NAFTA dismantled tariffs, and therefore it is "free-trade." Of course NAFTA has benefited the corporations! Otherwise it would not have passed! But that is how the "free-market" works - it benefits the powerful. That the powerful use their power to influence the government is axiomatic.

And now for the numbers: "Overall, the Mexican labor force grew from 32.3 million immediately before NAFTA to 40.2 million in 2002" since the Mexican baby boomers grew up.

The Mexican non-maquiladora (skilled to semi-skilled) manufacturing labor force was about 1.4 million in 1994, fell to about 1.27 million during the peso crisis (circa 1995), rose to a high of 1.47 million in 2000, and collapsed again to a low of 1.32 million in 2002 as a result of the American recession.

Next, the maquiladora (unskilled slave labor) employment figures: about 0.55 million in 1994; a high of 1.3 million in 2001 after a steady rise; a collapse to about 1.08 million in 2003.

And here is the crux - agricultural employment: 8.1 millions in 1993, a low of 7.25 million in 1995, a recovery to 7.6 million in 1997, another collapse to 6.7 million in 2000-2001, and a slight recovery to 6.8 million in 2002.

Observe that these employment figures should not merely have at least stayed put to maintain the economy - they should risen, and dramatically!

What about wages? Mexican "productivity" rose by 60% between 1993 and 2003. Wages fell slightly over the same period.

So, what happened here? What happened is that the bestial NAFTA demolished the Mexican national economy and in particular the Mexican agricultural sector. Not only that - NAFTA also sank wages in Mexico. Hence, over the 1990s, a vast cohort of young Mexicans were left in the lurch. They were young, strong, healthy, eager to work - and unemployed. Now what could those people do? Sit down and die? They had to seek a place under the sun - and that place was up north, where the bloodthirsty industrialists were willing to hire Mexicans at subsistence wages to undercut the wages of the "pampered" American workers.

And that is where the Mexican migrant stream came from.

Some of the migrants hit the Mexican cities, which struggled to cope with the influx. Cities need at least some time to build infrastructure - water and gas pipes, electric poles, etc, not to mention housing. Favella-type slums developed, and desperate people turned to the drug trade, which has done a good deal of damage to Mexican society in the past two decades.

Here are the figures for the Mexican migration to the United States:¹² Foreign-born population in America: 1960 - 10 million out of a total population of 180 million; 1970 - 10 million out of 203 million; 1980 - 14 million out of 227 million; 1990 - 20 million out of 249 million; 2000 - 31 million out of 281 million; 2006 - 37.5 million out of, say, 297-298 million. Of these, the Mexican-born share (further inflated with the Mexican-minded American-born "Hispanics," and by unaccounted immigration): 1960 - 0.58 million; 1970 - 0.76 million; 1980 - 2.2 million; 1990 - 4.3 million; 2000 - 9.2 million; 2006 - 11.54 million.

So: the American population has increased by about 50% since 1970. America's foreign-born population has less than quadrupled since between 1970 and 2006. And America's Mexican-born population increased about fifteen times between 1970 and 2006.

To get another view of the big picture, consider this data, taken from Carnegie's *Promise and Reality* document. The average U.S. southwestern border apprehensions rate between 1977 and 1993 was about, say, 600,000, with a reasonably stable distribution. The annual apprehensions jumped to almost 1.4 million around 2000, before rapidly falling to 700,000 - the old 1994 level - on account of the recession. The bulk of the migrants were dispossessed rustics.

That is the problem. The Mexicans can not be blamed for trying to live. Mexico can not be blamed for being demolished by policies forced on it by the American Oligarchy and its Mexican allies, not the least of which is the "War on Drugs," which really is a war *of* - or *for* - drugs. Cross-border migration is indeed a serious problem for both Mexico and America, and its causes are the vicious "free-trade" policies imposed by the Oligarchy.

The solution, as with too many of our problems, is fairly obvious: end the "free-market" rape, and rebuild the American and Mexican (and other) economies on sane premises - meaning, essentially, full employment and the satisfaction of real material needs. Moreover, the demographic crisis, at which we will look at shortly, must also be tackled. People must be given the opportunity to at least maintain the national populations! Even if we accept the Malthusian premise, surely we do not want to see populations *fall*.

Last, Americans ought to realize that the Mexican immigrants are their fellow victims. Instead of succumbing to the divide-and conquer trap, the mistreated Americans and Mexicans should unite

¹²Found here: <http://www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?id=679>, Jan 2, 2012.

in their fight against NAFTA, GATT, and the corporate predation. The liberal do-gooders, on their part, should take a look around, realize that racism is not the same as cultural friction, and endorse their own culture for a change.

In Europe, the situation is still tractable, though at the current pace, it will eventually reach a point of no return.

After the Second World War, the European nations were highly homogeneous in population. Things have changed.

In France, where it is illegal to census on the basis of ethnic origin, there are about 12-13 million immigrants and ethnic descendants of immigrants, congested in the cities, particularly around Paris. The total French population is about 63 million. Of the immigrants, about half are of European descent - and hence generally integrable - and the other half is from the Arab world or Asia - and hence a likely source of future friction. The 2010 burqa ban is indicative of rising social tension.

Germany, which suffers from a worsening demographic crisis, has a population of about 82 million. Of those, roughly, 3 million are of Turkish origin (some Turks are returning home on account of Turkey's recent prosperity), 3 million are from the former Soviet Union, upward to two million are Poles, and 1.5-2 million are from former Yugoslavia. A further large cohort (8-10% of the total population) resides in Germany without citizenship. Overall, four-fifths of the German population is "of no ethnical background." Some of the people "of ethnical background" are *de facto* Germans. Nevertheless, the figure is significant. As the German demographic crisis deteriorates, the proportion of the immigrant population will rise.

The United Kingdom's demographic situation is also bad, but not potentially catastrophic. In 2010, the UK's population was around 62 million. The white British-Irish population is about 51 million - about five-sixths. Another 3 million are "other" whites, including many Poles and Russians. The foreign-born proportion of the population in the UK has risen from an average of about 6% in the period 1950-1990, to over 11% in 2010.

Norway: population of about 4.5 million, almost stable but declining, of which about 0.55 million (11.4% of the total population as of 2010) are immigrants or born to two immigrants.

Sweden: stagnant population, 9.3 million as of 2009. Of those, 85% are Swedes, 5% are Finns, 1% are Norwegians or Danes, and the rest are from all over the place.

Belgium: 10.75 million as of 2009, of which 6 million are Flemish, 3.4 million are French, and the rest are from everywhere. About 23% (nearly a quarter!) of the population is of non-Belgian origin. Brussels is the host of the European Parliament.

The Netherlands has 16.7 million people as of 2011. 1.8 million are foreign-born, of which 1.4 million (8-9% of entire population) are non-EU.

Spain: 47 million as of 2010, 12% immigrants.

Italy: 60.6 million as of 2011, at least 8% immigrants, with a significant proportion of the linguistically aligned Romanians.

Switzerland: 7.8 million as of 2010. Around 2007, a fifth were foreigners, mostly European, with a hefty cohort of Portuguese and Ukrainians.

Given unfavorable economic conditions characterized by high unemployment, and a persistence of the trend of increase in the foreign-born or unassimilated immigrant-born population in the Western European countries, trouble will ensue. America swallowed vast hordes of immigrants, but it had space, and the immigrants were culturally aligned. Europe does not have that much space, and is unlikely to respond well to dramatically alien cultures.

9.6 The Cult of Productivity

The vague concept of productivity has been elevated into a holy good, a goal unto itself. The more productivity, the better - but what does it mean? In "economic" terms, productivity means GDP per hours worked per person. This monetization of labor is enticing for the econometricians, but

fails to reflect certain fundamental realities. To begin with, GDP is not a very meaningful indicator - in America, the measure has risen steadily, even though real wages and the real per-capita output of tangible goods (notably steel) have declined. Moreover, the index of productivity is inherently flawed, because, in essence, it measures the relative ease of converting energy into monetizable activity. Thus, in the larger sense, *real* cost of production - in terms of energy - is something else entirely, and furthermore, the amount of "productivity" thrown away at dog haircuts and similar "services" is largely meaningless.

Now, what is real productivity, how does it rise, and what are the effects of its increases? Real productivity, in the most abstract sense, is the improvement of social organization and techniques of manufacture to decrease the energy and time employed in useful production. The less energy you use, and the less time you take to produce a standard unit of manufacture, the higher the productivity, there being, in general, trade-offs between energy and time. Computers and robotics have brought about a truly revolutionary increase in real productivity. The old "industrial revolution," which came up with ways of burning coal to make stuff, is of a subtler nature. It did not necessarily employ less energy in producing things. Humanity had merely figured out how to turn the energy stored in coal (and, later, oil and gas) into work. The division of labor, assembly-line type arrangement, perhaps raised real productivity - but at a hideous psychological cost.

Our Free Market "economist" friends monetize energy and focus on time. To them, using five barrels of oil at the cost \$10 per barrel to make one gadget in one hour is the same as using one barrel of oil at the cost of \$50 per barrel to make the same gadget. The price oil is affected by: 1) the ease of production; 2) the political situation; 3) rabid speculation; 4) and perhaps even by demand! Another gruesome distortion introduced by the notion of "productivity" is its psychological effect on the workers. This is the old Luddite issue. Take chair-making. A master craftsman chair-maker will be able to make an ornate, beautiful, solid chair from relatively few materials over a relatively long period of time. A chair-making factory, powered by electricity, with a division of labor and an assembly line, will produce a simple, not necessarily ugly, chair of arbitrary sturdiness in almost an instant at the cost of, perhaps, a somewhat greater amount of energy.

As far as "productivity" goes, especially with the Liberal model, the factory wins by a margin. Yet the measure does not take into account the psychological difference between the activities of the craftsman and the laborers - and those are great. The craftsman works at his own pace, on a job which involves creativity and artistry. The laborer works at an externally imposed pace, during rigid hours, performing repetitive tasks involving not a modicum of imagination. The craftsman lives, while the worker takes a daily trip to the purgatory, where he gets bored. And when he gets bored, he seeks excitement in alcohol, idle sex, drugs, silly stunts, and other, shall we say, counter-productive activities. And that is fine for the free-marketeers as long as they can channel the craftsman's boredom into consumption and profits. Again, nothing new here - except that economists and policy makers seem to (or pretend to) have forgotten the basic facts related above.

The "service" jobs of our days are, in some sense, hardly any better than the factory jobs of the Charlie Chaplin *Modern Times* (1936) archetype.

We have to ask some questions: what is the point in increasing "productivity" if it does not translate to better living, and what is the end goal anyway? How much productivity do we need?

Obama with his 2011 State of the Union speech (emphasis mine):

That world has changed. And for many, the change has been painful. I've seen it in the shuttered windows of once booming factories, and the vacant storefronts on once busy Main Streets. I've heard it in **the frustrations of Americans who've seen their paychecks dwindle or their jobs disappear - proud men and women who feel like the rules have been changed in the middle of the game.**

They're right. The rules have changed. In a single generation, revolutions in technology have transformed the way we live, work and do business. **Steel mills that once needed 1,000 workers can now do the same work with 100.** Today, just about any company can set up shop, hire workers, and sell their products wherever there's an Internet connection.

Meanwhile, nations like China and India realized that with some changes of their own, they could compete in this new world. And so they started educating their children earlier and longer, with greater emphasis on math and science. They're investing in research and new technologies. Just recently, China became the home to the world's largest private solar research facility, and the world's fastest computer.

So, yes, the world has changed. The competition for jobs is real. But this shouldn't discourage us. It should challenge us. Remember - for all the hits we've taken these last few years, for all the naysayers predicting our decline, America still has the largest, most prosperous economy in the world. (Applause.) No workers - **no workers are more productive than ours.** No country has more successful companies, or grants more patents to inventors and entrepreneurs. We're the home to the world's best colleges and universities, where more students come to study than any place on Earth.

So what exactly is the point in being the most productive people on Earth when a robot or the Chinese can do the job more quickly or more cheaply and so "paychecks dwindle or jobs disappear"?

It should also always be remembered, that in the old days of America, people were expected to invent their own jobs. Nobody expected to be *given* a job! Everybody tried to come up with some useful way of benefiting society and of supporting himself. How things have changed...

But the current situation is somewhat more complex. One standard job in the old days was the shop-keeper's job or the craftsman's job. With the spread of the cancer of Walmart, both are now out of the question. Walmart will undercut every small business in a given area. One can not have a functional national economy based on Walmarts, as the Americans are finding out.

In general, while the argument can be made that the government should shy away from explicitly "giving" people jobs (except in extreme circumstances), it should be understood that the government should at least give people the opportunity to create their own jobs, by making sure they have access to credit, by making sure that powerful entities do not undercut weaker local small businesses, and by not brainwashing the people into obedient corporate-Fabian slaves. This means protectionism, anti-trust enforcement, etc.

In a sense, productivity has an in-built upper limit. People can only "consume" so much. *Ceteris paribus*, at some point, even with equitable wealth distribution, the factories will spew out more stuff than people can use. This is another well-known old problem. What happens then? Unless: working hours but not wages are cut, or productivity falls due to a reversion to older methods of manufacture, unemployment and a reduction of production (and profits) ensues. Cutting working hours but not wages is really a wage hike, and a reversion to older methods of manufacture is impossible, since - and this is somewhat subtle point - the industrialists cooperate not out of good will, but out of self-interest. They do not wish to mutually destroy each other. But if they can painlessly destroy and gobble up a fellow industrialist, they will do it. So under the free-market, with high enough productivity, you will get unemployment. Again, the fellows at the top are well aware of this. So what happens next? You, as the great industrialist/ technocrat/ banker/ Fabianist, monetize everything in an effort to create new "jobs." If the women cooked at home in the old days, get them to dig ditches or walk dogs or flip burgers, and have them eat outside of home and hire house-cleaners. Make various new gadgets and have hundreds of people answer phone calls for "user support." Create huge marketing centers and inundate people with phone calls. Come up with anything, any job. As long as the productive economy quietly performs its function in the background, things will roll on. This wonderful arrangement may collapse in one of three events: first, if unemployment outpaces the

rate of appearance of the newly invented jobs, the economy will descend into the deflationary spiral: no jobs, no disposable income, wages experience downward pressure, businesses and factories close, there are even fewer jobs, etc; second, if sabotage or organizational ineptitude destroys the productive economy, the house of cards collapses, though, in principle, it should be easy to rebuild; and third, if something happens to the unacknowledged source of Classical Liberalist "productivity" - the cheap energy - the economy falls apart. The third scenario is, of course, Peak Oil, at which we will look next.

Still analysing the situation from the "free-market," oligarchical perspective, what do we do to preserve our wonderful system in any of the three cases? In the first case, you need to throw labor at some large-scale non-productive project. It is conceivable that the space program was supposed to be a project of that type - except that it proved useful - which is, perhaps, why they recently tanked it. And since the population may begin to suspect something if you tell them to dig a great hole and then fill it up and turn it into a mountain, you go to war. This action also serves to redirect domestic popular fury.

In the second case, all you have to do is re-industrialize. Unfortunately, in the modern world of limited sovereignty, to violate the trade treaties and the other baloney, you need a good reason. And what is a good reason? War.

In the third case, you can try to consume less - or you can go to war and steal more oil. Note that America is not really in this case, because the Americans have plenty of oil, as recent production figures prove.

Then there is the bleaker yet Malthusian/ Human Hive perspective. With Malthusianism, the chronically unemployed are considered useless to society. If five percent of the population can produce enough for the oligarchs and half of the entire population, and forty-five percent of the population can provide the "services" the oligarchs want, then why waste scarce planetary resources on the useless half of the population? Wipe them out - there will always be more where they came from. We must seriously consider the possibility that those in charge think this way. People must realize that, at this stage, there are no jobs for them, and there may be no jobs planned for them. No jobs, but a something else - perhaps a virus. After all, why did all those micro-biologists mysteriously die a few years ago?

Granted, the notion is far-fetched - but then, so was 9/11.

The *Report From Iron Mountain* juggles with arguments of the same type.

This is under the "free-market" and the Oligarchy. In the imaginary future Earth of sanity and human decency, people may return some industries to the craftsmanship stage, perhaps with new unimaginable gadgets in hands; people may spend more time engaged in the higher aspects of life - meaningful social activity, contemplation, interaction with the natural world, and so on; and humanity may undertake large-scale projects - the exploration and colonization of space, the harnessing of solar energy, the exploration of the Mariana Trench, the development of near-instant relatively cheap transport systems, and whatever else there is to do.

So much for productivity. It should be a means of improving the human condition, rather than an end in itself. The point is not about being "productive" in throwing barrels of oil down the incinerator. Production exists to serve people, not the other way around.

9.7 The Peak Oil Cult

"Peak Oil" is the notion that "fossil" fuels are finite, and the rate of their extraction follows a near-bell-shaped curve, and once humanity passes the peak of that curve, the demand for fuel will outpace the supply, hiking prices upwards, which would disrupt and eventually collapse the world economy, bringing about the so-called "post-oil age," but not before the four horsemen have had their fun.

Apart from the original Club of Rome *Limits to Growth* (1972) manifesto, I offer three more references, which say, essentially, the same thing: Richard Heinberg's *The Party's Over* (2003); James Kunstler's *The Long Emergency* (2005); and Mike Ruppert's *Confronting Collapse* (2009).

Unfortunately, the Peak Oil Movement has grown into a Gaian eschatological cult. Its God is the pantheistic Nature; its messiah is, for practical purposes, M. King Hubbert; its scripture consists of *The Limits to Growth* and the writings of Ruppert, Kunstler, Heinberg, Jay Hanson et al.; its priesthood consists of the Peak Oil activist alarmists; and its symbols are, say, the empty barrel of oil and the abandoned, dilapidated skyscraper.

Ruppert, Kunstler, Heinberg, Hanson, and, likely, many of their fellows whom I have not read, are sharp thinkers and good writers. It is regretful that they have failed to examine their assumptions, and that they have allowed the crowd to turn them into cult leaders.

At the same time, I have to admit, as did Engdahl, years ago, that I, too, fell under the spell of the Peak Oil theory for a while. One tends to believe in Peak Oil, because: 1) the theory is internally consistent; and 2) its premises are hard to analyse, because of unavailability of data, and because of certain accepted but fallacious mainstream scientific theories, notably that of "fossil fuels."

Tarpley, Engdahl, and Alan Watt are three notable researchers who are alert to the Peak Oil scam. The crux is that to understand Peak Oil, one has to understand Malthusianism. Tarpley, Engdahl, and Watt are highly aware of the situation with the Malthusians, while most Peak Oilers ignore the *legacy* of Malthus and focus only on his genocidal *writings*, which they tend to accept as dogma.

Lindsey Williams and his friendly radio talk show hosts - for example Jeff Rense and Stan Monteith - are also up to date.

In fact, Williams has a book on the subject - *The Energy Non-Crisis* (1980). Engdahl, who is an expert on oil politics, is wrapping up a Peak Oil debunker of his own, which should be out in early 2012.

The Theory

Let us quickly go over the key aspects of the theory before studying its history and pointing out its failures.

First: are "fossil" fuels finite, and are they even "fossil"? This is a key issue, and we will discuss it momentarily.

Next - assuming oil is finite, its rate of extraction does have to follow a near-bell-shaped curve. Take a single oil field. We poke holes in the ground until we find the field. A few drops of the black gold slowly fill our first barrel. We proceed to set up shop and start doing real business. Millions of barrels later, the field starts to dry up, fewer and fewer barrels fill up every day, and eventually we pull the plug on the whole joint and move on to the next field. That is what happens, and the extraction rates of single oil fields do follow the near-bell-shaped curve.

Questions arise: Do oil fields refill? How many oil fields are out there? And how can we tell if a certain spot of land lies above an oil field?

Assuming the "fossil" nature of oil, the first question appears rhetorical. However, there is the case of the Eugene Island block 330 oil field, which (*WSJ* quoted at Wikipedia) peaked at 15,000 barrels per day before declining to 4,000 barrels per day around 1989. Then, magically, the field's production went up to 13,000 barrels per day at the time of the writing of my reference in 1999.

The second question - how many fields are out there? - also seems trivial - surely, we can just go to the encyclopedia and check. But it is not that simple. If we are to believe the official numbers, then, yes - fewer and fewer oil fields are being discovered, and they are smaller, and so on. But what is the source of our data on oil fields? Who controls the world's oil? There are two major groups of players: the Western petroleum mastodons - like Standard Oil's heirs, BP, and Shell - and the

non-Western national oil companies, notably those of Russia, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Venezuela. The top oil producing countries are: (CIA data quoted on Wikipedia, includes gas production equivalents, also mixed-up due to "refinery gains") 1. Russia - 10.5 million bpd (barrels per day) (2011); 2. Saudi Arabia - 8.8 million bpd (2011); 3. United States - 7.8 million bpd (2011); 4. Iran - 4.2 million bpd (2009); 5. China - 4 million bpd (2009); 6. Canada - 3.3 million bpd (2009); 7. Mexico - 3 million bpd (2009); 8. UAE - 2.8 million bpd (2009); Brazil - 2.6 million bpd (2009); and then Kuwait, Venezuela, Iraq, Norway, Nigeria, and Algeria, all of them above 2 million bpd. Follow Angola, Libya, Kazakhstan, and the UK above 1.5 million bpd, and Qatar, Indonesia, and Azerbaijan above 1 million bpd.

The official "proven oil reserves figures," which keep changing, go along the following lines: 1. Venezuela with 296.5 (the unit of measurement is immaterial); 2. Saudi Arabia - 264.52; 3. Canada - 175; 4. Iran - 151.2; 5. Iraq - 143.1; 6. Kuwait - 101.5; 7. UAE - 97.8; 8. Russia - 74.2; 9. Libya - 47; 10. Nigeria - 37; ... 14. United States - 19.12. Much of the Venezuelan and Canadian oil is of the hard-to-extract (i.e. expensive in real rather than monetary terms) tar variety.

Observe that the Westerners are in cahoots with or in control of all the major producers, except Russia, China, Iran, and Venezuela. Iraq and Libya, which have tremendous known reserves, received uninvited guests, and Saddam and Muammar were murdered. Hugo Chavez was almost ousted back in 2002, and these days complains that the Westerners probably infect undesirable leaders with cancer, which may well be true. Russia is under Color Coup attack. There are indications that China will likewise enjoy Color Coups in the future. Both great powers are surrounded by the Anglo-Americans and their pals. Iran is totally surrounded and has been threatened with war for a good decade.

One also wonders as to who owns the means of moving the oil around - namely the tankers and the pipelines. The situation with the tankers is a curious one. See George Washington University's Al Wood's 2011 paper *Tanker Ownership in non-OECD countries and the Rise of Government Owned Fleets*. Oil tankers fly the flag of the state of their registration, and belong to a myriad of companies, many of them single-vessel ones, which, in turn, belong to larger conglomerates. The system is messy and confusing. The flag state is meaningless: Panama is the top flag state, and Liberia, Singapore, the Marshall Island, and the Bahamas are four of the next six, the other two being Russia and China. There are about 4,300 large tankers in the world, of which about a thousand are registered in Panama and Liberia. Russia and China, who have perhaps registered their own fleets at home, have a total of about 500 registered tankers. Wood looks at the 2,500 largest tankers. Of those, a fifth belongs to governments, 4% belong to the oil companies, and the bulk (three-quarters) belongs to "independents." What are those independents and who controls them? 350 companies in over 50 countries own the largest 2,500 tankers. The largest company, the Japanese Mitsui, owns 73 ships. To protect themselves from liability, the tanker operators have created single-vessel subsidiary holding companies, which own 70% of tankers. The largest tanker owners are Greece(!), Japan, and Norway, with 20%, 12%, and 11% of the world tanker fleet respectively. China is catching up. Japan obviously has long decided to make sure its oil travels in its own ships. Norway is a massive oil producer with a historically powerful merchant marine. The Greek-based tanker-owning companies likely belong to foreign corporations or individuals.

It looks like the Oligarchs control the bulk of the global tanker fleet. Russia has some tankers of its own, and China is trying to catch up, but their share is not great.

The tankers account for the movement of two-thirds of the world's traded oil.

On the pipelines front, the Russians have a good network, which connects their oil to Europe. The key region is the South-Central Asia, and there the situation is a mess. In general, Russia wants to extend its network as far as possible, and the Western Oligarchs want to prevent such a development, and to build lines from sizeable oil fields around the Caspian Sea to Western-controlled areas. The conflict is interesting, but beyond our current scope.

Overall, the Western Oligarchs, historically led by the Anglo-American interests, own or control

(directly or indirectly) most of the world oil production and oil trade. Apart from the issue of control, there is the question of profits.

Now, the oil production in the Anglo-American sphere of influence is heavily cartelized. With a monopoly or an oligopoly (cartel), the supplier restricts supply to raise prices and garner greater profits. This is being done, with the additional aspect of the dollar's role in the oil trade. In general, all oil trade occurs in dollars. This means that to buy a barrel of oil, one must procure a batch of Federal Reserve Banknotes (or the electronic equivalent thereof). In other words, the entire world is borrowing dollars from the Fed. This is good for the Fed and the bankers, and to the great advantage of Washington.

Suppose that, in reality, the United States were floating on an ocean of oil. What would happen if the people were told of that? They would demand that the U.S. taps the wells and supplies its own cheap oil. The price of crude would collapse, dragging down the dollar. The U.S. would have a less valid excuse for meddling in the oil producers' business. Countries left and right would smell rat and start digging for oil - and would perhaps find more than they would expect. Can't have that! Better to keep the facts hidden and to keep the price of oil high in order to keep up the dollar.

Now, the OPEC countries' quotas depend on proven reserves. Thus if a country wants to up its production, it has the incentive to submit inflated figures for its reserve. During the 1980s, some OPEC members did not even bother to do that and just sold more than they were supposed to. This is not a real issue, however, because the dominant UAE nations - Saudi Arabia, UAE, and Kuwait - already have more money than they know what to do with. That is why they are building their theme park in Dubai. Observe that they can not spend all that they make anyway, because if they unload all the petro-dollars upon the market, they will cause an inflation and their dollars would lose value. So they keep the money in vast private bank accounts, and play lego in the Persian Gulf. As Lindsey Williams, whose credibility has been established, has told us, the U.S. does indeed sit on as much oil as one may want.

The Anglo-Americans and their allies have the incentive to peddle lowered estimates of oil reserves. Apart from everything else, it is poor strategy to lay your cards on the table, and a risky bluff to boast about a strength you do not possess. It is far smarter to pretend to be weak, and use your assets only when their time comes.

So, without a doubt, the current official estimates of the world's oil reserves are fraudulent and too low. There is a great amount of oil out there.

Then there is the question of how people search for oil. Exploratory wells tend to be expensive and technologically demanding. Generally, only nations with a developed petroleum industry, and large petroleum companies, can afford to drill wildcat wells. Countries with strong national oil industries tend to search on their own soil, which means that most of the world is in effect the playground of the oil majors. And they operate under corporate secrecy, at whim, and subject to the logic of profits. Thus, while a government can go around and dig without much thought of going bankrupt, the private drillers can only drill as much as their profit margin allows. The debt scams of the last half century have chained most governments, meaning that, by and large, only Russia and more recently China could drill at will. The Russian collapse of the 1990s, and the Chinese poverty before the same decade, further limited the two nations' exploration opportunities. Technological deficiencies have historically kept the Sino-Russians dependant in varying degrees on Western assistance. The old Baku wells, for example, were developed with a significant input from the Anglo-Americans. Russia's production peaked at 12 million bpd in the late Soviet era. The industry then collapsed during the rape of the 1990s. Production fell to 6 million bpd. Under Putin, the Russian output recovered. Today it is of the order of 10 million bpd. It would be higher if it were not for the decay of the Russian infrastructure. If Putin manages to rebuild his nation's infrastructure, Russia's oil production will most likely continue to go straight up.

The Chinese imported oil before the 1950s. Once the Communists cemented their rule, some exploration occurred, and China exported until the demands of industrialization swallowed the Chinese domestic oil output in 1993. Realizing that it is a cruel world out there, the Chinese undertook

heavy investments in their own oil industry around 2004. They kept discovering new wells and their production kept rising. Today, the Chinese spit out 4 million bpd, which accounts for only about half of their needs. The Chinese government has said that, by its current estimates, it can sustain the current level of production until 2030.¹³ They expect their production will stay flat. The Chinese also decided that it would be easier to buy oil from nations where production is cheaper. They made contacts with Libya and Sudan, and things looked good for a while, until the Westerners came in and busted the both places.

Two other countries with a history of strong state-owned petroleum industries are Iraq and Iran. The Iraqis, formerly at the mercy of the British, nationalized their oil industry in 1972. They were goaded into the war with Iran in the 1980s, bombed in 1991, embargoed over the 1990s, and conquered for good in 2003, from which time on they have been in a state of civil war. The Iraqi infrastructure is in ruins. This shows us 1) what happens when a relatively weak nation does not play by the Anglo-American book; and 2) that the Iraqi oil industry is in a state of decay and underdevelopment. The same can be said of Libya, which, it is worth pointing out, had no debt, had vast domestic investments, and had no need to further expand its oil industry.

Iran's oil production peaked at 6 million bpd in the late Shah era (mid 1970s). Back then, the Anglo-Americans ran the show. When Mossadegh tried to change things in the early 1950s, the CIA-MI6 combine ousted him. The Iranian oil industry was heavily export oriented and divorced from the national economy. The 1979 revolutionaries nationalized the whole industry. Having offended the Anglo-Americans, Iran became a pariah state. The silly takeover of the American Embassy antagonized the world and won Iran little more than vicious economic sanctions, which killed the country's oil production. Around 1980-1981, Iran's output fell to 1 million bpd. Next came the fratricidal war with Iraq, which averted efforts away from needed investment in industry and infrastructure. During most of the war, Iran's oil production hovered slightly above 2 million bpd. After the war, the Iranians recovered, and increased their production to the level of 3.5-4 million bpd, where they have stayed since. More US sanctions hit them in 1996. After 9/11, Bush II announced that Iran was "evil" - Iran which has not attacked anyone (Iraq initiated the 1980-1988 war) since the Napoleonic times. Thus, Iran has been under severe diplomatic and economic pressure for the last decade. Though their oil industry may appear stagnant, the Iranians have developed a spectacular gas production capacity and infrastructure. What Iran really needs is decent industrialization. To appreciate the Iranians' plight, observe that they do not have enough refineries to refine their own crude! Their refining capacity is about 1.6 mln bpd, and they still import some of their gasoline, for which they pay through their noses.

Another interesting case is that of Venezuela. That nation used to be the world's second largest oil producer back in the 1920s (the first was the US). The Venezuelans suffered from the so-called "Dutch Disease," i.e. oligarchy. The Venezuelan top honchos used the oil revenues to buy stuff from abroad to enjoy the good life. They neglected to develop the national industry, turning Venezuela into an industrial backwater. This state of affairs continued until Hugo Chavez took charge in 1999. He has faced incessant sabotage, and had to go through a major coup attempt in 2002. Observe that to combat low oil prices, Chavez tried to strengthen OPEC, thus arguing for a course of controlled, if necessary lowered production. Given favorable political conditions, Venezuela, which is awash in oil, can dramatically boost its output. But the point is that the Venezuelans do not really need to do that - what they need is not a huge hidden bank account of petrodollars, but internal development, for which they should be able to pay with their current oil revenues.

All of this means that the world has not been explored for oil all that thoroughly. Then there are the issues of technology and methodology. Today, explorers can drill deeper than they could a century ago. Moreover, one suspects that the exploration methodology follows elementary empirical precepts - explorers drill in places which look similar to places that have yielded oil before. This is a reasonably strategy - but what of those types of place, in which sufficient drilling has not taken

¹³<http://uk.reuters.com/article/2011/11/25/china-oil-resource-idUKL4E7MP0QP20111125>, Jan 3, 2012.

place yet? Whatever the case, the success rates in exploratory drilling are quite high these days. It is impossible to tell how much oil the majors find anyway, for reasons of secrecy.

We should also consider the effects of the "free-market." "Invisible hand" sophistries aside, the price of oil obviously affects the politics of oil. As pointed out, petrol-producing nations really need to churn out only enough oil to fuel their own domestic projects. Moreover, they have the incentive to keep production down in order to inflate the price of oil.

Industrial, oil importing nations, on the other hand, face the following conundrum: do we make the effort to produce our own, potentially hard to extract, oil, or do we buy the cheap Middle Eastern stuff which, cinematically speaking, keeps streaming from the ground in great black fountains? Why bother to produce oil, when you can build a few high-tech refineries and export value-added gasoline? This factor further restricts oil exploration and the development of oil infrastructure.

The above point is a source of tension between Peak Oilers and Free-Marketeters. The latter say that the market will take care of oil. When the cheap Arabian oil dries up, the market will find more oil, since investors will start looking around in the hope of making profits. The Peak Oilers point out that the *real* value of the new oil, expressed in terms of energy gained for energy invested, will be much lower than before. I.e. if it takes you a half barrel of oil to produce one barrel of tar-sands oil, when the Arabs used to just put barrels under the oil geyser and spent their days playing backgammon, you are in trouble. Both sides happen to be right - people *will* find new sources of oil when the cheap stuff runs out, and the new oil *will* be more expensive in real terms. The main question is, how much more expensive? And that is impossible to answer with the available information. These days we have computers and other improvements in productivity, and therefore a slight increase in the real cost of oil should not be too much of an issue.

To summarize, the Peak Oilers mistake the *effects* for the *causes*. In their worldview, oil scarcity causes economic hardship and political tensions. The opposite is the case - economic underdevelopment restricts the world's potential oil output; and the Anglo-American quest for world domination, a main plank of which is the control of the world's oil, incessantly provokes wars and destabilizations, which interfere with oil production. By controlling technological know-how, oil concessions, the world tanker fleet, and the petrodollar, the Oligarchs obtain their share of the loot. Their mission is to *control* oil; and as long as they have control of the black gold, they will gravitate toward creating the impression of scarcity to extend their influence and to boost prices. Understand that the Oligarchs are not particularly eager to develop America's oil, in part because it is safe in their hands. What they want, instead, is to get their grubby hands on all oil that lies outside of their core sphere of influence.

And so, contrary to what the Peak Oilers say, no great petroleum exporter has really peaked yet - quite the contrary. The Americans used to supply a great deal of the world's oil before the Middle Eastern production really kicked in. At that moment in time, the American Oligarchs asked themselves - why pay high wages at home, exhaust our own strategic supplies, and bother with digging, when we can simply go the Middle East where the oil bubbles near the surface, buy the cheap stuff, and get our cuts at the gas station and in a myriad other places via value-added, and also via the petrodollar? And so they curtailed the U.S.'s production, which peaked around 1970 at about 9.5 million bpd. Today, two-thirds of America's oil is imported - but one suspects that this development can be overturned in less than a half-decade.

For the rest of the world, as we saw above, countries like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the UAE have more money than they can use, and produce as much as they are told to produce by the Anglo-Americans. Russia, Iran, and Venezuela have tremendous infrastructure and underdevelopment problems, which suppress their potential outputs. Libya and Iraq have become US protectorates. Political and developmental issues trump imaginary scarcity! The validity of the Hubbert curve conjecture, applied at the national and world levels, is, at this stage, totally unproven.

Via some kind of extrapolation based on the Hubbert hypothesis and available figures, the Peak Oilers decided that world production would peak in the decade of the 2000s, and that the world collapse would begin around 2012. In the Peak Oil world, production peaked around 2005-2006, and then plateaued. Hitting the peak, the logic goes, precipitated the economic crisis, which is terminal and will wipe out a good deal of the world's population. The thesis is fine but excessively optimistic. In reality, the pseudo-free-market lunacy of GATT, NAFTA, and the WTO unleashed in earnest after 1995, and the debt avalanche of deregulated derivatives, which has been accelerating since about 1980, managed to tank the world economy. With the economic collapse, demand for oil fell. The frantic backroom speculation on the price of oil provided another source of downward pressure on economic growth. For a reasonable though not exact parallel, take steel production. Steel: 1) requires industry to be produced, like oil; 2) is absolutely essential for a modern economy, like oil; 3) "plateaued" in terms of world production around 1975, to rise again only around 2000, when the Chinese machine went up a gear. Steel did not "peak" because of any real scarcity. No - world steel production stagnated, because the Neo-Liberals and the imperialists began to ruin the world's economy via their debt and trade scams. The problem was one of social organization rather than of "natural" scarcity.

A worldwide economic collapse may well occur in 2012. Its cause would not be oil exhaustion, but political insanity, incompetence, and sabotage. Moreover, the collapse, contrary to what the Peak Oilers postulate, is and always was fully preventable.

Abiotic Oil

Let us complete our first-principles oriented analysis with a look at the debate over the origins of "fossil" (more accurately, "carbon") fuels. The accepted theory says that coal and oil are condensed organic (hydro-carbon) compounds. Thus, in effect, the sun shines, organic life lives, dies, sinks under the ground, and, over extend periods of time, turns into carbon fuel - coal, oil, or gas. This is the mainstream, Anglo-American, theory.

The theory is ostensibly reasonable, but: if the sun emits energy, where does that energy come from? And does not the Earth also produce some kind of energy or material convertible to energy? Why should it not?

Another problem arises from the so-called "law" (i.e. principle) of entropy, also know as the second "law" of thermodynamics. The idea is that when you use energy to do work, some of that energy "dissipates" as heat, i.e. by "burning" something - reducing it from a more complex, higher-potential state to a less complex, lower-potential state, you did some work, but the energy has gone for good. OK, but then where does all the energy go? And could we not regard the "dissipated" energy as tangential work, which we did not find useful, but which the heated air, so to speak, may have known what to do with? The ultimate question here asks: is the universe steady-state or decaying? Under the first assumption, the universe is, and from what we can see, always has been and always will be - or was somehow spawned out of the vacuum, and will exist on its own until the same force that created it "decides" that the show is over. In such a system, energy does not vanish but changes from one form to another. Under the second assumption, the universe came up out of nowhere and will eventually vanish under the onslaught of entropy. Naturally, one asks, so where did the universe come from? And why should it not obtain more energy out of nowhere if it already did it once?

The second, universal decay, theory, shares the ideological foundations of mainstream evolutionary theory, a key parallel being the notion that life, like the universe, in effect created itself. But when one looks at life, it looks like a stable, continuous process. One is born, grows up, has children, dies, the children grow up, have children, etc. Other than a few ambiguous fossilized bones here and there, and some fancy hypotheses, there is no real understanding how all of this started, and no indications that, barring suicide, it has to end. The great irony is that in *denying* purpose to existence and claiming that things just happen, the Darwinists are trying to impose a model of hierarchical, directed, progression - life started with single-cells, then amoebas, then this and that,

and now humans, and in the future something greater. Likewise, they want to have the universe start with a "big bang" (about as perverse and violent-minded term as you could ask for), and end with a whimper, as T.S. Elliot, whose wife enjoyed the loving touch of Bertrand Russell, put it.

To see the conundrum of entropy from a mathematical angle, consider the following argument: In physics, entropy is assumed to hold for an isolated system, and in the larger sense it does. But is the universe an isolated system? For an abstract comparison, take a compact - meaning closed and bounded - set on the real line. The meaning of bounded is clear; for the meaning of closed, consult an appropriate reference; but it suffices to say that the interval from one to two, endpoints included, is closed. Now for any such interval, which we regard as parallel to the "isolated system" in physics, you can find a value that is inside the interval and greater than all other values inside the interval. However, the entire real line obviously has no such maximum. Moreover, if you take an open interval - say, one to two without the endpoints - it will not contain a maximum value.

Which brings us to the questions: can we regard the planet Earth as an isolated system, and can we regard the universe as an isolated system?

And more generally: is the law of entropy binary or continuous, and are there existing systems to which it does not apply? In particular, assuming that the range of human sensory perception is limited, is it not possible that entropy holds within that range, but fails to hold in the larger reality beyond it? This clashes with the empiricist postulate that what we can sense is what is.

But to come to the point - arguments similar to mine were made back in the 1950s by Thomas Gold of Cambridge, and a couple of colleagues of his: Hermann Bondi and Fred Hoyle. Gold (1920-2004) was a German Jew whose family had fled the Fatherland back in 1933. Ironically, the British put Gold in a concentration ("internment") camp in Canada at the start of the war, because they regarded him as an enemy alien. After thus vacationing for 15 months, Gold came back to England, got his degree from Cambridge in 1942, and worked on radar research. After the war, Gold won a Trinity College prize fellowship by writing a thesis on the effects of resonance on the human ear. Many, including a future Noble Prize winner, ignored or denied Gold's thesis - but it was proved right in the 1970s.

Gold and Bondi, and concurrently Hoyle, published a couple of papers on the steady-state theory of the universe in 1948. The theory has since been largely abandoned. Hoyle and some of his associates proposed a "mini-big-bang" steady-state theory in 1993, which repeats the argument I made above, namely that, assuming the "Big Bang" - the original influx of energy - we should consider the possibility of the occurrence of additional big bangs along the axis of time.

In the 1950s, Gold opened the Anglo-American, Western branch of modern Abiotic Oil theory. The idea is that oil, rather than "biological" in nature, stems from some process inside the Earth's crust. In 1977, Gold heard of a submarine's discovery of an ecosystem based around thermal vents on the oceanic floor. Such an ecosystem drew on the energy produced *by the Earth*, rather than *by the Sun*. And so, if the Earth does produce some kind of energy, then could the carbon fuels be another terrestrial product?

Then again, one could argue that terrestrial energy is only the latent emission of solar energy that had been absorbed by the Earth. Whatever the case, the Earth's core is hot and emits energy, and so let us assume that the Earth does produce energy, and hence may be producing oil.

What does the evidence say? Gold speculated that oil may leak from the Earth's inner recesses inside the regions of seismic activity. With his colleague Steven Soter, he compared the historic seismic regions with the modern oil-rich regions, and found a good deal of correlation.

In 1986, Gold drilled a deep hole in a crater in Sweden, on the premise that the meteorite that had left the crater had smashed up the Earth and allowed oil or gas to float upward from the planet's insides. The operation produced a hundred litres of oil. A highly technical debate on the meaning of the findings ensued. Disheartened by the controversy, but undaunted in his convictions, Gold called the project a "fiasco," and went back to the drawing board. In 1989, he dug another well, which obtained 80 barrels of oil. To Gold, this was evidence of the correctness of his conjecture.

His opponents were unimpressed. Another dig in 1991 hit more oil closer to the surface. The more commercially minded observed that even if Gold was correct, the pathetic output of his well rendered his exploration methodology useless.

In the 1990s, Gold wrote articles and books to popularize his ideas. He was accused of plagiarizing Soviet writers, who had come up with the same notions in the 1950s, but it is most likely that Gold found and read the Soviet papers only after he had already formulated his own theory. To put it in plain terms, if you present the same problem to two persons of like minds, and the problem has a "natural" solution, they will both, independently, reach that solution, though at different times.

Over his career, Gold built a terrific reputation. He was a member of a myriad of prestigious societies (notably the Royal Society and the US Academy of Sciences) and the bearer of various great prizes. The man did not even have a doctorate.

Science is not democratic. If even one highly credible scientist objects to a given theory, then that theory is not "law," and should submit to critical examination.

In the world of fantasy, scientists are "open-minded" and ready to recognize their own mistakes. After all, making mistakes is a part of the game. Nobody is perfect, people err, and hence peer review. In reality, a scientist, who has spent his whole life building a career on the precepts of some theory, is unlikely to admit that his base assumptions were wrong and that he and his wise peers and teachers could have succumbed to collective delusion. So, no, "scientists" do not like to have their worldview challenged. The other problem is that the real wielders of power in the world are the ones who decide which theory stays and which theory goes, and they hold ideals greater than truth. Their ideal is power, and so, given the choice between a theory that fits reality but challenges their power, and a theory that is pure fantasy but helps their cause, they will always choose the latter. Thus, from their Malthusian perch, the top honchos favor the biogenetic, "fossil," exhaustible view of hydro-carbon fuels.

The abiotic oil conjecture has been around for centuries. Humboldt and Mendeleev had both speculated along the lines of abiogenesis.

In the 1950s, the Soviet geologist Nikolai Kudryavtsev resurrected the hypothesis. He formed a circle, and together with his colleagues developed an abiotic oil theory, which remained largely unknown in the West until Gold's publications in the 1970s.

Various mechanisms of oil creation have been proposed. Research into the subject continues.

In summary, there is debate on the subject of the origin of hydrocarbon fuel. It is conceivable that oil stems from some process that takes place below the Earth's surface.

Moreover, whatever the origins of oil, extraction is nowhere near any naturally occurring "peak." The ostensible contraction of oil supply is the product of economico-political forces.

Thus, we have to ask two questions: is "Peak Oil" inevitable? And if so, when will it occur, and should we care?

Even assuming that the Earth spews out certain amounts of oil, unless the process delivers sufficient quantities sufficiently quickly sufficiently close to the surface, the rate of human consumption of oil will eventually outpace the "natural" rate of production, and "Peak Oil" - the decline in the attainable rate of extraction of oil - will occur. Let us assume Peak Oil holds. When will humanity fall to the wrong side of the fence? Beyond any doubt, as Lindsey Williams has pointed out, and as the evidence suggests, people still have plenty of relatively cheaply attainable oil. Moreover, as the efficiency of available technology improves (say, in the form of better batteries), and if the worldview of humanity shifts away from consumerism, society will be able to diminish its use of carbon fuel. This gets us into the subject of technology, which the Peak Oilers treat with derision. In the grand tradition of Malthus, they regard technological optimism as unfounded. Malthus was wrong, and so are his intellectual heirs the Peak Oilers. Suppose we have another century of oil glut. Does the reader dare to predict what technological advances will take place in that century? In 1912, people barely had automobiles and electricity, planes were almost unknown, the nuke and rocketry

were science fiction, and the computers were undreamed of. Today we have instant communication and all sorts of other stuff. To go back another century, in 1812, only the British had any of what we would call modern industry, and the world was, in many ways, the same as it had been for a thousand years.

Peak Oilers will say, with some justification, that all of this munificence was only possible because of fossil fuels. But there is a degree of circular reasoning here - the fossil fuels have been around for ages - and only recently did human ingenuity provide the techniques for using those fuels. And if the humans could figure out how to use coal, and then oil, and then nuclear energy, who is to tell what they will come up with next? How many people in 1930 suspected that a mere two decades later, nuclear energy would be commercially viable? And we have to suspect that our Oligarchical friends, in their mission to control oil, have made sure to stifle any research into viable "alternative" energy. Imagine what would happen to their sordid imperial ambition if every backward nation in the world could gain access to cheap energy.

And so: Peak Oil is not a certainty; even if it does happen, it will not happen all that soon; and in the future, great things can take place.

At the same time: wasting energy - hydrocarbon or human - on consumerism and free-market revelry - is a demented and unnecessary course of action. People should focus on what they really need rather than what they have been taught to want, academics should focus on the real problems of humanity rather than on biometrics, or science fiction of the global-warming variety, and the world economic system should be revamped to serve the greater humanity rather than the degenerate global Oligarchy.

Brief History

So far we have raised objections to the theory of Peak Oil on the basis of first principles and elementary empirical observations.

In studying the history of the cult, one finds another reason to doubt the validity of Peak Oilery. In short, Peak Oil is Malthusianism in a new guise. One can understand neither Peak Oil nor Anthropogenic Global Warming without reading up on Malthusianism.

The man who came up with the theory of Peak Oil in 1956 was one M. King Hubbert. He posited that, assuming the oil on Earth is effectively finite (i.e. it forms very slowly), at some point, inevitably, the human extraction of oil would reach a maximum. In his model, the rate of extraction follows the logistic statistical distribution. Note that the graph of the logistic distribution typically has the shape of a non-symmetric bell. The usual "bell curve" is that of the Gaussian (or Normal) distribution. But those are semantics.

Hubbert's model did indeed work when applied to isolated oil fields, but, contrary to what the Peak Oilers say, it has not really worked when applied to national or worldwide rates of extraction. Political and economic, rather than purely technological and natural, considerations have so far dictated the rate of extraction of oil. Perhaps Hubbert will be proved right some time in the future - but so far, his claims remain conjectural.

Hubbert (1903-1989) was yet another graduate of the omnipresent University of Chicago. While pursuing his PhD in the 1930s, he worked part-time for the petroleum industry. Between 1943 and 1964, he worked for Royal Dutch Shell. And so Mr. Hubbert managed to study in the Rockefeller University of Chicago, to serve in the Rockefeller-dominated American petroleum industry, and to work for the British Oligarchy's Shell outfit.

After 1964, Hubbert had stints at Stanford and Berkeley.

To understand Hubbert's worldview, we observe that the man was one of the staunchest proponents of technocracy in America. In 1933, he co-founded Technocracy Incorporated along with one Howard Scott. The technocrats said that society should be in the hands of experts like themselves. The technocrats favored social engineering and dreamed about "progress." Control of population was (and

still is) a standard technocratic ideal. In many ways, Technocracy, Communism, Fabianism, and Corporatism are similar in outlook.

At the same time, the technocrats tend to have a relatively realistic grasp of economic reality, in understanding that money and market forces are only mechanisms for turning raw materials into human artefacts, and that energy rather than money is the real measure of costs of production. The technocratic approach to psychology favors the science fiction of behaviorism.

Thus it should be no surprise to find that many Peak Oilers argue for technocratic dictatorship as the solution to the Peak Oil problem. See for example the propaganda piece *Zeitgeist* (2007, sequels in 2008 and 2011). Others have sunken deeply into eschatology and want to adopt the course taken by the Christians after the First Coming - namely, they want to abandon the disintegrating, anti-human larger society, and form their own communities. Mike Ruppert is a prominent eschatologist leader. And so we see that a technocratic, Malthusian minded servant of the Oligarchy came up with a theory which fit neatly into his and his masters' worldview. I suspect that Hubbert was honest in his work - a true believer.

The second major influence on the Peak Oil movement was the Club of Rome, another brainchild of David Rockefeller and company, of which we have written enough. The Club of Rome is Malthus Central.

More recently, Peak Oil has been promulgated by certain oil industry veterans, like Colin Campbell (1931-) and Matthew Simmons (1943-2010). Simmons was a member of the CFR and of the National Petroleum Council - a high level "presidential advisory committee." Campbell has founded an "Association for the Study of Peak Oil and Gas" (ASPO), and is associated with the "Oil Depletion Analysis Centre" (ASPO UK) in London. Branches of ASPO have spawned across the world.

Conclusions

In sum, the Peak Oil movement is an eschatological, Malthusian cult. A realistic examination of the available evidence fails to support the Peak Oil theory. Politico-economic issues, and advances in technology, render a conjectured Peak Oil event in the long-term future inconsequential in the short-term. Even if the danger of Peak oil does exist, which is doubtful, we have bigger fish to fry at the current moment. Newer, better, cheaper energy sources should be sought on principle. At the current rate of technological innovation, it is hard to predict what problems humanity will be facing in 2050. As for Malthusianism, it was wrong and evil, and it remains wrong and evil.

9.8 Anthropogenic Global Warming

The Anthropogenic ("Man-Made") "Global Warming" Cult is an overtly Malthusian endeavour pushed down on the population straight from the top. The cult is Gaian, anti-human, anti-technological, anti-scientific, and anti-historical. It ties with the New Age farce and the United Nations world-government push. It aims to: 1) provide an excuse for the implementation of Malthusian policies, and for making Malthus acceptable again; and 2) concoct an existential threat for humanity for a while, so that people agree to rally behind a savior abstractly personified by the United Nations World Government.

Observe that the doctrine of AGW is *ipso facto* anti-human and anti-technological. AGW says that CO₂ is "killing the planet." CO₂ happens to be the by-product of human breathing. So there you have it - there are too many humans out there, and they breathe too much, and that is bad. Another source of CO₂ is modern human industry, which is the key factor in sustaining the modern human population. Too many factories emit too much CO₂, and that is bad, and nevermind that without the factories (and other such infrastructure) the planetary population has to fall. There are too many humans, and we are doomed, and technology will not help, and in fact it is better to

dismantle the factories and go back to manorial life. This is the same old Malthusian drivel in new clothes.

That AGW is Gaian (pantheistic, anti-Christian) should also be clear. AGW postulates that humanity is killing *the planet*. Pay attention to the language of the Global Warmers. They babble about the "planet" and "mother nature." And they want to save it. Forget the planet! What about the people?

Then there is the hypocrisy. To quote George Carlin from *Jammin' in New York* (1992):

We're so self-important. So self-important. Everybody's going to save something now. "Save the trees, save the bees, save the whales, save those snails." And the greatest arrogance of all: save the planet. What? Are these [-] people kidding me? Save the planet, we don't even know how to take care of ourselves yet. We haven't learned how to care for one another, we're gonna save the [-] planet?

...

Besides, there is nothing wrong with the planet. Nothing wrong with the planet. The planet is fine. The PEOPLE are [in trouble]. Difference. Difference. The planet is fine. Compared to the people, the planet is doing great. Been here four and a half billion years. Did you ever think about the arithmetic? The planet has been here four and a half billion years. We've been here, what, a hundred thousand? Maybe two hundred thousand? And we've only been engaged in heavy industry for a little over two hundred years. Two hundred years versus four and a half billion. And we have the CONCEIT to think that somehow we're a threat? That somehow we're gonna put in jeopardy this beautiful little blue-green ball that's just a-floatin' around the sun?

Carlin is correct - forget about the planet. It will manage. There are some who truly believe in "saving the planet," like Derrick Jensen, who wants to save the beavers and the salmon by blowing up dams. But by and large, people mouth AGW slogans, because: 1) they want to be cool and AGW is fashionable; 2) they want to appear clever and AGW sounds sciency; 3) they want to be "atheistic" and AGW offers the Gaian pantheistic religion, which is effectively equivalent to atheism; 4) they want a clean place to live in, failing to realize that without industry they may not even stay alive; 5) in their arrogance, they harbor a deep-seated condescension toward the people of the "third world." That is the legacy of the "white man's burden."

It is astounding, the arrogance. The first-worlders, having enjoyed a century of prosperity and industry, have found out that industry is bad. And so the third-worlders may not develop their countries now. Unfortunate, but that is how it is. The silly barbarians have to stop whining and breeding and get with the program.

For the classic example of the insanity of AGW alarmism, look up the excellent documentary piece *The Great Global Warming Swindle* (2007). There you will see an interview with a doctor in Kenya, who complains that his solar-panel powered clinic has to choose between refrigerating its blood bank and providing electrical lighting to the operating room. That is because Africa, which is rich in coal and oil and everything else, has to be environmentally friendly. This is *Malthusian genocide*.

All of this is justified, one might say, because, unfortunately, AGW is the holy truth. It may be anti-human and anti-technological, but it is right, meaning that Malthus was right. But Malthus was wrong, and so is the manufactured AGW swindle.

And that is the main point. Anthropogenic Global Warming is not happening, or, at worst, is not an existential problem. The questions to ask are: Is "Global Warming" at all happening? If so, is it man-made, and is it a problem?

Now, in our silly society, people have been taught to trust "experts." So if anyone dares criticize

Global Warming, he is asked: Are you an expert? And if you are not an expert, your opinion is bunk, you lose the right to "free speech," and you should just shut up and listen to your betters.

I take exception to this mentality. Take the recent economic crisis. Why did the economists fail to predict the crisis, and did it not occur on the basis of the policies they advocated? Neo-liberal after neo-liberal, Chicago boy after Chicago boy, won the Noble Prize in economics, and they all preached the same stuff - deregulate, free-marketize, privatize, monetize! And the world did all that, and the world economies are near collapse. The sane observer must conclude, therefore, that *the "experts" in economics are incompetents or worse*. Note that this conclusion requires no background in economics. You do not have to know *what* they are doing wrong in order to know that they are bungling things.

And if the "experts" in economics are wrong, then one has to consider the possibility that the experts in all the other politically non-neutral "sciences" (meaning everything sans mathematics - and one can argue that even mathematics has political connotations) are out of their minds. Thus one has to question Darwinism in biology... Global Warming in climatology... the wisdom of promoting homosexuality and Amazonianism in the absurd disciplines of "gender" and "feminist" "studies"... the accuracy of the views presented by modern history... the "Big Bang" in physics... the whole gamut.

Moreover, after one realizes that much of what passes as "science" is masked ideology, one can and should criticise at will.

This is not to say that one should argue blindly. Not all "science" rests on dubious foundations.

We will consult a number of experts in our brief examination of AGW - though we do not necessarily need to.

AGW is Blatantly False

The historical Medieval Warm Period is the *reductio ad absurdum* of AGW. We know that around 1000-1200 A.D., it was warmer than before 1000 A.D., and warmer than after 1200 A.D. Moreover, there was a Little Ice Age in the Baroque Era, around 1500-1700 A.D. These are not the fantastic predictions of contrived "models." The Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age are recorded historical phenomena. The chroniclers looked around and chronicled: "it's warmer than it used to be!" and "God is angry, we are freezing." Thus, for example, the river Thames used to freeze back in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. The people had fairs on top of the ice. In 1788, the Bishop of London walked over the frozen river from Fulham to Putney. The last Thames frost fair was held in 1814. The climate was growing milder, and the Thames stopped freezing. To raise the temperature, people must have been breathing particularly energetically in those days, when modern industry did not yet exist.

For an example of the effects and the reality of these two "climate anomalies," read chapters 7 and 8 of Pulitzer-Prize winner Jared Diamond's *Collapse* (2005). In the late 10th and early 11th centuries, the Vikings went and colonized Greenland. Their colony survived for about four centuries, before declining temperatures heralding the onset of the Little Ice Age rendered Greenland uninhabitable by a Viking-type society. Bands of hunter-gatherer Inuits remained on the island, but pastoral-agricultural civilization collapsed.

And that is it as far as the "anthropogenic" ("man-made") aspect of AGW goes. Climate has been changing, in accord with some unknown natural processes, throughout and before human history. Inductively, it follows that climate changes naturally. Day follows night, summer follows winter, and climate changes. Humans have nothing to do with it. Thus, even if we assume that modern society is witness to some "climate change," the logical supposition should be that people are observing a natural process. To say that this time around the humans are the ones causing the "change in climate," is to spit on both history and science. This is why AGW is anti-scientific and anti-historical in addition to being anti-human.

But let us consult some experts. Follow quotations from Wikipedia's *List of scientists opposing the mainstream scientific assessment of global warming* article, as of Jan 4, 2012.

- Khabibullo Abdusamatov, mathematician and astronomer at Pulkovo Observatory of the Russian Academy of Sciences said in a 2007 news agency interview: "Global warming results not from the emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, but from an unusually high level of solar radiation and a lengthy almost throughout the last century growth in its intensity."

- Sallie Baliunas, astronomer, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics said in a 2002 lecture for The Heritage Foundation: "Most of the increase in the air's concentration of greenhouse gases from human activities - over 80 percent - occurred after the 1940s. That means that the strong early 20th century warming must be largely, if not entirely, natural."; "The coincident changes in the sun's changing energy output and temperature records on earth tend to argue that the sun has driven a major portion of the 20th century temperature change."

- Don Easterbrook, emeritus professor of geology, Western Washington University said in a 2006 presentation to the Geological Society of America: "Glaciers advanced from about 1890 to 1920, retreated rapidly from circa 1925 to circa 1945, readvanced from 1945 to 1977, and have been retreating since the present warm cycle began in 1977. ... Because the warming periods in these oscillations occurred well before atmospheric CO₂ began to rise rapidly in the 1940s, they could not have been caused by increased atmospheric CO₂, and global warming since 1900 could well have happened without any effect of CO₂. If the cycles continue as in the past, the current warm cycle should end soon and global temperatures should cool slightly until about 2035, then warm about 0.5C from 2035 to 2065, and cool slightly until 2100."

- William M. Gray, Professor Emeritus and head of The Tropical Meteorology Project, Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University said in a 2006 newspaper interview: "I am of the opinion that [global warming] is one of the greatest hoaxes ever perpetrated on the American people."

- William Kininmonth, meteorologist, former Australian delegate to World Meteorological Organization Commission for Climatology wrote in a 2004 article and book: "There has been a real climate change over the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries that can be attributed to natural phenomena. Natural variability of the climate system has been underestimated by IPCC and has, to now, dominated human influences."

- David Legates, associate professor of geography and director of the Center for Climatic Research, University of Delaware wrote in a 2006 article for the National Center for Policy Analysis: "About half of the warming during the 20th century occurred prior to the 1940s, and natural variability accounts for all or nearly all of the warming."

- Tim Patterson, paleoclimatologist and Professor of Geology at Carleton University in Canada said in a 2007 newspaper article: "There is no meaningful correlation between CO₂ levels and Earth's temperature over this [geologic] time frame. In fact, when CO₂ levels were over ten times higher than they are now, about 450 million years ago, the planet was in the depths of the absolute coldest period in the last half billion years. On the basis of this evidence, how could anyone still believe that the recent relatively small increase in CO₂ levels would be the major cause of the past century's modest warming?"

- Tom Segalstad, head of the Geology Museum at the University of Oslo said in a 2007 presentation to the 9th International Symposium on Mining in the Arctic: "The IPCC's temperature curve (the so-called 'hockey stick' curve) must be in error, because the Medieval warm period (the "Climate Optimum") and the Little Ice Age both are absent from their curve, on which the IPCC bases its future projections and recommended mitigation. All measurements of solar luminosity and ¹⁴C isotopes show that there is at present an increasing solar radiation which gives a warmer climate Warmer climate

was previously perceived as an optimum climate and not catastrophic. ... On a wet basis the Earth's atmosphere consists by mass of 73.5% nitrogen, 22.5% oxygen, 2.7% water, and 1.25% argon. CO₂ in air is in minimal amount, 0.05% by mass, and with minimal capacity (2%) to influence the "Greenhouse Effect" compared to water vapor."

And so on and on and on.

The above quotations also serve to debunk the embarrassingly silly theory that CO₂ causes warming. CO₂ may accompany warming, or it may be completely unrelated to warming, or it may cause negligible warming, but it most certainly will not turn Manhattan into a pond, no matter how inviting the prospect of Wall Street underwater may be. And even assuming that CO₂ causes warming, it is lunacy to decide that the human-related emission of CO₂ is any way significant. Why CO₂ of all things? What about the Sun? Clearly, CO₂ was chosen, because humans "produce" it indirectly.

The scientists quoted above are eminently credible. Nor are they alone in resisting AGW. Arthur Robinson of the Oregon Institute for Science and Medicine has started a couple of anti-AGW petitions over the last 15 years. The second one, in 2008, attracted 31,000 signatures of "people with scientific qualification" (includes baccalaureate holders), about 9,000 of whom held PhDs in "hard-science" fields.

I have heard the argument that even 9,000 PhDs are only a negligible proportion of all the science PhDs in America. If we are going to use that type of logic, let us ask the American public about God. What qualifications does one need to talk about God? Surely being able to breathe suffices. So let us poll the Americans and let "democracy" decide that issue for us. Some may reply that "science" differs from "religion." The problem is exactly that AGW is religion rather than science. Even one qualified dissenter who presents a good argument is sufficient to discredit a theory. And with AGW, we have thousands upon thousands of "deniers." Speaking of which, the introduction of the term "denier" is a vile reference to "Holocaust deniers," and an example of the tactics employed by the Warmer fanatics.

The Warmers, pompous from the hot air they have ingested, are aware of the problem posed by the Medieval Warm Period, and want to delete the Period from the history books. There is a Wikipedia page on "Description of the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age in IPCC reports." The first IPCC report, in 1990, almost completely overlooked the Medieval Warm Period / Little Ice Age conundrum. They dedicated less than a page to the issue. Their ponderings were supported by an unsourced graph, which has been traced to some person's private, qualitative opinion on how temperatures have fluctuated. The graph vanished from the IPCC's subsequent reports.

The second, 1995, IPCC report again failed to seriously tackle the Medieval Warm Period.

The third, 2001, report, said, in effect, that in the IPCC's sage opinion, the MWP and the LIC did not really happen.

The fourth, 2007, report, reluctantly agreed that, yes, there was a MWP. But then the IPCC camarilla added that the MWP is really insignificant, it does not matter, it was not "global," and we should forget about it. This appears to be the current party line.

The Climategate 2.0 batch of emails reveals that the Climate Warmers are very concerned about the Medieval Warm Period. In particular, climate researchers such as the folks at junkscience.com, have pointed to the following email:

(Climategate 2.0, email 5111)

```
>Date: Tue, 7 Mar 2000 15:53:11 -0500 (EST)
>From: "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>
>To: p.jones@uea.ac.uk
```

...

What this demonstrates is that it is possible that many of the

```
>favorite climatic episodes, the MWP, the LIA, may not be global phenomena.
>
>We will review carefully the borehole database for deep high quality data
>that may shed some additional light on the full millennium in different
>regions. We might even think about different parameterizations for
>some of the best data. But it will be very difficult to make the MWP go
>away in Greenland.
...

```

Henry Pollack is a prominent IPCC alarmist. It is up to the reader to look up the document and to determine for himself what Pollack meant to say. As far as I am concerned, the IPCC are obviously trying to erase history in full accord with the notions promulgated by George Orwell.

The MWP also destroys the idea that a "global warming," if such a thing is happening, is bad for humanity. People thrived during the MWP! The winters were shorter, the sun was shinier (metaphorically speaking), the crops grew better, and life was good. Europe's population boomed during the Medieval Warm Period, and stagnated after 1200, when the warming waned. One could claim that the population stagnated not because of the cooling but because the Europeans had overloaded their continent, but the fact remains - they prospered in the early medieval times.

Yes, the glaciers probably retreated in that era - and in so doing, they opened new lands for farming and human habitation. The coastal cities did not sink, the deserts did not gobble up the world, and life went on. There are questions one must ask. Where did human civilization blossom originally? In Egypt, Mesopotamia, and other such *warm areas*. Classical Civilization thrived around the Mediterranean, not the Baltic. Many more people live in warm places than in cold places. The American East Coast, England, and North-Western Europe can maintain their populations only because of the **warm** gulf stream.

Then there is water. Humans consist of water. They need water. Water is good for humans. Water is life. People have traded over waterways for millennia. Water irrigates crops. Water is civilization. Populations concentrate near bodies of water. So if the polar ices are melting - and if they are melting now, they will freeze again in the future - let them melt! People can use the water. The coastal cities did not sink back in the Medieval Warm Period, and they will not sink this time, either. Holland and New Orleans are doing just fine under the water level - the Katrina debacle was the product of political incompetence, rather than the "will of nature." The levies gave, because whoever was in charge had not done his job.

So, no, "global warming," even if it is real, and even if it is anthropogenic, is not a problem. To tax people's industry, and to prevent people from developing their communities and living better lives, is not merely criminal, but overtly *evil*.

In sum, the historically documented (and otherwise confirmed) Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age provide a *reductio ad absurdum* to the AGW thesis. In particular, 1) "climate change" is not man-made; and 2) a warming would be beneficial to human civilization.

Fraud and Embarrassment

Follows an assorted collection of criticisms toward the AGW cult.

First, in regard to the consensus. The Warmers like to say that there is a "scientific consensus" on the reality of AGW. The Wikipedia "List of Scientists opposing..." page opens with a reference claiming that "97-98% of the most published climate researchers think humans are causing global warming." So what? If 97% of "scientists" say that white is black, what are we going to do? Who owns the journals? They are either private or ostensibly public but in reality (private) foundation-

funded. Most are "paywalled," meaning that you have to pay to read the stuff.¹⁴ In other words, if the Malthusian Oligarchs want to promote AGW - as they obviously do, as we have seen - they can use their corporate media to create a furor, and they can make sure that their private "academic" magazines and foundation grants go only to alarmists. This, obviously, is exactly what is going on. A stooge and scoundrel of the calibre of Al Gore does not win the Noble Prize and the Academy Award without a little help from his friends.

Then there is the other issue, that of "peer review." To introduce an idea into the academic world, all you have to do is train a cadre of thoroughly brainwashed "academics," who will be existentially attached to whatever you teach them, because their careers will have been built on the proposed thesis - and then elevate them into prestigious positions, and particularly into the review boards of the top privately-funded journals. Have them peer review each other's papers. That is how things work, and that is what has happened with the so-called "climate science." We know, from Dodd's interview and other sources, that the Oligarchs perfected this technique a century ago, when they took over the Anglo-American historical establishment. We know they manufactured the "feminist studies" field. They have high-jacked academic disciplines before, and, given the opportunity and an incentive, they will do so again.

And here is some proof. The following tidbit is from Donna Laframboise's blog. Laframboise is a Canadian journalist and the author of a series of books critical to the AGW farce.

*An Even Younger Senior Author*¹⁵

Yesterday I wrote about Richard Klein, a Dutch geography professor currently working in Sweden, who began writing reports for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) at the tender age of 25.

That was nine full years prior to earning his PhD, and part of a larger pattern. Sari Kovats also became an IPCC author 15 years prior to completing her doctorate, Lisa Alexander became an IPCC author a decade prior to getting hers, and Laurens Bouwer hadn't even finished his Masters when he first served as a lead author. The IPCC has a history, therefore, of pretending that grad students are the equivalent of the world's top scientists.

... Klein appears to be mistaken [in claiming to be "the youngest ever coordinating lead author in the history of the IPCC"]. Another Dutchman - economist Richard Tol - got there first.

...

Given that Tol and Klein were born a few months apart in 1969, and the report in which Tol was involved came first, it would seem that it is Tol who holds the dubious distinction of being the youngest ever person to oversee an IPCC chapter.

Tol earned his PhD in 1997 - around the time his report was released. In that respect, his case is less egregious than the others cited above. But this still means the IPCC assigned him the most senior of author roles when he was a 20-something grad student.

If climate change is the biggest challenge facing humanity, why have kids filled key IPCC positions for the past 15 years?

*Greenpeace and the Nobel-Winning Climate Report*¹⁶

Considered the climate Bible by governments around the world, the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report is meant to be a scientific analysis of the most authoritative research.

Instead, it references literature generated by Greenpeace - an organization known more for headline-grabbing publicity stunts than sober-minded analysis. (Eight IPCC-cited

¹⁴<http://www.eecg.toronto.edu/~prall/climate/journals.html>, Jan 4, 2012.

¹⁵<http://nofrakkingconsensus.com/2010/10/22/an-even-younger-senior-author/>, Jan 4, 2012.

¹⁶<http://nofrakkingconsensus.com/2011/07/27/how-the-ipcc-defines-distinguished-scientist/>, Jan 4, 2012.

Greenpeace publications are listed at the bottom of this post.)

In one section of this Nobel-winning report, climate change is linked to coral reef degradation. The sole source for this claim? A Greenpeace report titled *Pacific in Peril* (see Hoegh-Guldberg below). Here the report relies on a Greenpeace document to establish the lower-end of an estimate involving solar power plants (Aringhoff).

When discussing solar energy elsewhere, the report references two Greenpeace documents in one sentence. Here it uses a Greenpeace paper as its sole means of documenting where the "main wind-energy investments" are located globally (Wind).

...

The expert reviewers who had input into just one portion (Working Group III) of the IPCC report are listed in this 8-page PDF. They include three Greenpeace employees, two Friends of the Earth representatives, two Climate Action Network reps, and a person each from activist organizations WWF International, Environmental Defense, and the David Suzuki Foundation.

...

The third Greenpeace representative given official standing as an IPCC reviewer is Sven Teske. When a Greenpeace protest vessel shut down Europe's largest coal port in 2005, Teske was on board. Described as a renewable energy expert, he declared:

Climate change is now the single biggest threat facing our planet... Greenpeace is here today to expose Europe's dangerous addiction to coal.

Let us be clear - Donna Laframboise is an "expert." She is an expert journalist. She tells us facts, and it is up to us to interpret her findings. The rest of story can be found in her latest (2011) IPCC expose, *The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken For The Worlds Top Climate Expert*.

James Delingpole is another notable researcher on climate issues.

Dr. Tim Ball has also commented on the subject. The rising independent journalistic dynamo James Corbett has recently founded a portal on anti-AGW research: www.climategate.tv.

The IPCC is the main vehicle of AGW propaganda and "research." And, as we can see, the IPCC was composed of, among others, a gang of impressionable young PhD candidates and a bunch of avowed Gaian lunatics.

Laframboise also provides evidence of the Oligarchical puppeteering of the IPCC:

*WWF Influence at the Highest Levels of the IPCC*¹⁷

The 2007 report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is 3,000 pages long. Since most people will never wade through a document of that length, the IPCC has prepared a handy summary-of-summaries called the Synthesis Report.

The final, specific wording of that document was hammered out via a political negotiation involving bureaucrats, politicians, and diplomats. But the draft document from which those people based their discussions was authored by a select group of 40 IPCC personnel known as the "core writing team."

The IPCC says there were 450 lead authors, plus 800 contributing authors for its 2007 report (which is often referred to as AR4 for Assessment Report 4). This makes a grand total of 1,250 participants. Of those a mere 40 individuals were elevated to core writing team status.

...

One would therefore expect that these chosen few would be of the highest calibre: Top-notch, reputable scientists. Highly experienced professionals. Individuals known for their impeccable judgment. Those whose objectivity is beyond dispute.

Alas, that would be in some parallel universe in which the IPCC thinks that public

¹⁷<http://nofrackingconsensus.com/2011/10/04/wwf-influence-at-the-highest-levels-of-the-ipcc/>, Jan 4, 2012.

perception matters. In our world, the 40 *crème de la crème* individuals break down as follows:

- 6 of them were IPCC employees at the time - Peter Bosch, Renate Christ, Jian Liu, Martin Manning, Jean Palutikof and Andy Reisinger
- 1 was an American lawyer (Lenny Bernstein) and another was a medical doctor with a thin publication record who is employed by the World Health Organization (Bettina Menne)

That leaves us with 32 people who might be considered world-class scientists. But among those are:

- IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri - who is thoroughly tainted by the fact that he writes forewords for Greenpeace publications
- Bill Hare - a longtime Greenpeace employee who is considered a legend in that organization
- and - who'd have guessed it? - 9 other people with documented links to the World Wildlife Fund. These nine individuals belong to the Climate Witness Scientific Advisory Panel about which I have been reporting recently. Their names are Osvaldo Canziani, Saleemul Huq, David Karoly, Zbigniew Kundzewicz, Monirul Mirza, Leonard Nurse, Nijavalli Ravindranath, the late Stephen Schneider, and Gary Yohe.

So of the 32 members of the IPCC's core writing team that we might have expected to be world-class scientists, 11 of them (34%) are publicly affiliated with environmental NGOs. And we're really supposed to believe that the IPCC is a scientific organization writing purely scientific reports.

So, at one recent time, a quarter of the IPCC's top honchos was affiliated with the high-level Malthusian WWF of Philip the Germ, Bernhard the Nazi, Julian Huxley the eugenicist, Godfrey the Rockefeller, and other such specimens.

The David Suzuki foundation is a Malthusian front, and the pathetic charlatan David Suzuki, who got his PhD at the University of Chicago, is a convinced Malthusian.¹⁸

In 2009, the CFR's Foreign Policy published its *First Annual List of the World's 100 Top Global Thinkers*.¹⁹ Number one was Helicopter Ben Bernarke (also known, thanks in no small part to Gerald Celente, as Osama Bin Bernarke). Second, the Noble Peace Prize winner war criminal and traitor to America Obama (betraying the Constitution is treason, and Obama has done that many times, for example by waging a non-congressionally approved war on Libya). Third was Zahra Rahnavard, the mouthpiece for the attempted "Green" Color Coup in Iran.

The fifth "global thinker" was Rajendra Pachauri, the head of the IPCC. Donna Laframboise had this to say of him (the source contains links to the referred utterances and factoids):

*My Fave Chairman Pachauri Quote*²⁰

Rajendra Pacharui has been chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) since 2002. Any confidence any reasonable person might have had in his leadership has long evaporated.

Last September I blogged about how an inquiry that examined IPCC policies and procedures blew "smoking holes through just about everything" this man has told us about his organization and the way it produces its reports.

¹⁸See, for example, the material collected here: <http://suzukiwatch.wordpress.com/>, active as of Jan 4, 2012.

¹⁹http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/11/30/the_fp_top_100_global_thinkers?page=full, Jan 4, 2012.

²⁰<http://nofrackingconsensus.com/2011/06/23/my-fave-chairman-pachauri-quote/>, Jan 4, 2012.

Six weeks later I wrote about the fact that, if you catch him in the right mood, Pachauri will bizarrely attempt to deny that the IPCC is a United Nations organization.

I've mentioned that his idea of statesmanship is to declare that climate skeptics should rub asbestos on their face.

I've observed that, when IPCC insiders were given a chance to comment on Pachauri's performance via an anonymous online questionnaire last year, they used words such as *inexcusable*, *dysfunctional*, and *ill-advised*.

I've written about the fact, given all the calls for his resignation that have been studiously ignored, there's no escaping the conclusion that the IPCC is "a screeching, flashing, billboard-sized example of influence without accountability."

A few days ago I pointed out that Pachauri speaks incessantly about 'the cause' and has admitted that he sees fighting climate change as merely a means to an end. His real goal, he says, is transforming the global economy.

Lest someone accuses me of over-relying on Laframboise's research, let me observe that I can not, for lack of time, read every single document pertaining to an issue that is fairly clear anyway. The point is that my claims and observations are easy to check, and Laframboise has reached conclusions similar to mine, and has done the necessary muckraking. Bravo to her, but what really matters is that, verifiably, Pachauri is a thoroughly discredited frontman for a discredited organization. That bedlamite has gotten it in his head to provide electricity to rural India via solar panels. This is physically impossible. Solar panels are ostensibly "green," except that *manufacturing* solar panels is an expensive process involving large quantities of energy. Even assuming that switching to solar panels is a good idea, one needs an industry to build the panels, and an industry requires regular power stations - water-powered ones where possible, carbon-powered where not possible. Moreover, no electricity in a modern society means poverty and starvation.

Also, from *India Today*:

*Pachauri in a spot as climategate hits TERI*²¹

During his tenure, first as director from 1982, and then as director-general of The Energy Research Institute (TERI) since 2001, Pachauri was a member of the boards of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission (ONGC), Indian Oil Corporation (IOC) and National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC), three of India's biggest public sector energy companies, all of whom by the very nature of their business contribute heavily to greenhouse gas emissions. These emissions, according to the IPCC, are adding to the country's growing carbon footprint and hastening climate change.

TERI, in fact, entered into business dealings with these companies and allegedly benefitted from Pachauri's association with them. Pachauri's dealings have also been noticed by the international media. Recently, the Sunday Telegraph of London had accused him of amassing a fortune using his links with carbon trading companies. Pachauri dismisses the report as "a pack of lies".

The climate change hero was an independent director on ONGC's board for three years between June 2006 and June 2009, during which he was entitled to first-class air travel when he attended meetings, five-star hotel stays and an allowance of Rs.25,000 for each meeting attended. This was in addition to having a say in the PSU's decision-making process. It was during this period that TERI had secured business contracts from ONGC.

And that is the CFR's top AGW asset.

The sixth person in the CFR's list is William Clinton, the Rhodes Scholar war criminal guilty of treason to America. Number twelve is the Malthusian enthusiast Bill Gates, who has recently joined the alarmist team in the AGW game. The next Global Warmer in the list is Nicholas Stern

²¹<http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/Pachauri+in+a+spot+as+climategate+hits+TERI/1/78466.html>, Jan 4, 2012.

(1946-), at place 36. Stern is a British Oligarch, the "Baron of Brentford." He is the "Chair of the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment at the London School of Economics." His brother Richard was the vice-president of the World Bank, and his brother Brian was the vice-president of Xerox.

Stern got his PhD at the high-level all-graduate Nuffield College at Oxford, which was founded in 1937, and which closely resembles the Milner Group's All Souls. The grandfather of the Nuffield who founded the college (William Morris, 1877-1963) was William Morris (1834-1896), the author of the notable utopian piece *News from Nowhere* (1890), and a great admirer of Ruskin, the spiritual guru of the Rhodes gang.

Like his brother, Stern was a Chief Economist and Senior Vice-President of the World Bank. In the second half of the 1990s, he was a high official of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. For a brief while, he was a permanent secretary to the British Treasury. In 2006, he published his *Stern Review Report on the Economics of Climate Change*, which said that to get the "market" to appreciate nature, carbon taxes and other such instruments must be implemented. Carbon taxes, dear reader, are taxes on the the air you breathe and on the life that you live. They are the ultimate monetization of everything.

Stern wants to throw one percent of the global GDP toward AGW.

The next of the CFR's Warmers is James Hansen at number 68. Hansen (1941-) studied at the University of Iowa and worked for NASA. He has built his career around AGW. His 1988 report to the U.S. Senate committee chaired by Al Gore was one of the key moments in AGW history. Remember that there was no AGW before 1988, during which year, incidentally, the IPCC was founded. Writes Laframboise:²²

Hansen's testimony was a turning point - after which the mainstream media, the environmental lobby, and much of the known world became critically concerned about climate change.

Which brings us to the crux of the matter: If Hansens scientific arguments were so convincing, if his evidence was so cut-and-dried, so "beyond debate," why did Wirth stoop to political theatre, to "stagecraft" - as a television journalist charitably terms it?

Why did Wirth [Senator, member of the committee] (and, by implication, Al Gore) deliberately schedule the hearing for the hottest part of the year? Why did Wirth sneak into the hearing room the night before and open the windows so that the air conditioning system wouldn't work be ineffective? If weather is not climate, why did Wirth go to such trouble to suggest the exact opposite to the media covering that event?

You can find a clip on YouTube, in which Wirth proudly confirms the veracity of the above allegations. And that is how it all started.

This does not directly impute Hansen, though it does suggest that his career has been aided, perhaps without his knowledge, by interested parties at the top. Hansen himself is a fanatic who wants to sue the CEOs of the oil companies for "high crimes against humanity and nature." That the CEOs are guilty of crimes against humanity is quite likely. But since when could nature be a plaintiff?

Recently, Hansen has provoked the cops into arresting him on at least two occasions to garner publicity.

At number 69, the CFR, to their credit, put Freeman Dyson, a vociferous critic of Hansen and AGW.

Number 77 is Amory Lovins (1947-), an AGW propagandist and the founder and chairman of the Rocky Mountain Institute. The RMI's work has benefited (Wikipedia page on RMI) "80 Fortune 500 companies in a diverse range of sectors." The Institute has (Wikipedia page on Lovins) "spun off five for-profit companies."

²²<http://nofrackingconsensus.com/2010/12/11/if-the-science-is-so-persuasive-why-the-theatrics/>, Jan 4, 2012.

Lovins studied at Harvard and Oxford. He has been an environmentalist since when the movement started around 1970. He is against nuclear energy and has occasionally written for *Foreign Policy* since the mid-1970s.

Grateful for his input, the Oligarchs have showered Lovins with prizes.

At number 78, we have Bill McKibben (1960-). The *Boston Globe* thinks this fellow is perhaps America's leading environmentalist. The Skull and Bones *Time* raises the bar higher, calling McKibben the world's top green journalist.

McKibben is in charge of the NGO "350.org," which holds "actions" across the world. So this "organization" is something like dupe-central for the global "green" slow-motion Color Coup. Such activity requires funding. Naturally, we ask ourselves, did the Rockefellers fund 350.org? Of course they did!

1Sky and 350.org: Stronger as One

by Jessica Bailey, posted on 04/21/2011 at the Rockefeller Brothers Fund's website²³

This month marked the exciting marriage of 1Sky and 350.org - two grantees of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund's Sustainable Development program.

...

Despite the news coming from Washington, the announcement to merge 1Sky and 350.org - two of the biggest movements on climate - into a single organization under the banner of 350.org, gives me hope that we just might build a people-powered movement strong enough to protect this planet. 1Sky and 350.org were born around the same time and involved many of the same leaders. Bill McKibben, who has been a 1Sky board member and will chair the new 350.org board, once referred to 1Sky as the U.S. Embassy for 350.org and 350.org as 1Sky's foreign legion.

The new 350.org has an aggressive plan to mobilize millions of people in a tech-savvy, citizen-driven movement that can finally build the support necessary for real climate action. The good news is they have a solid running start. The new campaign will have over 600,000 active supporters, thousands of volunteer community organizers in every state, and hundreds of partner organizations.

Straight from the horse's mouth. We need not add anything more on the subject of McKibben.

Conspicuous with his absence from the list is Maurice Strong (1929-), the powerful veteran Rockefeller crony, New Ager, and AGW promoter. Of him we have already written.

That is what the top visible echelon of the Warmer movement consists of: fanatic patsies, brain-washed and bought-and-paid-for academic hacks, and overtly Oligarchical personalities like Nicholas Stern and Maurice Strong.

The reader should realize that the AGW predictions, which consistently fail to predict anything real, are based on computer models. Now, as I have pointed out, as someone with a significant background in mathematics, statistics (which is mathematics), and computer programming (which is also mathematics), I can say with certainty that computer models are highly susceptible to small perturbations, that the relationship between complex models and reality is remote at best, and that it is very easy to make a model produce the results the researcher desires. In short, trying to reshape society on the basis of the results of a model purporting to predict a complex multi-dimensional phenomenon, is something between a joke, a suicide, and a bedlamite's revelry.

But let us hear some experts, from Wikipedia's "list of scientists opposing..."

- Freeman Dyson, Professor Emeritus of the School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Ad-

²³<http://www.rbf.org/post/1sky-and-350org-stronger-one>, Jan 4, 2012.

vanced Study; Fellow of the Royal Society said in a 2011 email exchange with a journalist: "First, the computer models are very good at solving the equations of fluid dynamics but very bad at describing the real world. The real world is full of things like clouds and vegetation and soil and dust which the models describe very poorly. Second, we do not know whether the recent changes in climate are on balance doing more harm than good. The strongest warming is in cold places like Greenland. More people die from cold in winter than die from heat in summer. Third, there are many other causes of climate change besides human activities, as we know from studying the past. Fourth, the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is strongly coupled with other carbon reservoirs in the biosphere, vegetation and top-soil, which are as large or larger. It is misleading to consider only the atmosphere and ocean, as the climate models do, and ignore the other reservoirs. Fifth, the biological effects of CO₂ in the atmosphere are beneficial, both to food crops and to natural vegetation. The biological effects are better known and probably more important than the climatic effects. Sixth, summing up the other five reasons, the climate of the earth is an immensely complicated system and nobody is close to understanding it."

- Richard Lindzen, Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and member of the National Academy of Sciences has made his views clear in several newspaper articles: "We are quite confident (1) that global mean temperature is about 0.5 C higher than it was a century ago; (2) that atmospheric levels of CO₂ have risen over the past two centuries; and (3) that CO₂ is a greenhouse gas whose increase is likely to warm the earth (one of many, the most important being water vapor and clouds). But and I cannot stress this enough we are not in a position to confidently attribute past climate change to CO₂ or to forecast what the climate will be in the future. [T]here has been no question whatsoever that CO₂ is an infrared absorber (i.e., a greenhouse gas albeit a minor one), and its increase should theoretically contribute to warming. Indeed, if all else were kept equal, the increase in CO₂ should have led to somewhat more warming than has been observed."

- Hendrik Tennekes, retired Director of Research, Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute said in a 2009 essay: "The blind adherence to the harebrained idea that climate models can generate 'realistic' simulations of climate is the principal reason why I remain a climate skeptic."

- August H. "Augie" Auer Jr. (1940-2007), retired New Zealand MetService Meteorologist and past professor of atmospheric science at the University of Wyoming, believed that the cause of global warming was unknown: [Computer modeling results gave] "usually an envelope of figures, one which said the planet could warm 6 deg in the next 100 years and the other end of the envelope was perhaps half a deg in 100 years. And you know which one would be quoted" [in the media] ... "So if you multiply the total contribution 3.6 by the man-made portion of it, 3.2, you find out that the anthropogenic contribution of CO₂ to the global greenhouse effect is 0.117 percent, roughly 0.12 percent, that's like 12c in \$100." "It's miniscule ... it's nothing,".

The models are bogus, and there is no "consensus."

For a hilarious example of the absurdity of the Warmers' models, consider the McIntyre and McKittrick 2005 scandal. McIntyre and McKittrick reconstructed the algorithm of Michael Mann, the author of the infamous "hockey stick" graph. The Macs observed that whatever parameters they threw into the algorithm, it spat out a hockey stick. The U.S. House of Representative got an army of statisticians to confirm the findings, and they did.

The Climategate trove revealed that some Warmers had also tried to feed random numbers into their hockey stick algorithm - and like a good algorithm, it produced a hockey stick! But of course it would!

It also emerged that Mann had cherry-picked his data to make his hockey stick look just right.

Another interesting question is whether a global "warming" is occurring at all. Some scientists (like Nicola Scafetta, Ian Clark, and Piers Corbyn) have claimed that instead of a warming, we are experiencing a cooling. Ironically, the global cooling thesis was fairly (though far from overwhelmingly) popular back in the 1970s.

The warmers, just to be safe, sometimes insist on calling their Global Warming myth, "Climate Change." Some say that there is a "long-term" trend toward warming, which may be causing "short-term" coolings.²⁴ This was the premise of the 2004 Hollywood scarepiece *The Day After Tomorrow*. In this way, the Warmer boys and gals have all directions covered. Climate does change, as does everything else. If temperatures go down, the Warmers will adjust their theories, and point to those in their ranks who "predicted" the change beforehand. And if temperatures go up, the Warmers will say that the temporary-cooling hypothesis was a mere educated guess, and that the important thing is that the "man-made" GW thesis holds anyway. It is a heads we win, tails you lose type of scenario. A farce worthy of a Mel Brooks.

Finally, one wonders how and why exactly climate changes. The how probably has something to do with the sun, which has cycles of its own (there exists some research on the subject). The "why" is one of the universal questions, to which perhaps the best answer is "Because that is how things are."

To wrap things up, Paul Erhlich the Club of Rome Malthusian mentioned carbon gasses and a potential "global warming" back in 1968 in his *Population Bomb*. Around 1988, the Oligarchs, aware of the Soviet collapse, and ready to begin the next stage of the Great Game, introduced their Anthropogenic Global Warming scam to the world (Gorbachev joined the fun). They had Hansen present to the Senate in a contrived stageplay, and founded the IPCC. In 2006-2007, they had another great publicity stunt in the form of Al Gore's "documentary" and the subsequent Academy Award and Noble Prize. The United Nations is thoroughly Malthusian and anti-technological at the top. It is also Gaian/ New Age, as we will see shortly. The large foundations and the top Oligarchs keep recruiting eco-patsies and financing their movements and NGOs. The major governments have been brow-beaten, sabotaged, and swindled into signing AGW-related documents and agreements - though one can find a source for optimism in Canada's recent (December 2011) withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol, which withdrawal is to take place in 2012.

The brainwashing of the public seems to have attained its reachable extent. In the United States, roughly, a third to a half of the people think that Global Warming is man-made, and the same proportion think that it is not or is not at all happening. The balance equivocate. Two thirds think that GW is a problem, and a third think it is not.²⁵ The numbers supporting AGW have fallen since their high at the time of the Al Gore media-blitz campaign and Katrina in 2005-2006-2007. Unfortunately, these types of numbers may prove sufficient to pass a simple majority-wins referendum, particularly in combination with some natural disaster and a heavy media campaign. It always comes back to the control of the media and the power of brainwashing.

At the same time, the Climategate scandals have revealed that the Warmers really are lying through their teeth. The example of the Canadian government, and the accumulating evidence against the Warmers, may get the serious, anti-Oligarchical (and many small 'o' oligarchs probably do not embrace the plan of the big 'O' Oligarchs) people in the important governments may decide that it is a bad idea to commit great resources to a suspect theory.

The main Warmers are a band of true-believer zealots, opportunistic charlatans, Oligarchical movers-and-shakers, and naive brainwashed academics. The apparent goals of the Global Warming Swindle are: the provision of an imaginary global existential threat; and the reintroduction of Malthusianism

²⁴See, for example, the following article by Michael Le Page of the Canadian consulting firm Rowan Williams Davies & Irwin Inc: <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn17808-climate-myths-any-cooling-disproves-global-warming.html>, Jan 4, 2012.

²⁵<http://www.pollingreport.com/enviro.htm>

under a new guise.

As for the "theory" itself, it is absurd. Climate change is perfectly natural and has nothing or extremely little to do with human activity. If the planet is warming, it is probably still coming out of the Little Ice Age, which continued into the 19th century in some parts of the world. In any case, a global warming would be a boon for humanity.

I have heard the argument that even if AGW is wrong, propagandising it is still a good idea, because humanity has to clean up its act anyway. The problem is that AGW is killing people. Preventing people from developing is equivalent to slowly murdering them. Carbon taxes are taxes on human life.

If people want to, let them "save the environment." Millions of unemployed are brooding over bottles of Jack Daniels in their homes, drawing the dole. Why don't the governments grab those fellows (metaphorically speaking), and, as Tarpley once mentioned in reference to one of FDR's projects, send them out to plant forests? If people want to cut trees, they might as well plant new ones. It only makes sense. So round up the unemployed, and get them to plant forests. They are drawing unemployment anyway! Might as well be doing useful work! Plant forests, dig new rivers (like Muammar Qaddafi did before they murdered him), save the environment - nothing to it - except political insanity and academic ignorance.

One last point - chemtrails. Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity to research the problem in detail. The brief summary is as follows: sometime in the mid-to-late 1990s, strange trails started appearing in the skies. The difference between the regular *contrails* and the so-called *chemtrails* is that the former disappear much more quickly than the latter. Since they started spraying, the sprayers (who have to be associated with the world militaries) have spread all over the world. The reader will probably spot chemtrails if he makes the effort to look at the sky frequently enough.

People have little idea of what is going on. The major governments have consistently denied that there is such a thing as chemtrails. Too many people, however, have independently started complaining about the chemtrails despite a media blackout on the issue. Collective schizophrenia does not work that way. Something is going on, but it hard to say what.

The sprayers can only have one or both of two goals in mind: to directly affect certain living organisms on the planet, or to affect certain natural patterns of the planet.

One wonders, could the Oligarchs have tried to manually realize their AGW predictions? To fulfil the prophesy they have made? I find this particular theory a bit too far-fetched - but something smells rotten - and, given that the Oligarchs conducted 9/11 and created the AGW fraud out of nothing, we should give them some credit. They may lack a conscience, but they certainly have imagination.

9.9 The New Age Religion

In this section we take a look at the New Age cult, which, by all indications, constitutes the flagship of the Oligarchs' effort toward building a new world religion for their New World Order. The New Age farce rests on the writings of Madame Blavatsky, Alice Bailey, and Annie Besant. New gurus and additional New Age scriptures have appeared since the inception of the UN and the Second World War.

The great push for the New Age opened during the 1970s, when the minds of the people - and particularly of the young - were fertile as an aftermath of the "revolutionary" events of the 1960s. More recently, the New Age advances mercilessly, flooding the bookstores with garbage and drivel, and streaming from the television sets on such shows as Oprah Winfrey's. That Oprah is a New Ager is obvious from her fanatical endorsement for the New Age scriptural piece *The Secret* (2006). The New Age cult has the endorsement of the United Nations.

Describing the specific doctrines and ideas of the New Age cult is not that easy, because there are many branches of New Agery, with a combined massive total of literatures. Moreover, I find the

New Age literature unreadable.

From deduction, observation, and a read through some referential literature, I can say that: there are Gaia-oriented, pantheistic strands of New Agery, which put God in "nature" and regard human beings as only "a part of nature," equal to the monkeys and the porkers and the other critters. Then there is a more Luciferian strand, which attributes divinity - existing or potential - unto Man himself. This falls in with the Masonic/ Gnostic tradition. The idea is that man has divine power and can turn into a God. Notice that both strands deny and oppose monotheism and the Christian idea of divinity.

We have already pointed toward a number of New Age prophets and some New Age scripture.

The symbols of the New Age are the swastika, the six-pointed star, the compass-and-square of Masonry, and an assortment of other such alchemic/ occult/ Hindu/ gnostic pictographs. The New Age hidden high priesthood is, from what one can see, the Oligarchy.

As in Darwinism, there exists a symbiosis between the pantheistic and the anthropotheistic views of the universe. Vaguely, the idea is that most humans are but a part of nature, cattle, sheep; but some humans can turn themselves into Gods via the power of their "intelligence." This is a crucial point, inasmuch as it implies the divinely ordained validity of arranging human society along the lines of castes. The intelligent Oligarchy, under this doctrine, has the right to direct, and if necessary cull, the human herd.

In itself, pantheism is compatible with the caste arrangement, in the sense that one can claim that there is a pyramidal order in nature - there are trees and plants, and the bugs and the herbivores eat them, and the predator carnivores eat the herbivores, and man eats everything; but the same arrangement holds in human society - there are the "low quality" people, and their betters command them, and there are the Oligarchs at the top, and all of this is "natural," i.e. the will of Gaia.

The "positive thinking/ self-help" phenomenon is part-and-parcel of the New Age cult. "Positive thinking" tends to preach: 1) blind, as opposed to qualified, belief in oneself; 2) greed - the love of Mammon - by claiming that to get something, you must really really yearn for it; and 3) by implication of the two prior points, Self-Help postulates that Man is God - or rather, that Man can find God inside himself. The philosophy of "self-help" is extremely pernicious, because it builds up egos without foundations. It justifies petty greed and rapacity. It is a doctrine, the falsehood of which has been recognized for centuries - and which has continued to plague mankind nonetheless. Observe, again, that the pantheistic view clashes with the Christian idea that Man is in the image of God, and thus special. Under pantheism, man is not so special and his life is not sacrosanct. In regard to the anthropotheistic view, it is worth pointing out that the theme of the evil of hubris is ingrained in the Classical-Christian-Western tradition. Excessive pride has led humanity into trouble again and again. Driven by arrogance, losing grasp of reality, humans have hurt themselves and their fellows again and again over the centuries. The "sin of pride" is not some blind Christian dogma, but the essence of thousands of years of collected human wisdom and experience.

Moreover, while the caste system is fully compatible with certain quasi-pantheistic religions like Hinduism with its Karma (and Karma is prominent in New Agery), Christianity says that God loves everybody and if any of his children are dearer to him, they are the weak and the poor.

Thus, the false dichotomy of blind dogmatic bigoted Christians opposing the perfectly reasonable beliefs of idiosyncratic, "free-spirit" lovers of "nature" and whatever else, should be exposed. The Christians tend to oppose New Agery, because it is overtly anti-Christian, and is in fact - literally - Luciferian, as we will see. Putting Christianity aside, one has every reason to oppose New Agery, unless one feels that sheep and humans are essentially the same, or that trying to become God is a good idea. And I have to say, if you feel that sheep and humans are the same, expect to be treated like a sheep; and before you grasp for Godhood, try to think of all the errors, follies, and petty acts of unkindness that you have committed. Being Man is hard enough.

One of the main goals of New Agery is to supplant all major existing religions. Thus, the anticipated New Age messiah, "Maitreya," is supposed to be the Christian Christ, the Muslim Mahdi,

the Hindu Krishna, the Jewish Messiah, and the Buddhist Buddha, all at once.

The Oligarchs may be mad enough (and, I have to say, possessed of a sufficiently great sense of humor) to unleash a flesh-and-blood Maitreya on the world. The great irony is that he would be the definition of the prophesied Christian Antichrist. Admittedly, this is a remote possibility - but it would be the logical culmination of the New Age play - and besides, a proper religion will need a Messiah.

As we know, the only temple at the Rockefeller New York United Nations is a New Age-type shrine. Maurice Strong, the powerful Canadian Oligarch, UN functionary, Rockefeller stooge, and Global Warmer, is also a pious New Ager. In the late 1970s, he bought a vast strip of land in Colorado, and set up his own New Age commune.²⁶

But let us look into the available evidence. In our chapter on secret societies, we met Madame Blavatsky, and examined the considerable influence of her cult. Throughout this work, here and there, we have seen evidence of the presence of New Agery within the United Nations. Let us what else we can find.

One standard source on the scripture and structure of New Agery is Constance E. Cumbey's *The Hidden Dangers of the Rainbow* (1983). Gary H. Kah has written on the link between the U.N. and the New Age cult in a series of books. We will look at his *En Route to Global Occupation* (1992).

The Scripture

We draw on Cumbey's work. Let me stress that while she writes from the Christian perspective, we must adopt a historico-politico-philosophical view. Thus, we are interested in ideas more than dogma, and in the political rather than the theological (though the two are related) import of the New Age cult.

Constance Cumbey (1944-) is a Michigan lawyer and a devout Christian.

The woman opens her book by quoting a 1982 advertisement for the advent of "Maitreya" placed by the influential New Ager Benjamin Creme, a disciple of Blavatsky and company. Creme (1922-) got into the occult at the age 14. In 1959, according to Benjamin, his "Master" contacted him telepathically and asked him to record a message on tape. Creme began lecturing on New Agery in 1975. He told of (Wikipedia) "the emergence of a group of enlightened spiritual teachers who could guide humanity forward into the new Aquarian Age of peace and brotherhood based on the principles of love and sharing." In charge of this wonderful group would be Maitreya.

After Maitreya failed to pop up for years and years after 1982, Creme's star waned. Recently, in 2010, Creme explained that Maitreya had given his first interview for US television. In Creme's opinion, Maitreya's arrival is near. The man apparently does not receive royalties from his books, and lectures by invitation only, and has a "worldwide" volunteer network, which raises the necessary question - who is funding him?

Writes Cumbey (*Rainbow*, Preface):

"THE CHRIST IS NOW HERE" ad campaign was preceded by an incredibly sophisticated public relations campaign including a worldwide speaking tour by one Benjamin Creme - an aging English esotericist who happened to be a disciple of several occult pioneers including Helena Petrovna Blavatsky and Alice A. Bailey. Touring the globe since 1975, Creme had managed to win the support of influentials ranging from U.N. officials through Methodist Ministers; from Belgian nuns through Elizabeth Kubler-Ross; from the Hunger Project through holistic health leaders; and from mind-control trainers and trainees through astrologers. Clearly he was not out there on his own. The man's audacity was justified by his broad base of support.

²⁶<http://www.manitou.org/MI/mhcp.php>, Jan 6, 2012.

Creme's front organization was the Tara Center, today called the Share International, with offices in London, Amsterdam, Tokyo, Los Angeles, and, according to Cumbey, New York. These are top global cultural centers. The organization has smaller branches in many other places worldwide. Note that Share International is only one link in an elaborate global chain of New Age fronts and organizations. Since establishing such a network from scratch requires heavy funding, it is almost axiomatic that the masters of money have to be behind the whole scam.

But Tara was not the only such organization. Also involved were religious leaders, including many Unity and Unitarian leaders, educators, cooperating New Age networking groups who turn their members out to submit themselves to Creme's bizarre hypnotic powers, occultists of every shade and description, political activists, opportunists, and those who had a sincere and genuine concern for the world's poor and labored under the mistaken impression that they were lending their support to a remedy for the world's numerous wrongs. They were unsuspecting that they were supporting a movement that parallels Nazism in every grotesque detail, including a teaching that a "blood taint" rested on those of Jewish extraction and another being that of a planned new "super-race." Many did not know that this movement planned the eventual extermination and replacement of these very peoples they labored to help with a "new root race" and even the violent extermination of themselves should they persist in orthodox religious beliefs. And many, for certain, did not know that they were actively involved in the very same movement that was proud to claim Jim Jones as its own prior to his Guyana murder/suicide fiasco.

The Jim Jones tragedy is fascinating and has bizarre links to the CIA-MI6 cabal; but is beyond our current scope.

And you may further be certain that many of these sincere but deluded people did not know that they were actively participating in a movement which gives Lucifer the status of a divinity and plans mass planetary Luciferic "initiations" for those wishing to enter this "New Age" alive.

Yet despite the naivete in a movement which traffics in ignorance and despair they were involved. They are often sucked in by good intentions and held in by sophisticated forms of mass hypnosis and mind control. Those participating in Creme's lecture audiences as well as thousands upon thousands of New Age activities designed to program participants to unquestioningly accept this new "Christ," were unwitting and unsuspecting victims in the largest, best financed con job this world has ever seen.

Absent awareness of the underground movements of the last three centuries, one would be tempted to disregard Cumbey's powerful statements as the ravings of a fanatical Christian lunatic. One hopes that, in light of what we have seen so far, the reader takes Cumbey seriously. The Nazi connection is blatant in light of the fact that the New Age rests on Blavatsky's writings, which Hitler kept next to his bed. The Luciferian angle we have seen repeatedly, and have equated to the anthropotheistic view of divinity. The "eventual extermination and replacement" of people is the Malthusian-eugenical agenda. The "mass hypnosis" is another regrettable manifestation of the hideous mass-media control of the last century, exemplified, also, in the anthropogenic "global warming" scam. It all checks. Cumbey stresses that "I am also not talking about what I found reading between the lines - although some of that, should desirably be done, as well. I am talking about what the leaders of this movement have set forth in cold print."

Gatto said the same in regard to education - and it is true - the head honchos have put their miserable plans in print, available to anyone who cares to look. They do so out of arrogance, out of carelessness stemming from their control of the media, and in accord with their personal code of honor, which, from what I understand, compels them to - perhaps indirectly - *tell people* what they are doing. This is a form of insurance, and an excuse. After all, the reasoning appears to go, it is not the Oligarchs' fault that people fail to use their intelligence, and go along with the Oligarchs'

plans.

Who is this Maitreya?

(Ch.1) According to Tara Center, sponsor of the ads: He is a world teacher for all humanity. He is a modern man concerned with modern problems - political, economic and social. Since July of 1977 he has been emerging as a spokesman for a group or community in a well-known modern country. He has extraordinary spiritual power. His location is known only to a very few of his disciples. He will soon announce his identity. He will communicate to all humanity through a worldwide radio and television broadcast. He plans to build a new world.

The name "Maitreya" stems from Buddhist doctrine. He is supposed to be fifth incarnation of Buddha.

Lucis Trust - formerly Lucifer Trust - ran ads in the Reader's Digest, which displayed The Great Invocation to Maitreya.

The Great Invocation refers to The Plan. It says, "Let Light and Love and Power restore The Plan on Earth."

What is The Plan?

It includes the installation of a New World "Messiah," the implementation of a new world government and new world religion under Maitreya. They have numerous political, social and economic goals, including the following: A universal credit card system. A world food authority which would control the world's food supply. A universal tax. A universal draft.

But there is more to The Plan - they intend to utterly root out people who believe the Bible and worship God and to completely stamp out Christianity.

This is the plan of the Oligarchs and their UN. The Lucis trust is Alice Bailey's UN supported Lucifer Trust outfit.

Cumbey quotes a *Denver Post* journalist, according to whom Creme said that "It will come, anyway, because it must. We will begin to live as potential gods."

The Club of Rome, thought Cumbey, is another New Age organization. There is some truth in that, since the Club of Rome pushes the Gaian strand of New Agery, and is in the hands of the same people who run the UN.

Also,

Interestingly enough, in *The Aquarian Conspiracy*, Marilyn Ferguson comes flat out and makes an admission that the purpose of the LSD circulation in this country was to get people open, to get their channels open so they would have what she called a "religious experience." But this is nothing more than possession.

Ferguson's book is one of the key post-Bailey theosophist/ New Age works.

Another major New Ager is David Spangler (1945-), who runs the influential Scotland-based Findhorn Foundation. The Findhorn utopian settlement ("Findhorn Ecovillage") (Wikipedia) "has been awarded UN Habitat Best Practice designation from the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (HABITAT), and regularly holds seminars of 'CIFAL Findhorn', a United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), affiliated training centre for Northern Europe."

Spangler says that in order to enter the New Age we must take a Luciferic initiation. He says we're heading into a vast planetary initiation, a mass initiation of people.

...

We also note another distinguishing characteristic of the New Age Movement the 666.

Within the Movement there is extensive usage of the numerals 666. I have noticed the 666 in various books by David Spangler. One example is a little booklet called *Love Is* by The New Troubadours and published by the Findhorn Foundation. There are numerous triple six formations worked into the pictures in the book.

New Agers consider the 666 a sacred number.

Those who so freely use the numbers 666 honestly believe they are sending signals to outer space, or to what they call the superior intelligences which they believe inhabit our planet. They are asking those superior intelligences to come in and bring a new advanced civilization.

They believe that the more times and the more places that the numerals 666 are used the quicker that new civilization will come.

666 is the number of Satan in Christian theology. It also has certain meanings to the Masonic-Cabbalistic types. Alan Watt, Jordan Maxwell, and Michael Tsarion are experts on numerology and symbology. The reader can consult their works should he want to look into the subject.

Cumbey speculates that the New Agers (meaning the people behind them) may try to use satellite-based holographic technology to create "miracles" for their Maitreya. This is a reasonable line of thought, and should visions start spawning in the skies, we will have to make the necessary conclusions. Holographic technology exists.

So how influential is the New Age movement?

According to Marilyn Ferguson and other New Age sources, they are in every city and institution in the world. Their people are in the United Nations, prominent scientific, legal and medical circles and even at the congressional and cabinet levels of the United States government.

Getting hard numbers in regard to the New Age is difficult, because the cult has so many branches. For example, anyone who tries to adopt the techniques suggested in positive-thinking books, is tainted, to a degree, by New Agery. But such a person may continue to go to church or espouse "atheism."

Wikipedia's New Age article says that:

People who practice New Age spirituality or who embrace its lifestyle are included in the Lifestyle of Health and Sustainability (LOHAS) demographic market segment, currently in a growth phase, related to sustainable living, green ecological initiatives, and generally composed of a relatively affluent and well-educated segment. The LOHAS market segment in 2006 was estimated at USD\$300 billion, approximately 30 percent of the United States consumer market. According to *The New York Times*, a study by the Natural Marketing Institute showed that in 2000, 68 million Americans were included within the LOHAS demographic. The sociologist Paul H. Ray, who coined the term Cultural Creatives in his book *The Cultural Creatives: How 50 Million People Are Changing the World* (2000), states, "What you're seeing is a demand for products of equal quality that are also virtuous."

In other words, New Age type influences have permeated a significant proportion of the politically active, dominant segment of the American population.

Cumbey (Ch.2) got wise to the New Age scam when she began to notice an increasing frequency in the use of such terms as: "The vocabularies included such New Age "buzz" words as holistic, Space-ship Earth, Global Village, celebration/ celebrative, transformation, crowded planet, paradigm, right brain/left brain/whole brain, matrix, linear thinking dualistk, mechanistic, global thread, new vision, initiation, interdependent, new age, etc." But Cumbey's greatest shock was discovering that

this type of language, and the idea of merging Christianity with the eastern religions, was beginning to appear in the churches and in the Christian literature. She also made the obvious link with the New World Order-one-world government phenomenon.

Cumbey then read Ferguson's *Aquarian Conspiracy* (1980) book, which lays it out - there is a powerful, international group of people working for a New Age-based New World Order, which will dismantle Christianity and the other old religions, and unite the world. Arthur Koestler, the British-Oligarch-connected author of the post-humanist *The Ghost in the Machine* (1967), thought Ferguson's work was "stunning and provocative." Robert Muller, the United Nations Assistant Secretary-General, called the book "remarkable" and "epoch-making." The book was a best-seller and became something of a Bible for the New Age crowd.

Ferguson (1938-2008) had been a journalist before writing the *Aquarian* book. Her interest into New Agery developed when she started looking into the (post-humanism/ eugenics driven) research into the human mind.

Ted Turner, Buckminster Fuller, and other prominent figures were pals of Marilyn's. In 1985, the woman was the key speaker at a United-Nations-sponsored conference on the "Spirit of Peace." Mother Theresa and the ridiculous tool the Dalai Llama were also present. At the time, Ferguson was lecturing all over the world.

John Naisbitt (1929-) the futurist was a significant associate of Ferguson's. His books merit attention, inasmuch as they plainly say where things will be going; but we have to leave them for another time. In general, many prominent "futurists" are, probably in the tradition of Herbert Wells, high-level long-range planners.

Cumbey's eyes popped out when she consulted the Bible and realized that the "Aquarian Conspiracy" was the end-times and that Maitreya obviously was the prophesied Antichrist. Without a doubt, the New Age baloney does fit with the Biblical prophecies. What this bizarre coincidence means is hard to say - but it has alerted the more careful among the Christians. One suspects that the creators of Theosophy/ New Agery deliberately adapted their doctrines to the end-time prophecies of the existing religions, with obvious intentions in mind - after the "end times," one would expect a "new age."

But the final straw came when Cumbey talked to a New Ager politician, who told her that "the New Age Movement was far larger than [Ferguson's] book portrayed it as being." The politician woman, troubled by some comment of Cumbey's, complained that "The antichrist is not the negative thing the Bible's made him out to be!" Stunned, Cumbey could not sleep for a few nights. So she started researching, and found the works of Blavatsky and company.

Some New Age theology:

(Ch.3) Their [New Agers'] version of the Ten Commandments is fascinating to say the least. They claim there is no such thing as murder or adultery. If one is murdered it is either happening because he wanted it to happen or because his bad "karma" was being worked out for him.

While their theology is obfuscated in deliberate gobbledy-gook, it is not complicated. A Christian may read the main tenets in the third chapter of the book of Genesis. Basically they involve (1) an attack on the authority of God's Word; (2) a denial that one will die (reincarnation); (3) a claim that man can be as a god himself; and (4) a deification of Lucifer and other demonic entities (the Masters of Wisdom theory).

The universal proclamation of the Movement is that man is God and "Man created God in his own image." The Movement worships pagan deities from Pan to Buddha and Shiva. They even worship Lucifer himself.

The political goals of the Movement include a mandatory New World Religion, establishment of a "universal credit card" system, establishment of a World Food Authority, World Health Authority, World Water Authority, etc.; establishment of a universal tax

and a universal draft which is truly universal everybody is eligible, worldwide!

Moreover, "Many among their number encourage the internal undermining of nations and they proudly proclaim the "subversiveness" of their Movement as if such a designation were a badge of honor." This is a part of the UN push for the abolition of national sovereignty.

While they call for the division of large federated nation states such as Canada and the United States, at the same time they call for institution of a Planetary Guidance System or other form of world government. While they promote simple life-styles, at the same time they call for the interconnection of the entire world by incredibly sophisticated computers with snooping capacities that are Orwellian in scope.

Emphasis mine - "It is a Movement that has seen the deception of many - including many of its own **who participate for the finest of motives.**" We must continue to stress that most people are fundamentally decent. When accosted by "conspiracy theory," some reply that it is impossible for so many to willingly and wittingly participate in such evils. Correct - except that it is possible - when the participants are dupes! What better example than Communism?

In looking at the history of the New Age cult, Cumbey quickly found Blavatsky:

A vast organizational network today, the New Age Movement received its modern start in 1875 with the founding of the Theosophical Society by Helena Petrovna Blavatsky. A basic teaching of this organization was that all world religions had "common truths" that transcended potential differences.

Strongly propounding the theory of evolution, they also believed in the existence of "masters" who were either spirit beings or fortunate men more highly "evolved" than the common herd. This was a doctrine which was to have a substantial impact on the development of Hitler's Nazism several decades later.

Blavatsky and company's masters had told the incipient New Age gurus to "keep the society and teachings secret - at least for the time being. This was a dictum that was to prevail for 100 years - until 1975 - the year initiates were at last permitted to make the initiatory teachings public." In other words, the Oligarchs had to first prepare the ground for the New Age, before they could unleash the cult. "After the secrecy order came down, the Society began to communicate by secret signs and words of recognition" - standard Masonic/ secret-society practice.

"Freely acknowledging their demonic origins, the organization called one of its publications *Lucifer* for many years."

After Blavatsky came Besant and Bailey, both with neurotic and idealistic tendencies. The latter married, and was likely under the control of (or did she control him?), the high-level Mason Foster Bailey. The Baileys founded the Lucifer Trust in 1922, as we know.

The New Age "Vatican" - Findhorn - was established in 1962. Sprangler went there in 1970. Thence he found a "spiritual advisor" in one Myrtle Glines - an ex-Mormon!

Linkages were formed with the International Cooperation Council. This 200-plus organizational network of networks is dedicated to the speedy implementation of "The Plan" a plan which includes the bringing in of a New Age "Christ."

In 1973 David Spangler and other Findhornites left for the USA to form the Lorian Association. This was another Planetary Network designed to publicize the "spiritual" goals of the coming "New Age." Lorian Association is presently headquartered in Madison, Wisconsin. Spangler also calls Findhorn his home.

In 1975, the New Agers got the go-ahead. "That was when its disciples had permission from the deceased Alice Bailey to "come out of the closet" and spread the New Age message to the world." Off they went with "*joie de vivre*" - Spangler, Ferguson, Mark Satin, and a bunch of other patsies and agents.

One important para-military organization with ties to the New Age Movement has come into being the Guardian Angels.

More ominous still are developments that have taken place under the auspices of the United States Military - the First Earth Battalion headed by recently retired Lt. Col. James Channon who proudly proclaimed he was leading his "monk-warriors with the Force."

Most important New Age organizations have coalesced behind Planetary Initiative for the World We Choose. Planetary Initiative itself has organized "The World Council of Wise Persons." If their plans go according to schedule, Planetary Initiative will hold its World Congress in Toronto, Canada, on June 21, 1983, with a simultaneous meeting of the World Council of Wise Persons taking place in New York City at the United Nations headquarters.

Who is in charge of this movement, and what connects it together? (Ch. 5) "The glue binding most New Age devotees is one of common mystical experiences, "Experiential religion" is considered vital within the Movement. A substantial proportion of those within the Movement strongly believe in psychic phenomena and say they do so because of "direct experiences." I.e. group think and mob mental-orgasm.

The New Age Movement, called by Marilyn Ferguson *The Aquarian Conspiracy*, and deriving its name from the so-called Age of Aquarius, encompasses a number of groups and submovements, such as: the Holistic Movement, Humanistic Psychology, Transpersonal Psychology, Humanistic Movement, New Thought, Third Wave, Third Force, The New Spirituality, the Human Potential Movement, Secular Humanism, and Humanism.

The original influences on the New Age will be familiar to the reader:

Besides the writings of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky and Alice A. Bailey, the bulk of New Age doctrine is derived from the works of George Gurdjieff, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, P.D. Ouspensky, H.G. Wells, Nicholas Roerich, (the Agni Yoga teachings), and David Spangler. The esoteric thrusts of the Movement as well as the aims of its groups are largely derived from the Alice Bailey books. Its overall direction and tactical strategy may be found in *The Open Conspiracy: Blueprints for a World Revolution* by H.G. Wells. The "New Revelation" of the Movement has come forth in the prolific prose and poetry of Spangler.

Teilhard de Chardin was a renegade Jesuit Darwinist fanatic. Nicholas Roerich was a prominent occultist and a major influence on FDR's vice-president Wallace. Gurdjieff (1877-1949) was a Russian occultist of Greek-Armenian origins. Ouspensky (1878-1947) was his pupil. The master and student were strangely influential. Naturally, they made their way to London, where they influenced a host of public figures. Ouspensky's lectures, for example, benefited from the patronage of Aldous Huxley, T. S. Eliot, and Gerald Heard. Ouspensky's pupils included Henry John Sinclair, the 2nd Baron Pentland, and a number of occultists and New Agers who have subsequently become prominent. Gurdjieff took a mechanistic, nihilistic view of life - men were machines and did everything for no reason. In turn, Ouspensky promoted "expression of sexuality." Apparently, Karl Haushofer, a mentor of Rudolf Hess (Hitler's number two), was a disciple of Gurdjieff.

One curious but largely unknown fact, which we have mentioned, is that the New Ages shares the roots of Nazism:

While professing to support equality, the Movement's seminal writings openly call for the triumph of Aryanism and the domination of Caucasians over other "root races." The New Age is, according to the "Tibetan Master," an age of Occidental racial triumph. We are all to be considered equal in the New Age to be sure but at varying stages of evolutionary development!

It is conceivable that the top honchos have abandoned the insistence on Aryanism and white supremacy in view of subsequent developments. These days they embrace the "evolutionary developed" of all races; but their contempt for the "root" people - of any color - remains invariant. Furthermore,

In fact, Jews are no better off with the New Agers than they were under their predecessors the Nazis. The New Agers also maintain the traditional occult doctrine of a blood taint resting on those of Jewish extraction.

Has this doctrine been discarded after 1945, or are the Jews being duped into a hideous new debacle?

Organizations as diverse as Amnesty International, Greenpeace, the Sierra Club, Children of God, and Zero Population Growth openly and proudly bill themselves as "New Age." So do another approximately 10,000 organizations within just the United States and Canada not including the branches of these organizations - many of which are located in every major city.

These organizations have achieved "synergy," thereby maximizing their strength to enormous proportions through a process of networking. This structure is difficult to depict on an ordinary organizational chart. Sociologically described as "Segmented Polycentric Integrated Networks" (SPIN), Marilyn Ferguson says that the "organization chart of a SPIN would look like 'a badly knotted fishnet with a multitude of nodes of varying sizes, each linked to all the others, directly or indirectly,'"

And there is no single leader or organization indispensable to the functioning of this New Age "network of networks."

This is reminiscent of the system developed by Weishaupt.

"Jim Jones was an excellent case in point. Prior to the Guyana suicide/murder fiasco, the New Agers were most proud to claim him as their own. In fact, they gave his organization the label of a New Age "spiritual" center. ... Of course, once Jones lost his sanity and his favorable public image, the rest of the New Agers never mentioned him again, except to point to him as an example of the dangers of religious fundamentalism."

"The political goal of the Movement is global control. Although this goal has never before been achieved, they think the times are ripe and they may well be right."

While the writings are probably deliberately scattered, nevertheless, there is a discernible political program emanating from the New Agers. They propose to establish gigantic global agencies such as a World Food Authority, World Water Authority, and an authority to administer a universal draft and a universal tax. They have pointed to such legislative proposals as the Peace Academy as proof of their success in advancing towards the New World Order. They intend to give us a "Universal Credit Card" not to mention a "New World Religion." ... New Age spokesmen openly discuss their replacement with a bioregional parliament and a "Planetary Guidance System."

Naturally,

While it is all too common for New Agers to ridicule orthodox Christians and particularly fundamentalists as being "fanatical and unsophisticated," their own beliefs surpass the "bizarre." They calmly discuss not only Luciferic initiations, but "raising the fires of Kundalini," chakras, and "Maitreya the Christ."

They rationalize the concepts of initiation and secret ritual by claiming a need for the "geniuses" among us to have their own private language and code. The Movement has managed to win many of the very cream of our intellectual crop by flatteries. The flattery is the same as that employed by the serpent to Eve "Thou shalt be as gods."

... In fact, the New Agers claim they are a "new species." They have "evolved" into *homo*

noeticus. They "evolved" by employing mind-expansion techniques such as meditation and the "other disciplines."

Poignantly,

One is also forced to pause when he sees the extensive organizational efforts of determined New Agers. Planetary Initiative and its World Council of Wise Persons are synergistically enhanced by the parallel operation of networking organizations such as New World Alliance, Club of Rome, World Goodwill, Lucis Trust, and thousands of others.

The New Agers push the pernicious Hindu Karmic doctrine of reincarnation. It says that a person is endlessly reborn, improving himself every time, until he hits Nirvana, which, as Kurt Cobain endeavoured to show us, is *nothingness* - a "release" from suffering, pain, and the other darker sides of *life*. With Karmic rebirth comes determinism - the downtrodden are where they are, because they fouled up in their previous lives - and the "successful" deserve their "success," because of virtue and good Karma from their previous existences. Moreover, as Cumbey points out, the doctrine of rebirth peddles the illusion of eternal life - which has always been attractive to the materially rich and powerful - for what good are wealth and might, when it is man's destiny to die?

For another link to our previous research, note that:

It is interesting to note that several of the signers of the 1973 Humanist Manifesto are also actively involved in Planetary Initiative for the World We Choose - the big, invogue political vehicle for the would-be forces of "Maitreya the Christ."

The New Agers peddle "interdependency":

Another key teaching of this Movement is that all things are "interconnected" or "interdependent." This is known in the New Age Movement as the Doctrine of Wholeness. This is also called the Doctrine of At-One-Ment, which is a probable perversion of the Christian doctrine of atonement. Its relationship to the Holistic Movement is clear.

This is ancient, as old as Plato, Communistic ideal of the one-world human-herd. A human herd at the bottom, governed by the human demi-Gods at the top. In particular, "Further, the Movement's theology contains a strong belief in an "inner government" of our planet by a hierarchy of spirits or alleged "masters of wisdom.""

For obvious reasons, the New Agers despise those who adhere to the old religions.

It should be realized that, like the Nazis did, the New Agers have made their intentions quite clear:

The Movement has threatened violence and even extermination of Jews, Christians, and Moslems failing to cooperate with "Maitreya" and the New World Religion. The threat is contained in several places in the Alice Bailey writings and reiterated in the David Spangler writings, which state that those of us who refuse to accept the "Christ" will be sent to another dimension other than physical incarnation, out of physical embodiment, to another level of vibration where we will be happier!

The threat is also repeated in the Agni Yoga (Nicholas Roerich) teachings, another cornerstone work of the "New Age."

We have been warned! Anyone who thinks that these are the vain utterings of impotent fools would be well advised to look back to the attitudes of patriotic German Jews toward Hitler and the Nazis in the years preceding the Kristallnacht and its related developments. The top powers of the world have repeatedly said that they want depopulation and world government, and their patsy New Agers have said the same thing. We really ought to pay attention to their words.

Moreover, the calls for a world army and a cashless society and so on, which have been repeatedly made by the one-worlders, the technocrats, the eugenicists, and the rest of them, are ingrained into the New Age doctrine. Cumbey supplies the verbatim quotes in her book. The New Age cult is just another tentacle of the global octopus, along with the U.N., Masonry, the banker international, the Global Warming Cult, the Humanist crowd, the eugenics enthusiasts, the Communists, the Globalizer Free-Marketters, the multiculturalists, the Peak Oilers, and all other such fronts and groups. From various directions, they all call for the same thing. Such is the principle of the Hegelian Dialectic. The ostensible leaders of most of the groups do not even realize the implications of their preachings, or the motivations and identities of their backers. The conspiracy exists. It is a part of a historical process, it is complex, it is elaborate, but it is also tractable, comprehensible, and its less palatable conclusions are preventable.

Follows another of Cumbey's lists of New Age doctrines:

(Ch. 7) Some of the other items to be covered in the propaganda drive to prepare the world for the so-called new "Christ" includes teachings on:

1. Evolution of consciousness.
2. The interrelatedness of the individual soul to all souls.
3. The "kingdom of God" as simply the appearance of soul-controlled men on earth in everyday life "WE ARE ALL DIVINE."
4. The idea that there are some on earth who have reached relative perfection "SOME OF US ARE, HOWEVER, MORE DIVINE THAN OTHERS."
5. The belief that there are individuals who have reached total perfection or "Christ Consciousness" "ONE OF US IS PERFECT AND SHOULD BE KING!"
6. A recognition that there has always been a "plan" (The Plan) and that this plan has been present but unrecognized throughout history.
7. Mind control.
8. Holistic health.
9. Color therapy and music therapy.
10. Iridology.

We should point out the pernicious nature of the New Age's shrill insistence on "meditation." The term is amorphous. For example, as far as I can see, sitting in bed and thinking about things, is meditation. Reading and analyzing are mediation. The New Age-type meditation, however, aims at an absence of thinking. Instead, it recommends "feeling." Such "meditation" precludes reasoning and research, and renders the subject "open" to, in effect, mind-control and remote hypnosis. Likewise the self-help/ positive thinking drivel. If you want to do something, you have to establish a goal, develop a strategy for reaching that goal, and explore the world to understand how to implement your strategy. You have to read, to talk to people, to observe, to figure out how things work. Building a blind belief in yourself by looking strictly inwards can lead only to effective schizophrenia, delusion, and grand failure.

It is of interest that "According to Creme, [whom she heard in a speech of his,] Lucifer is in charge of our planetary evolution." In broad terms, Luciferianism seems to be the idea that man is God; and Darwinism, through its prodigal child eugenics/ posthumanism, though, abstractly, perfectly compatible with creationism, clashes with Christianity in insisting (and thus, for that matter, contradicting its own silly theory) on exactly the same notion - the universe (life) created itself, man is God, man can direct his own evolution, some men are more evolutionarily advanced than others, etc.

Also notable is that during the same speech, at which Cumbey was present, "Creme received another round of applause when he stated "democracy will disappear."" Democracy is another vague term - but it looks like, if we interpret "democracy" as self-determination, the top honchos intend to

try to control every imaginable - or perhaps merely every significant - aspect of human life. Thus, they may allow people to choose between Pepsi and Coke - when in reality they are essentially the same.

Let us look at the Nazi connection.

(Ch. 8) ...one of the most startling aspects of the New Age Movement, apart from its apparent fulfillment of biblical prophecy, is its amazing resemblance to Hitler's Nazism. One of the best-kept secrets of the twentieth century is the occultic roots and nature of the religious philosophy at the heart of the Third Reich.

...

At any rate, for all practical purposes, the New Age Movement appears to qualify as a revival of Nazism. This is not to call every New Ager a Nazi.

...

While still a very young child, Hitler was initiated into the finer mysteries of the occult. He attended a Benedictine monastery school near his German home. The abbot in charge was fascinated by the lore of the Albigensians or Cathars, who could probably be accurately classified as early New Agers in that they believed man could gain the powers of a god. The occult interests Hitler gained in this school, stayed with him all of his adult life and helped to shape his future spiritual philosophy.

While Hitler was in Vienna pursuing a career as an architect and artist, he spent his spare time in occult bookstores and libraries, acquainting himself with the mysteries of metaphysical lore and gaining the acquaintance of adepts in both "white" and "black" magic. ...

Mescaline was used to transport him to the highest state of consciousness where he could look into what New Agers and occultists call the "Akashic Record" - a demonic version of historical and future events. ... From that point, Hitler suffered the known side effects of both prolonged meditation and mindexpanding drug abuse.

... If the hypnotic effect of dabbling in occultism worked for Hitler, it would work for a nation. For that reason, occultism played a prominent role both in establishing Hitler in power and in maintaining that power.

...

Both Nazism and the New Age Movement are political/ spiritual entities based on the same esoteric foundations: the "Secret Doctrine" which has been at the base of all pagan religions and at the base of esoteric "Christianity."

Perhaps that "Secret Doctrine" might be best summarized as being the antithesis of Judeo/Christian beliefs. The Secret Doctrine glorifies Lucifer and all the practices condemned in the Bible.

Follows the usual Masonic mumbo-jumbo about wise masters and initiations and so on.

Next,

Where the doctrine abounds that men have evolved from differing root races and are at varying stages of evolutionary development, it becomes easy to justify classification and discrimination.

"Final solutions" become the logical next step. This was never God's plan. Nations were punished for idolatry and infanticide - not for their blood-strains.

...

The New Agers have a slightly different order [from Adolf's]. Jews are on the list as soon as they are finished with the Christians. But both groups are high on priority for persecution, with the Jews faring slightly worse than the Christians. At the esoteric core of their philosophy and plans, the New Agers maintain the old occult Aryan doctrine of a blood taint resting upon those of Jewish extraction.

The problem with the Jews is that, because of their clannishness, they would not be particularly eager to join a New World Order. Some researchers have claimed that the Jews intend to be in charge of the New World Order, but I find that untenable. Perhaps a few ostensible Jews, in reality high-level occultists and bankers, are scheming for a place at the top - but Jewry taken collectively can not conceivably rule an entire planet. The existence of separate factions within the overarching conspiracy contributes to the confusion.

Cumbey quotes the following striking excerpt from a book by Foster Bailey, the Masonic husband to Alice:

(Foster Bailey, *Running God's Plan*, 1972) "Another approved hierarchical project is the uniting of the nations of Europe in one cooperating peaceful community. The plan is not for a new all-Europe government nor for a common language, but for right national relations dedicated to the welfare of the people living in those countries undistorted by national pride, ambitions and prejudices. . . . This project is quite a different proposition to those in Africa and Russia. It was initiated some years ago and got underway as 'Pan Europa.' Many ways were tried to promote this plan, but the idea was not sufficiently idealised by, the people who were a bit too sophisticated and firm in their belief in the practical value of selfishness. Here we are dealing with a most intelligent people, highly organised, well-educated, alert to world affairs, but proud of their differences and convinced of their Tightness about all things. This was therefore a much tougher problem but dear to the heart of the 'European Master.'

"One attempt was to begin by uniting the peoples living in the Rhine River valley using that river as a binding factor. It was an attempt by a disciple but did not work. Now another attempt is in full swing, namely the six nation European Common Market" (pp. 14-15).

The "disciple" was obviously Hitler, and the conspirators were clearly the extended network of the Anglo-Americans, including Rockefeller, Morgan, Milner's people, and the City of London. The "project" for Russia was Communism. Note that as a high-ranking Mason and the husband to the druidess of Theosophy, Bailey knew what was going on.

Unfortunately, the aristocratic, free-market-blinded Oligarchs have bungled yet another attempt at unifying Europe, as the events of 2011 strongly suggested. In trying to force union on Europe before it was ready, and by making the EU anti-democratic, the top honchos misplayed their hand. The EU should have been divided into three parts - northern Europe, consisting of France, Benelux, Germany, and Scandinavia; southern Europe, consisting of the obvious candidates; and later Eastern Europe. The dominance of northern Europe would have precluded war. By chaining economically heterogeneous nations to a free-market and sterilizing their fiscal powers, the Oligarchs set off a time bomb, which was near exploding in 2011. By making the EU anti-democratic, they have created a secessionistic backlash. Should cooler heads prevail, the European nations can preserve their union under a reformed, popular, sensible framework. That is the best course the Europeans have.

It is conceivable that the EU and the Euro were designed to fail as part of some grander scheme.

The planned North American Union suffers from a similar problem. The United States and Canada are integrated in all but name. The two nations are married economically, socially, and culturally. But why drag Mexico, which is an entirely different affair, into the mix? It is very likely that the idea is to weaken the predominantly affluent-white American and Canadian societies. But the plan seems to have backfired, and, to the Oligarchs' annoyance, the North American Union is likely behind schedule. I do not think that they can at all succeed in merging Mexico with its northern neighbours in the short to mid-term.

Observe that not everything the Oligarchs do is intrinsically bad. A united world, in the era of instant communications and nuclear weapons, is likely to develop in the long term. The problem is that the Oligarchs are rapacious and impatient - they want what they want now, and they want everything.

Though she repeats herself, Cumbey had much more to say, and had unearthed many more fascinating quotes, but the points have been made, and we can move on.

The New Age and the UN

Gary Kah is the former Europe and Middle East Trade Specialist for the Indiana state government. Because of his work in the internationalist camp, he was invited to join the high-level World Constitution and Parliament Association, which is another one of the countless NWO fronts. The WCPA have this to say for themselves:²⁷

The World Constitution and Parliament Association (WCPA) is a worldwide association of citizens, chapters, and affiliated organizations working with dedication and love toward a global democracy that embraces all nations and peoples under the Constitution for the Federation of Earth.

The WCPA was founded in 1958 by Philip Isely and other visionaries who understood that our world cannot long endure unless it was united under a single, democratic constitution for the Earth. During those initial years, the organization worked tirelessly to organize world citizens from around the globe to write the Constitution for the Federation of Earth. This process moved through four international Constituent Assemblies that took place in 1968, 1977, 1979, and 1991.

Isely (1915-) is a lifelong one-worlder. He is a member of the following organizations: ACLU; Fellowship of Reconciliation; World Union; World Federalist Association; World Future Society; Earth Island Institution; International Society for Ecological Economies; International Association for Hydrogen Energy; Friends of Earth; Wilderness Society; Solar Energy Society; Sierra Club; Amnesty International; World Resources Institution; Human Rights Watch; Natural Nutritional Foods Association; Environment Def. Fund; Greenpeace; International Studies Association; Ctr. for Study of Democratic Institutions; War Resisters League; Audubon Society; Worldwatch Institution; International Association for Constitutional Law; Earth Regeneration Society; International Society for Universalism (Honor award 1993); Zero Population Growth; Mt. Vernon Country Club.²⁸

In the introduction to his *En Route*, Kah explains that:

During the early 1980s, I was on the fast track of a successful government career, which took me around the world dealing with American embassies, foreign government officials, international business leaders, and, at times, members of the press and media. It was in many respects the perfect job, the kind that most people only dream of having. The last thing I ever thought I'd do was to research and write a book on the seemingly obscure subject of globalism and the occult. But I now realize that God had different plans.

Through my travels and job-related contacts, I became aware of plans being laid worldwide for the establishment of a one-world government, most frequently referred to by insiders as the New World Order. Most of my insights were gained over a three year period as a result of several experiences. Had I learned about this information from someone on the streets, I probably would have dismissed it as nonsense. However, because of the circumstances surrounding my experiences and the caliber of people through whom I learned of these things, I had no choice but to take the information seriously.

Thus, unlike Cumbey or the present author, Kah had the advantage of (marginal) insider status.

After he got wise to the scam, Kah went through the usual books (which were much harder to obtain, even in reference, back in the 1980s), and found out the usual facts - the bankers are in charge with their Fed, and they are using their foundations to push for the New World Order. A

²⁷<http://www.wcpa.biz/WhoWeAre.html>, Jan 5, 2012.

²⁸<http://www.iseli.org/Article9.html>, Jan 5, 2012.

high-level person from the "Far East" shared Kah's suspicions, and directed him toward researching the CFR and the Trilateral Commission. After two years of reading, Kah traced the conspiracy back to the Illuminati, as have others.

In general, Kah's findings follow the lines of and largely coincide with what has been presented here. A few of his findings which add to our picture follow below.

Regarding the owners of the Fed:

(Ch. 1) Mr. R.E. McMaster, the publisher of a financial newsletter called "The Reaper," was able to determine who the Fed's principal owners were through his Swiss and Saudi Arabian contacts. According to McMaster, the top eight stockholders are Rothschild Banks of London and Berlin; Lazard Brothers Banks of Paris; Israel Moses Seif Banks of Italy; Warburg Bank of Hamburg and Amsterdam; Lehman Brothers Bank of New York; Kuhn, Loeb Bank of New York; Chase Manhattan Bank of New York; and Goldman, Sachs Bank of New York. These interests own the Federal Reserve System through approximately three hundred stockholders, all of whom are known to each other and are sometimes related to one another.

Those are the usual suspects: Goldman the recently notorious worldwide vampire squid (Taibbi's term); Chase the vehicle of the Rockefellers; Kuhn&Loeb, and Warburg, the financiers of wars, revolutions, and dictators of the first half of the 20th century; Lehman Brothers whose collapse signalled the 2008 crash; Lazard, which was a premier Milner group weapon of war back in that cabal's heyday in the first half of the 20th century; and, of course, the Rothschilds.

Kah quotes Myron Fagan's claim that the Rothschilds, "Through their U.S. and European agents, the Rothschilds would go on to finance the Rockefeller Standard Oil dynasty, the Carnegie steel empire, as well as the Harriman railroad system." I have seen this imputation before, but have not been able to verify it, though it rings true.

In regard to the New Age affiliation of the Club of Rome:

(Ch.2) What is particularly disturbing about all of this is that the Club of Rome is being spiritually driven-spiritually as in occultism. On pages 151 and 152 of *Mankind at the Turning Point*, Aurelio Peccei reveals his pantheistic/New Age beliefs, talking about man's communion with nature and the transcendent and using the term "noosphere" in referring to the collective field of intelligence of the human race. This uncommon expression cannot be found in a dictionary. By use of the term "noosphere" Peccei gives himself away as a student of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, a French Jesuit priest (now deceased) whose occult ideas and writings, I would later discover, have had a deep impact on the New Age movement. In fact, Chardin is one of the most frequently quoted writers by leading New Age occultists.

At the conclusion of the book, Peccei remarks: "Philosophers have, from ancient times, stressed the unity of existence and the interconnection of all the elements of nature, man and thought. However, their teaching has seldom been reflected in political or social behavior." The Club of Rome and its network of affiliated organizations would like to change all of that.

COR's New Age slant is reflected in its American Association membership, which included the late Norman Cousins, the long-time honorary chairman of Planetary Citizens and possibly the best-known and respected name at the forefront of the New Age movement. Other members are John Naisbitt, author of *Megatrends*; Amory Lovins, speaker at John Denver's New Age center (Windstar, in Snowmass, Colorado); Betty Friedan, the founding president of the National Organization for Women; and Jean Houston and Hazel Henderson, well known authors and speakers at New Age centers and conferences. Robert O. Anderson and Harlan B. Cleveland are also members. Both men belong to the CFR

and have been closely associated with the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies. Four of our U.S. congressmen are members, along with representatives of Planned Parenthood, officials of the United Nations, and people connected to the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations.

Amory Lovins is also a prominent Warmer. Friedan is one of the top neo-feminists.

Of particular interests are Kah's findings on the WPCA. Kah managed to infiltrate the WPCA by posing as a New Ager globalist, and consequently amassed a good deal of revealing *insider* documents.

(Ch. 4) The WPCA's plan, which includes a ten region world government, has been taken straight out of the Club of Rome's handbook. For example, among the WPCA's plans is a proposal calling for a new international monetary system, referred to as the "New World Economic Order" - the exact wording used by the Club of Rome to describe the same. The WPCA is also using the environment as its chief argument for why a world government is required, similar to COR's strategies and proposals.

The WPCA is, in part, a New Age front:

The spiritual motivation behind the WPCA was once again demonstrated in a letter revealing the list of speakers at the Provisional World Parliament (Exhibit C) [printed in Kah's book]. At the bottom of the page, under "World Spiritual Leaders," you will notice that the "spiritual leaders" who were to speak at the conference were all yogis or swamis from the Far East Listed on the same page with these occult masters was the Reverend Jesse Jackson, leader of the Rainbow Coalition and a presidential candidate at the time. Jackson is also a current member of the Council on Foreign Relations. He is one of the few African-Americans (from a percentage standpoint) who is involved in this scheme. Ramsey Clark, former U.S. attorney general, was another of the recognized American leaders who was to speak at the Parliament session. He is also one of the vice presidents of the WPCA as well as being a former member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The sum of the documents Kah managed to acquire before his cover blew spelled the following:

(Part II) The organization that has figured most prominently in the WPCA's leadership is World Union. According to the letterhead of February-April 1987, presented in Exhibit D, the general secretary of World Union, Sri A.B. Patel, is the WPCA's honorary president for life. Mr. N.S. Rao, the chairman of World Union, on the other hand, is listed as one of the WPCA's two copresidents. According to Who's Who in the World, Philip Isely is a member of World Union as well, although the letterhead does not reveal this information. And another letter I received indicates that the new general secretary of World Union, Samar Basu, is also an official of the WPCA.

As mentioned earlier, World Union joined with World Good-will - a creation of Lucis Trust - in 1961. Lucis (or Lucifer) Trust is an offshoot of the Theosophical Society, which is plugged into the highest levels of Freemasonry. Past and present members of Lucis Trust include: Robert McNamara, Donald Regan, Henry Kissinger, David Rockefeller, Paul Volcker, and George Shultz - the same crowd that runs the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission.

Besides the CFR/WCPA connection existing through Lucis Trust and World Union, the WPCA has at least four CFR members directly in its ranks. They include current CFR members Gerard Piel, Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, and Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, who are all WCPA honorary sponsors; and Ramsey Clark who is a former CFR member. Jesse Jackson's affiliation with the two groups must also be considered. In addition to this,

one must not forget that the CFR is the real power behind the United Nations, having conceived the organization. More than 20 percent of the WCPA's honorary sponsors are identified with that organization.

Another WPCA was the World Council of Churches.

The greatest number of connections with the WCPA comes through the World Future Society of which Isely is also a member. From all appearances, the World Future Society has become that "world forum," called for in the Club of Rome's 1972 book, *The Limits to Growth*. In that book, the Club's Executive Committee stated: "Since intellectual enlightenment is without effect if it is not also political, The Club of Rome also will encourage the creation of a world forum where statesmen, policymakers, and scientists can discuss the dangers and hopes for the future global system without the constraints of formal inter-governmental negotiation."

The World Future Society is where the political, economic, and spiritual aspects of the one-world government all come together. It seems to be a type of common ground or clearinghouse for all of the global societies. According to a World Future Society advertisement from several years ago, the organization's directors include Arnold Barach (Editor, Special Projects, The Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc.), John W. Gardner (Chairman, Independent Sector, formerly U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare), Barbara Marx Hubbard (President, Futures Network), Robert S. McNamara (Former President, World Bank), and Glenn T. Seaborg (Professor of Chemistry, University of California, formerly Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission), among others.

Clearly, the World Future Society is an organization that must be reckoned with.

The Society sponsors an annual symposium that is attended by the leading movers and shakers of the New Age/one-world movement. Since 1980 these meetings have focused on such issues as: Global Community Networking; The Aquarian Conspiracy; The Future of International Governance; and Thinking Globally, Acting Locally. Perhaps the most important symposium to date, however, was Worldview 84 (held in 1984), which was nothing less than a world government planning session.

Kah printed some WPCA documents in the first appendix to his book. He pointed out that:

In examining the letterheads you will notice that WCPA membership is composed of prestigious leaders from around the world, including current and former mayors, members of parliaments, prime ministers, ambassadors, foreign ministers, key members of the United Nations, Nobel Prize winners, prominent World Court judges, influential financiers and attorneys, as well as leading educators and religious leaders.

A high percentage of members are from Asia and the Far East—in particular from India. This, of course, is where the religions of pantheism are rooted, and, therefore, where occult influence is strongest. Although every major world religion, including Judaism and Christianity, is represented in the WCPA, participating members typically have a strong disposition toward pantheistic beliefs, regardless of their outward religious affiliation. You will also notice that a disproportionate number of members are in some way connected with the United Nations, especially through UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization). Here is a statistical breakdown.

Out of 150 Honorary Sponsors listed on one of the letterheads, a total of thirty-four were identified with the United Nations; fourteen came from the area of commerce, banking or finance; and eight were Nobel Laureates. As far as countries are concerned, twenty-six came from India; ten from Nigeria; nine each from the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom; eight from Canada; and six from Pakistan. A total of forty-five sponsors came from the East Asian countries.

Many distinguished names appear on these letterheads (as noted in Exhibit A), and it is important to remember that while these individuals are certainly instrumental in the

forming of the world government, they are not the most powerful figures of the oneworld movement. They are only the figureheads. The real movers and shakers remain behind-the-scenes.

...

In reviewing this letter (Exhibit F) you will notice the frequent mention of the New World Order. You will also discover some disagreement over the precise meaning of the term. Some insiders envision a New World Order built around an empowered United Nations; while the WCPA advocates a more radical, all-encompassing form of global government. Either version however, would move us into a one-world system.

The last point proves yet again that there are multiple factions and views with the NWO gang, though they share common principal goals.

The letter in Exhibit G, announcing the convening of the 4th World Constituent Assembly, was sent to every Head of State in the world in December 1990. The message is straight forward. "We are forming a World Government, can we count on your support?"

...

If the adjacent letter has been sent to every Head of State in the world, why have our leaders not informed us of this plot? It is difficult to imagine that they aren't taking this group seriously considering all the prominent world figures who are involved in it. One need only look at the names of the first three vice presidents listed under the executive cabinet, to realize the seriousness of this threat, (Tony Benn, former Cabinet Minister, United Kingdom; Gordon Bryant, former Cabinet Minister, Australia; and Ramsey Clark, former Attorney General of the United States; see Exhibit A).

There are only a few other possible reasons why we haven't been warned:

1) the letter got intercepted by a top aide and never made it to the Head of State; 2) the letter was taken seriously, but the receiver was fearful of taking a stand realizing the powerful forces behind this effort; or 3) the letter was taken seriously, but the leader's attempt to expose the conspiracy has failed because of one-world interests who control major press and media communications.

A possible fourth reason is that the Head of State is himself involved in the plot. I wonder how many times a president must publicly mention the phrase "New World Order" before he qualifies for this category?

The letter says that war (meaning the Gulf War, which was authored by the one-worlders - but that is not mentioned) looms on the horizon and climate change threatens to flood Disneyland. We need World Government.

Kah throws more such documents at the reader.

The man published another book in 1999, *The New World Religion*.

To summarize, in the WCPA, we have an organization, with: 1) thick connections to the Lucis Trust, which is Theosophy / New Age Central; 2) notable connections to the CFR and the WCC; 3) ties to a powerful quasi-Club of Rome organization; 4) "key members of the United Nations, Nobel Prize winners, prominent World Court judges, influential financiers and attorneys"; 5) massive ties to the UN and related organizations, particularly the eugenicist/ post-humanist Unesco; 6) frequent references to a "New World Order."

It all checks.

Conclusions

Thus, we have, in the New Age cult, yet another strand of New World Order panterrestrial social engineering. The goals of this particular fraud are: 1) to create a worldwide pseudo-grassroots pro-

world-government pro-Gaian fanaticism organization; 2) to foster global consciousness; 3) to promote pantheism and the related anthropotheism, while at the same time killing monotheism; 4) to promote Darwinism, the ideology of the caste, and the idea of the improvable human; 5) to get people to sleep ("meditate"); 6) to promote all sorts of irrationalism, obscurantism, and confusion - the bewildered are easier to control.

Nazism and the New Age both stem from Theosophy.

Once one starts paying attention, one notices all sorts of New Age motifs and themes in popular entertainment and "culture." The people did not suddenly realize that they had always dreamed of Madame Blavatsky and wanted to enjoy her stuff. It works the other way around.

Between the currently fashionable Gaian environmentalism, Darwinism, and atheism - all of them pan-/anthropo-theistic - the New Age is steadily gaining ground among the better educated, influential strata of society. At the bottom, Oprah is broadcasting her drivel day and night directly into the eye-sockets of millions of women across North America. Similar New Age television hosts surely must exist in the other countries of the "global village."

Despite the gloomy outlook, one has to express doubts toward the prospects for success of the New Age cult. It is too stupid, too barbaric, and too obviously propagandized to prevail. Perhaps humanity will shake off this throwback to savagery like a bad LSD trip.

9.10 Darwinism

And now we come to the repugnant Darwinian theory of "evolution," one of the basest, most-backward, most anti-scientific, most anti-human concoctions in recent history. It is fitting, and, shall we say, natural, that the ones who came up with Darwinism were the vicious British Oligarchs of the 19th century - the same people who wanted to starve their own subjects and to "civilize" the world by subjugating it.

Let us begin by putting aside the false dichotomy of "scientific Darwinism" versus "ignorant Christian creationism."

First, on the personal level, until recently, I was vociferously anti-Christian. For better or for worse, I have gone to church only a few times in my life, to accompany acquaintances, who were never particularly pious, but went to church for traditional or whatever other reasons. I can not say that I "believe in God." The Christians obviously react against Darwinism, not out of blind dogmatism and ignorance, though there is some of that, but because Darwinism attacks them - not intellectually, but culturally and personally.

The reader may also accuse me of being against Darwinism on quasi-Christian ideological grounds. To that I reply that the Darwinists themselves refuse to live by the lunacy that they preach. They excuse their hypocrisy by stating that it is not their fault that Darwinism is true, thus imputing themselves intellectually as well as morally. Note that, as with so many other ideologies, the more convinced Darwinists tend to be decent, and often quite smart - but they fail to examine their base assumptions, and they refuse to look at the countless problems with their arguments.

Here I have to ask the pro-Darwinist reader - do you take Darwinism religiously, or did you memorize its creed in school, regurgitate it on your test, and move on with life? Because in the latter case, you can afford to take an unemotional view at the present discussion. Many people reflexively conflate Darwinism with "science" and progress, without bothering to examine the foundations of the Darwinist creeds.

And so, while realizing that Darwinian fanatics are not necessarily either bad or stupid, I have to take a hard line here, because Darwinism is a matter of life and death, as, one would think,

the Second World War proved for good. The argument that eugenics was a misinterpretation of Darwinism, or a historical episode of mass schizophrenia, does not stand in the light of the fact that eugenics was invented by Francis Galton - the first of Darwin's two cronies - and that perhaps the top eugenicist of the 20th century was Julian Huxley - the grandson of Thomas Huxley, the second of Darwin's two cronies. Eugenicism is alive and well today, in the United Nations, of which Huxley was a major co-founder, and in various other haunts, such as the Club of Rome.

To be fair to Thomas Huxley, he was against "Social Darwinism." But he was also a racist. In his opinion, "No rational man, cognizant of the facts, believes that the average negro is the equal, still less the superior, of the white man." That eugenics is implicit in Darwinism is one of the best-hidden realities of the 20th century. My impression is that people tend to double-think around the issue - they blabber about "selfish genes" in their bio-/zoology courses, and then go along their lives practising altruism, love and friendship, the exception being the psychopaths.

The modern outlook of Darwinism remains the same - dog-eat-dog, winner-take-all. Take Richard Dawkins's 1976 *Selfish Gene*. Specifically, Dawkins writes in Ch.1 of his work, that

I shall argue that a predominant quality to be expected in a successful gene is ruthless selfishness. This gene selfishness will usually give rise to selfishness in individual behaviour. However, as we shall see, there are special circumstances in which a gene can achieve its own selfish goals best by fostering a limited form of altruism at the level of individual animals. 'Special' and 'limited' are important words in the last sentence. Much as we might wish to believe otherwise, universal love and the welfare of the species as a whole are concepts that simply do not make evolutionary sense.

...

Unlike both of them [Montagu and Lorenz], I think 'nature red in tooth and claw' sums up our modern understanding of natural selection admirably.

The key words being "special" and "limited."

Dawkins later (Ch. 12) pretends to explain altruism by claiming that genes force organisms to sacrifice themselves for the group in order to save the common gene pool! I.e. Dawkins may pretend to talk about "altruism," but in reality he continues to push "selfishness." He continues with the hackneyed Darwinian argument that

My own feeling is that a human society based simply on the gene's law of universal ruthless selfishness would be a very nasty society in which to live. But unfortunately, however much we may deplore something, it does not stop it being true.

I.e. "I do not intend to live by what I preach, but I insist on being right in what I say!" This irreconcilable contradiction is definitive of Darwinism, which always has attracted true believers, brainwash jobs, and double-thinkers. Most of us fall in the category of brainwash jobs.

Which brings me to the next point - though I adopt a harsh tone here, I freely admit that I used to espouse evolution and profess "atheism" before I realized that I would have to take a serious look at how the world really works. And so in criticising those who accept Darwinism blindly, I am criticising my younger self along with everybody else. It is unpleasant to realize one's delusions, and it is unnecessary to self-flagellate excessively, but one must acknowledge one's mistakes and learn to appreciate valid criticism.

In disclosure, I must say a few words about the "evolution" of my thoughts on Darwinism. Like most people, I first learned the theory when I was a small child. A child will generally adopt the worldview of those around him who impress him the most favorably. My parents never mentioned either Jesus or Darwin. They did, however, give me a fair amount of popular-science children's books, which I read. Darwinism is exceedingly simplistic, and so I knew it by heart at an early age. School added nothing to my knowledge on the subject, except the impression that serious people take Darwinism for granted. And that is important, because at some point, it dawned on me that Darwinism is sus-

piciously simple. Why do giraffes have long necks?²⁹ Because over generations, they extended their necks to eat the tall branches! This seemed absurd to me - why did this process not end with the death of the first short-necked giraffe? Why did not animals elsewhere reach for the tall branches? Was it because of the trees? Maybe the trees in other places had sufficiently many low branches to suffice for all the animals - but then why did the trees near the giraffes have fewer low branches? To escape the rapacious giraffes? And more questions - why are some animals ridiculously bright and colorful, while others sport camouflage? The ability to fly and the capability of staying underwater for prolonged periods of time seemed like useful traits to have - why did not more animals evolve those traits? Ditto for human intelligence - why did not more animals develop it?

To every question, I managed to concoct a Darwinian answer. Some answers contradicted each other, but I came up with the argument that this happened over here and that happened over there. But more questions appeared, and it occurred to me that the complexity of nature renders the case-by-case Darwinian analysis of every species utterly absurd. Darwinism takes one species and one factor for one trait, when nature exists in a continuum in time, space, and complexity.

I thought about all of this, and reached the conclusion that older, specialized people had thought about it before and had figured it all out. It is extremely hard for a child, unless particularly precocious or arrogant, not to reach that conclusion. And so, like the vast bulk of other people, including most academics, I decided that Darwinism is true *not on the basis of a careful examination of the history of and the evidence for and against the theory, but on the assumption that those who taught me knew what they were talking about.*

Later, when I went to college, I took economics. I was taught a variety of fairly trivial mathematical models, which, I quickly discovered, had no bearing on reality. The best courses in economics I was given were the qualitative ones, taught by professors with experience in policy making at the governmental or quasi-governmental level. By the time they gave me my degree, I had reached the conclusion that I had not been taught anything of substances. Naturally, I assumed that the people in charge probably figured things out as they went, and in either case they knew what they were doing.

As I studied economics and free-marketeering, I could not help but notice that Darwinism and Economic Liberalism preached the exact same thing - selfishness is good, competition is great, and the "invisible hand" of "natural selection" (or the "market") knows best.

Soon after, the 2008 stock market collapse occurred. Until then, I had assumed that, there having been one Great Depression (in reality there have been more than one), the people in charge knew what they were doing. But the collapse proved that either: 1) they were incompetents, or 2) they lied to the people and crashed the economy on purpose. I checked, and sure enough, the economists who had created the pre-conditions for the 2008 crash were free-marketeers to the last of them.

And so I had to conclude that the economists' establishment was utterly discredited, and totally ignorant of reality. I checked, and it turned out that, yes, the "free-market" is a sick joke, almost too absurd to be true, and most economists were divorced from physical reality.

The realization that the free-market in economics is bunkum, and the establishment in economics did not know left from right, forced me to suspect that it is possible that the free-market in "biology" is also wrong, and that the bio-/zoologists were as clueless as their economist fellows.

Another cause for my suspicion was the realization that, for some strange reasons, the British Oligarchy (and I did not think of them in that way at that time) had "discovered" Darwinism exactly at the peak of their imperial expansion and domestic industrial rape of the underclass. Thus, despite Thomas Huxley's complaints, they could justify their imperialism on the grounds of Social Darwinism and the "civilizing mission" of the underdeveloped savages, and they could excuse their policies of domestic torture by claiming that the so-called capitalists were more evolved than the hapless workers - a patent absurdity. Post-WW2 Darwinists insist that eugenicism and Social Darwinism

²⁹The issue is obvious and much discussed. For a good overview of the current state of affairs, look up Wolf-Ekkehard Lönnig's paper *The Evolution of the Long-Necked Giraffe (Giraffa camelopardalis L.) - What Do We Really Know?*, available online.

are mis-interpretations of the original theory - but the argument is untenable. Darwinism says "selfishness" - meaning exploitation - is "natural," and therefore, implicitly, good and justifiable. The Darwinists go at great lengths in claiming that morals, free will, etc, are disjunct from "science," but that is hocus. Human society can not but exist on moral and ethnical grounds - and a society based on the precepts of Darwinism acknowledges exploitation - possibly clannish exploitation, but exploitation nonetheless - as somehow "natural," not in the sense of a regrettable evil that ought to be prevented, but as a humdrum fact of life.

And so I smelled rat. The Christianity vs Darwinism false dichotomy confused me for a while, because every time I looked at the anti-Darwinist view, I found lengthy Biblical quotations - and that was no good for me. Finally, I read through a few anti-Darwinist books, ignoring the parts, which argued that the Earth was created 6,000 years ago. Lo and behold, I found that there is a fair amount of expert scientists, who disagree with Darwinism on non-theological grounds. I also found that the evidence in support of Darwinian theory is, at best, ridiculous, and at worst, non-existent. Then I began to hear about Malthus and the eugenicists. And *one can not understand Darwinism without understanding Malthusianism and eugenicism in their historical contexts.*

That is where I come from. I absolutely do not argue against Darwinism on theological grounds. I do find Darwinism morally repugnant, as, in light of Dawkins's quote, do the Darwinists. But my argument is purely "scientific," with an accent on first principles rather than on endless empirical semantics, though the latter have their place in the discussion.

Preliminaries and Definitions

Let us clear up a few general misconceptions, which typically plague debates on Darwin's doctrine.

First, we have to define "evolution" and "Darwinism." The problem here is twofold: 1) some people conflate the two ideas; and 2) many, including trained scientists, conflate Darwinism with science in general.

Darwinian theory is a subset of evolutionary theory. The word "evolution," in its broader, everyday sense, means something like "change over time." In this sense, evolution is omnipresent. We are interested, however, in the technical definition of "evolution." Thus, let us define "evolution" as "the mutability of species from lower to higher orders of complexity." Darwin stated his own argument, at the end of the preface to the *Origins of Species* (1859), as follows:

I am fully convinced that species are not immutable; but that those belonging to what are called the same genera are lineal descendants of some other and generally extinct species, in the same manner as the acknowledged varieties of any one species are the descendants of that species.

That was the first part of his thesis; the second was that "Furthermore, I am convinced that Natural Selection has been the main but not exclusive means of modification."

Thus, evolution means mutability of species, and Darwinian evolution means mutability of species under "natural selection," which we also have to define.

It is somewhat amusing that the Darwinists gleefully peddle their own version of Transubstantiation, while deriding the Christian one. At least the Catholics have the decency and sanity to admit that their blood of Christ still looks like wine, though it has changed in substance. The Darwinists, going beyond the wildest dreams of the medieval alchemists, want to transmute not only lead into gold, but also monkeys into men.

This is not to say that mutability in species or elements is not impossible. Maybe it is possible - what do I know? But, since there is no recorded case of lead spontaneously turning into gold (and not only in "substance"), or of amoebas growing wings and fangs, I have to stick with the inductive

conclusion that, barring miracles or "natural" extremely rare events, elements and species remain as they are.

The parallel between alchemism and "evolutionary" theory is older than Darwinism: Lamarck, who proposed evolution - but not Darwinian "natural selection" - a half century before Darwin, labelled his theory "transmutation of species." Transmutation is exactly the term used by the medieval alchemists in regard to their efforts to obtain gold from baser metals.

The crux here is the "miracles or extremely rare events" caveat. Now, miracles and extremely rare events are of two types - unique, and recurring. Two examples of unique events can be found in the origin of the universe and the origin of man. The Christians say God created both at separate times, and Darwinism says that "nature" first created itself and then created man. I hasten to add that the Darwinists insist on denying purpose to nature. To them, things just happened. With all due respect, saying that the universe and life came out of nothing is effectively equivalent to saying that they created themselves. Divorce the word "created" of its agency if you must - but it all amounts to the same thing.

We must also note that "natural selection" and abiogenesis are disjoint in principle, but joined in Darwinism, in the sense that one can have the one without the other, but Darwinism insists on having both. Specifically, Darwin explicitly stated the "primordial soup" argument in 1871 in a letter to Joseph Dalton Hooker. He said that life may have started in a "warm little pond, with all sorts of ammonia and phosphoric salts, lights, heat, electricity, etc. present, so that a protein compound was chemically formed ready to undergo still more complex changes."

To see the disjunction between abiogenesis and "natural selection," simply suppose that "God" created the universe and the first amoeba in such a way as to allow the amoeba to "evolve" via "natural selection." This argument shows that basic non-Christian creationism, and "natural selection," are perfectly compatible. For a notable example of the obviousness of the latter argument, take a look at the beliefs of Francis Collins, one of the two top people of the Human Genome Project. Ignorant of evolutionary theory, Collins is not. And yet, the man, once an atheist, became an evangelical Christian! Nor did he deny "evolution" and "natural selection" - he opted for theistic evolution and evolutionary creation, which mean the same thing - God hardcoded "natural selection" into his universe.

The Darwinists' insistence on abiogenesis points to one of the subtle, but critical aspects of Darwinism - among its other purposes, the theory explicitly aimed to demolish monotheism of the Christian variety, and impose pantheism of the "fittest takes all" type. The crux of Darwinian theory is not abiogenesis, but "natural selection." The Darwinists did not have to assault Christianity the way they did (Thomas Huxley was particularly vociferous). That they did attack Christianity, strongly suggests that undermining the Christian faith - meaning, not the supposed backwardness and ignorance of Christianity, but those of its postulates, which were disagreeable to certain elements of the British Oligarchy - was precisely one of the intentions of the promotion of Darwinism.

And in regard to the pantheistic, "nature" is "God" underpinnings of Darwinism, let us consult Richard Dawkins, the avowed Darwinist and "atheist":

(*The God Delusion* (2006), Ch.1, p. 18) Deists differ from pantheists in that the deist God is some kind of cosmic intelligence, rather than the pantheist's metaphoric or poetic synonym for the laws of the universe. Pantheism is sexed-up atheism. Deism is watered-down theism.

To Dawkins, I think it is fair to say, atheism means a faith in "science," and "science" means a faith in Darwinism.

But to continue with miracles and rare events. The unique rare event presents irreconcilable epistemological and empirical problems. Empirical "science" relies on careful observation and experimentation under controlled conditions. It totally fails to apply to unique events, since, even if someone saw such an event and recorded his observations, how can we tell if he did not lie, mis-perceive, or

have the DTs? Thus, one has to approach unique events rationally - things were so and so before, they became so and so after, and so we guess that the event did this or that.

The problem becomes practically insurmountable, when one has no good information regarding the before and after states of affairs, or when the event and its context are overly complex. Thus, the genesis of life presents a problem which may be insoluble. I see three ways in resolving the issue:

First, if humanity manages to invent a time travelling machine, which can go *back* in time, people can go back in time and witness and record on film the creation of life. The problem is that in Darwinian theory, the exact time and place of the creation of life is unknown. Another problem is that a bunch of wise guys may pretend to invent a time machine to trick everybody else. Another problem is that, in view of the extreme advancements in the human capability of producing virtual reality, a like-minded gang of swindlers can play all sorts of tricks on the population. And a last problem is that it may be fundamentally impossible to go back in time.

I realize we are talking science fiction here, but that is only natural when one talks about Darwinism. With a tongue in cheek, I note that Dawkins agrees:

(The Selfish Gene, 1976 Preface) This book should be read almost as though it were science fiction. It is designed to appeal to the imagination. But it is not science fiction: it is science. Cliche or not, 'stranger than fiction' expresses exactly how I feel about the truth. We are survival machines-robot vehicles blindly programmed to preserve the selfish molecules known as genes.

Science fiction indeed, Dick!

A second way of "proving" abiogenesis would be the creation of life from "primordial soup" in laboratory settings. The problem with this is that the researchers will have to prove that they cleaned their beaker particularly well and cleansed their soup of bacteria. Another problem is that in so "proving" abiogenesis, the scientists will have proved intelligent creation.

In the same sense, if a few of aliens or "Gods" come to humanity, demonstrate an ability to create life out of inorganic soup, and claim to have authored humankind, we will have reason to suspect intelligent design.

Third, perhaps, sometime in the future, humanity will make currently unimaginable discoveries, which will imply abiogenesis or intelligent creation or whatever else. This is what the Darwinists falsely claim to have done.

The Christians take the second approach - Gold told them all about it. The problem is that God made his disclosure a long time ago, and time impairs memory. Another problem is that he went through human agents, who are notoriously prone to error and committing deceit.

The first and second approaches are obviously useless to the Darwinists, and so they focus on the third one, and build castles on a swamp of false suppositions.

Let us also quickly look at rare events of a similar kind. Those could be replicable in laboratory conditions, or too large and complex to replicate. In the first case, empirical science can do its job. In the second case, we are in trouble.

What you do in the second case, using the "scientific method," is: you try to garner as much information on the circumstances surrounding the rare events as possible. On the basis of that information, you create a hypothesis, which tries to correlate the circumstances preceding a rare event of a type with the event itself. Ideally, one looks for causes; failing that, one takes symptoms. It is important to distinguish between the two. Having only symptoms, one can test the hypothesis by using it to predict future rare events. A single confirmed failed prediction sends the scientist back to the drawing board. If the predictions consistently hold, we say that the hypothesis offers a good approximate description of reality, and we stick to it until something better arrives.

To get the idea, suppose people notice that volcanoes emit smoke before exploding. The smoke obviously does not cause the eruptions, but it is safe to say that where one has a smoking volcano, one will soon (relatively speaking) have lava or at least soot. Note that in this example the process we examine resists understanding, but admits description, i.e. we know that volcanoes emits smoke before erupting, but we do not know why.

Having identified causes rather than symptoms, one can go a step further. One now looks at the causes. If they are ever present - in historically recorded observations, or at the moment of observation - without triggering the process, back to the drawing board.

Which brings us to what the Darwinists have tried to do. Fundamentally, they are looking at what they claim to be non-replicable extremely rare events - namely the transitions from one species to another. Hence, the Darwinists throw away what generally passes for modern science - the lab experiment. Observe that the Darwinists have the additional motivation to beware lab experiments in their fear of supporting the creationist outlook in any way. Because if someone changes one species into another inside a lab, or creates life out of soup, he will have proved that intelligence can create life or transform complex organisms from one to another - but *not* that "nature" can do the same. Thus, in saying that the transition between species is too rare to be observed, the Darwinists forfeited the testability of their theory on the basis of its predictive properties. That leaves them with testing their thesis against recorded past events. Here we run into another trouble.

Record-keeping in human civilization has existed for about 10,000 years. Writing in a recognizable form came about 5,000 years ago. Moreover, the earlier we go, the sparser records become; and the vicissitudes of time and human madness have destroyed a good deal of the little there was. Nevertheless, it is possible to construct a general picture of what humanity did in the last 10,000 years, with the level of detail improving with proximity to the present.

Beyond the range of human records, things become extremely murky, and rely, in effect, on conjecture and archaeological findings.

But to go back to the Darwinists. Or rather, at this stage, the evolutionists. They had to come up with causes or symptoms of the process they claim occasionally takes place - the transition from one species to another. So they looked around and noticed that: 1) organisms live; 2) organisms eat, fight, and breed, the children bearing resemblances to their parents; 3) organisms come in all shapes and sizes; 4) there have been organisms on Earth, which have since vanished - notably the dinosaurs. The first observation was a bit too tautological even for the Darwinists. Speaking of which, though the one to coin the phrase "survival of the fittest" was Herbert Spencer, Darwin also used to term. "Survival of the fittest" is a tautology: how do you define fittest? They are the ones who survive - circular logic. The Darwinists are very aware of this and insist on saying "natural selection," even though they also claim that nature has no agency and therefore can not select. Seemingly trivial, these factoids are not only instructive and amusing, but compose tremendous arguments against Darwinism. The Darwinists have a tough time even *defining* their theory. Indeed, they incessantly abuse definitions, as we will see.

Speaking of Spencer (1820-1903), he was the one to invent Social Darwinism. It so happens that Spencer's father was a secretary in the philosophical society founded by Darwin's grand-dad, and that between 1848 and 1953, Spencer was a sub-editor at the evangelically free-market-loving magazine *The Economist*. Supposed to be an iconoclast, in reality, Spencer wrote what his fellows wanted him to write, and by peddling free-marketeering and Social Darwinism, he became, by the 1870s, (Wikipedia) "the most famous philosopher of the age."

Let us ignore the original evolutionist, Lamarck.

Darwin took the second, third, and fourth of the above points, and constructed the following thesis: organisms fight, and those of the sharper shapes and larger sizes kill their smaller fellows (metaphorically speaking), and the survivors have children, which grow bigger and sharper and better yet, and sometimes the sharper, bigger critters turn into entirely new species, while sometimes the weaker,

smaller species die off completely. The Darwinists play around with the words, but the above is what they really say.

And to answer the questions of "How come some animals are more equal than others?" and "How exactly do they change into new species?," Darwin speculated that, somehow, all organisms undergo rare changes in their substances, and those animals made "stronger" ("more adaptable") by their metamorphoses survive at higher rates than the other organisms, and they pass their substance to their heirs, and sometimes the change in substance is great enough to create a new species. That is what "Darwinism means" - "evolution" (one species turning into another) on the basis of "natural selection" (i.e. the "most adaptable" survive and pass their substance) and small, gradual, possibly imperceptible changes in the (substance of the) evolving organisms.

The difference between Darwin's and Lamarck's views lay in Lamarck's claim that the environment directly moulds a given critter. Under Darwinism, the critter changes magically by itself, and the environment acts as something like an arbiter.

Having established their thesis, the Darwinists had to "prove" it, i.e. test it against existing information, or come up with new information amenable to their views. In particular, they had to figure out: 1) how parents transmit their traits to children; and 2) how the magical Darwinian little change occurs.

Observe that the first problem is ancient and can be examined in the absence of Darwinism. It is obvious that children tend to inherit some of the physical characteristics of their parents. This has nothing to do with transmutations of species or with "natural selections." Now, as we know, the inheritance issue was tackled by Mendel, and then by a series of other researchers. Without going through all the details, Watson and Crick co-discovered DNA in 1953. All right, so the genetic code influences trait inheritance. So what? That was never the main issue in regard to Darwinism!

In fact, from the computer programmer's perspective, the genetic code implies intelligent design. The genetic code looks suspiciously like computer code. And computer code is extremely sensitive to purposeful design. If you just throw binary digits at random, you get nothing. A complicated program consists of an elaborate structure of deliberately arranged pieces of code. To make a parallel to mutations, if you change even one letter - never mind line! - of code, the whole program crashes. You can force it to ignore the error - but then it will not behave as it is supposed to behave. Now if you irradiate a person, as the Iraqis found after the Americans liberated them with depleted uranium, the person may become sterile. Or she could give birth to deformed or otherwise impaired children. That is mutation! It is malignant rather than beneficial. That is how it works in the real world!

Which brings us to another key point - the Darwinists claim that the magical mechanism of change is mutation. Single genes change randomly, they say, and some genes prove better than others and gradually become dominant.

A few more points:

First, by claiming that the magical change is small and usually imperceptible, the Darwinists have made their theory utterly impossible to test. No testing by accuracy of prediction, no testing via checking for the presence of causal forces (or at least accompanying symptoms) in recorded observations, no nothing. So now we are in the absurd situation where the Darwinists insist that the changes have to be there, because the transmutation of species has to be there, when there is no clear case - even remotely clear! - of either a species turning into something else, or some advantageous mutation occurring at all.

Unable to produce any such clear evidence for their theory, the Darwinists blithely proclaim that everything will become clear in the future, all sorts of fossils will appear, new observations will explain how each species acquires its traits, and the conclusive "proof" will finally come. Some, like Dawkins, take the more extreme - and utterly untenable - position of claiming that the theory is a scientific

fact as well established as the Earth rotating around the sun (*Selfish Gene*, Ch. 1). Let me merely point out that there are no scientists who dispute the Earth's Solar orbit, or, say, the fact that the Earth exerts a gravitational force on nearby bodies. That is because people made predictions on the basis of the two latter theories, and tested those predictions. And you and I can repeat the tests as many times as we would.

There are, however, plenty of scientists who reject Darwinism - as we will see. And that is exactly because some scientists have examined the evidence for Darwinism and have found out that it is puny and ambiguous, to non-existent. Let me stress that there are many more scientists who would reject Darwinism given the opportunity to study the evidence, and the assurance of immunity to persecution. Most believe in Darwinism out in collegial respect, naivete, and ignorance. Others do not believe in Darwinism, but keep mum to preserve their careers.

Next, observe that the magical mutation is absolutely necessary for the Darwinian theory to hold. Without "benevolent" mutations, of which no evidence exists, the "struggle for survival" *diminishes* the gene pool, which demonstrably exists! Thus, it renders a species *less* complex.

Moreover, consider the following notion: suppose a species's gene pool is somehow fixed. Now, perhaps a lot of the genes lie dormant, and only become active if the organism needs them. This would explain the vast amount of "junk-DNA," which the geneticists, in their folly, regard as evolutionarily obsolete. It is not obsolete! It is just inactive, because the organism does not need it in its current environment and iteration! Or it serves as some kind of an error-correcting code. Observe that such a theory would explain the cornucopia of variation within a given species, and provides a non-magical way for organisms to adapt to their environments (possibly over a few generations). But such a theory is no good to either the evolutionists or the Darwinists, since it provides neither a mechanism for the transmutation of species, nor a "natural selection."

Another serious problem with Darwinism defined as the slow change of one species into another is that it is incredibly absurd. It is a classic Big Lie, too great to deny. Darwinism explicitly says that change has to occur in a continuum. On the other hand, we have reality, in which species occur in a discrete framework. Darwin thought that the missing links would emerge from the archaeological digs and the naturalists' expeditions - but they have not. No credible missing links have been found, because, one suspects, none exist.

Some Darwinists just ignore this problem and forge ahead. Others adopt the "Darwinism with jumps" (or "punctuations") view. Darwinism still holds, they say, but instead of gradual change, there are jumps. For example, see Arthur Koestler's *The Ghost in the Machine* (1967).

Darwinism with jumps is ever more impossible to test than the gradualist version.

And so the Darwinists, unable to really "prove" anything, come up with theory after theory to explain everything you can imagine. Thus Darwinism, in many ways, is about as useful in explaining things as is Creationism. Why do the giraffes have long necks? "Because God said so," replies the Creationist. The Darwinist, in turn, elaborates that the giraffes have long necks, because for generation after generation, they reached after the higher branches, and those who did not reach up starved, and those with the longer necks survived, and there was an original proto-giraffe, who was lucky, and had a longer neck, and so on *ad absurdum*, the gist being: "Because nature via its Prophet Darwin said so." More generally, the Darwinist always says that whatever happened, happened slowly over a long period of time under pressures we can not accurately identify. How is this any better than saying "God said so!" ? But check for yourself, dear reader! Why do peacocks have bright feathers? Why do humans have intelligence? Why do giraffes have long necks? Why do birds have feathers? They will tell you the same thing over and over - gradual change for reasons unknown. Or they will flat out state some reasonable-sounding reasons, which, however, somehow fail to apply to a large group of other species. The whole edifice of Darwinism consists of breadcrumbs!

For one blatant *reductio ad absurdum* to Darwinism, take the human intelligence and conscious-

ness. Darwinism can explain neither, and so it simply says that neither exists. People are robots. Dawkins in the 1976 Preface to *The Selfish Gene*: "We are survival machines-robot vehicles blindly programmed to preserve the selfish molecules known as genes." He means "blind" as in purposeless; thus his turn of phrase is an example of an oxymoron - but surely he is being cute, post-modern, and ironic, in the Darwinist tradition of "natural selection." How is it natural if someone ("nature") is selecting something?

But even if we suppose that consciousness is somehow a mix of "instinct" and robotic behavior, what do we do with the human conception of beauty? This obviously exists and is impossible to explain in terms of "natural selection" and "random mutation." I suppose that the Darwinists can argue that beauty is just an illusion, it is a misconception stemming from sexual attraction, i.e. people like certain shapes because they remind them of sexual organs. But that is absurd, and, moreover, can not explain the appreciation of music, elegant language, and mathematics - and any mathematician will readily tell you that there are certain proofs in mathematics, which possess esthetic beauty. I can make sexual allusions to the Pythagorean theorem - but that would be in fun.

So let us look at the evidence and the dissenting views.

The Case Against

Before we continue, let me stress that: 1) I do not argue for creationism. I do not at all care about creationism. I see plenty of evidence for creationism, but not enough to draw conclusions. And that is fine with me - I have other things to worry about. 2) Neither do I argue against evolution per se. Evolution defined as the transmutation of species is no great concern of mine. I do not see much evidence for it, and that is fine. Maybe evolution holds, maybe it does not. 3) What I do argue against is Darwinism. First, I find Darwinism intellectually repugnant, too stupid to believe. Second, I find Darwinism morally repugnant - and that is crucial, because Darwinism is far more than a petty pseudo-scientific theory - it is a worldview. And I feel that I have made the case throughout this book, that a society founded on Darwinian precepts would not be one, which most of us would like to inhabit.

For the hardcore neo-Darwinian view, we can safely rely on Dawkins's expostulations, notably *The Selfish Gene* (1976), and *The Blind Watchmaker* (1986).

For the Christian-Creationist view, I recommend Ian T. Taylor's excellent *In The Minds Of Men* (the most recent, 6th, edition was published in 2008), and James Perloff's *Tornado in a Junkyard* (1999). Both men are hardcore Christians (Perloff used to be an atheist) - but they are also professional journalists, and they have done their homework. You can find a mass of references to academic anti-Darwinian sources in the Taylor and Perloff's books.

For a classic, technical, expert dissent to Darwinism, try Michael J. Behe's *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (first published in 1996). Behe has also written *The Edge of Evolution* (2008). For a criticism from the perspective of a professor of law, see Phillip Johnson's *Darwin on Trial* (1991). Another academically accredited (from Cambridge, at that) critic of Darwinism and proponent of intelligent design is Stephen Meyer, the author of *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design* (2010). Then there is Jonathan Wells, a person with PhDs in religious studies and molecular cell-biology, who has written *Icons of Evolution* (2000).

Note that since it is impossible to expect a person whose career rests on promoting Darwinism to shoot himself in the head in the professional sense, we must reject the argument that only bio-/zoologists can criticize Darwinism. Journalists, lawyers, and historians, are professional researchers - let them do their job! On top of that we have the criticism of the cell biologists, who are eminently qualified to talk about Darwinism and evolution.

Let us also reject the standard Darwinist argument that Darwinian evolution is the consensus among scientists. The claim is blatantly false.

Why did Darwinism become so prevalent academically? Because the Oligarchs promoted Darwinism for existential reasons. Darwinism allowed them to excuse their eugenicism and Malthusianism, as well as their dream of becoming Gods. So they promoted it, as they have promoted the free-markets, global warming, false history, and other hokum.

As Gustave le Bon pointed out, Hitler demonstrated, and the Madison Avenue boys keep reminding us, the symbol-minded are you and I and everyone else around us. Symbols and pictures bypass one's conscious defences and strike directly at the "subconscious" or the "psyche" - both terms are hackneyed and vague - but they should convey the point.

Thus, the parts that people remember best from high-school evolutionary theory, are the diagrams and the artistic drawings, all presented as plain fact in support of the incontrovertible Darwinian theory.

Survival of the Fakest, by Jonathan Wells

The American Spectator, Dec. 2000 - Jan. 2001

If you had asked me during my years studying science at Berkeley whether or not I believed what I read in my science textbooks, I would have responded much as any of my fellow students: puzzled that such a question would be asked in the first place. One might find tiny errors, of course, typos and misprints. And science is always discovering new things. But I believed - took it as a given - that my science textbooks represented the best scientific knowledge available at that time.

It was only when I was finishing my Ph.D. in cell and development biology, however, that I noticed what at first I took to be a strange anomaly. The textbook I was using prominently featured drawings of vertebrate embryos - fish, chickens, humans, etc. - where similarities were presented as evidence for descent from a common ancestor. Indeed, the drawings did appear very similar. But I'd been studying embryos for some time, looking at them under a microscope. And I knew that the drawings were just plain wrong.

I re-checked all my other textbooks. They all had similar drawings, and they were all obviously wrong. Not only did they distort the embryos they pictured; they omitted earlier stages in which the embryos look very different from one another.

Like most other science students, like most scientists themselves, I let it pass. It didn't immediately affect my work, and I assumed that while the texts had somehow gotten this particular issue wrong, it was the exception to the rule. In 1997, however, my interest in the embryo drawings was revived when British embryologist Michael Richardson and his colleagues published the result of their study comparing the textbook drawings with actual embryos. As Richardson himself was quoted in the prestigious journal *Science*: "It looks like it's turning out to be one of the most famous fakes in biology."

Worse, this was no recent fraud. Nor was its discovery recent. The embryo drawings that appear in most every high school and college textbook are either reproductions of, or based on, a famous series of drawings by the 19th century German biologist and fervent Darwinian, Ernst Haeckel, and they have been known to scholars of Darwin and evolutionary theory to be forgeries for over a hundred years. But none of them, apparently, have seen fit to correct this almost ubiquitous misinformation.

For the rest of the dirt on Haeckel, and other debacles and swindles, look up Wells's *Icons of Evolution* (2000), or Chapter 7 of Ian Taylor's *In the Minds of Men*.

Again - the picture of the little embryos, which tends to make an impression and stick in the defenceless young mind, and which you and I most likely both saw in our high-school classes, is a fraud, and has been known to be a fraud for many decades.

A few paragraphs below, Wells writes:

As it happens, all of these examples, as well as many others purportedly standing as evidence of evolution, turn out to be incorrect. Not just slightly off. Not just slightly

mistaken. On the subject of Darwinian evolution, the texts contained massive distortions and even some faked evidence. Nor are we only talking about high-school textbooks that some might excuse (but shouldn't) for adhering to a lower standard. Also guilty are some of the most prestigious and widely used college texts, such as Douglas Futuyma's *Evolutionary Biology*, and the latest edition of the graduate-level textbook *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, coauthored by the president of the National Academy of Sciences, Bruce Alberts. In fact, when the false "evidence" is taken away, the case for Darwinian evolution, in the textbooks at least, is so thin it's almost invisible.

Now, it is initially difficult to believe that a mistake of such magnitude could have occurred. This is one reason for the blind adherence of Darwinism - how could they possibly lie (or err) like that? They could! Look it up - even the Darwinists will tell you that, yes, Haeckel was a hack, and that, yes, his pictures stayed in the books for years and years.

How could this happen without a combination of conspiracy and mass delusion at the higher level of the zoo-/biological establishment? Remember that until, say, the mid-20th century, the people in charge of the zoological establishment in Britain, where the whole scam started, were a close, tightly-knit group. Their representatives were the likes of Julian Huxley and Francis Galton.

We continue with another classic Darwinist fraud - the missing link. In his 1859 *Origin*, Darwin did not explicitly tackle the "evolution" of humans. He left the best part for last. But everybody knew what was coming, and indeed, in 1871, Darwin explained to the hapless human herds that they were the descendants of monkeys. Since then, Darwin's disciples have scoured the Earth in search for the hallowed Missing Link, the greatest treasure since the Holy Grail.

Updated theories claim that instead of men "evolving" from apes, both men and apes evolved from some other common ancestor. They can theorize all they want - but why don't they produce some more bones?

Before we look at the evidence, such as it is, let us note that even if they produce a solid pile of bones of some humanoid-type creature, the Darwinists will not have completed their job - because they have to produce an entire intermediary *species* (more than one, really). The definition of species is interbreeding - if two critters can have fertile offspring, they are of the same species. This produces yet another insurmountable problem with Darwinism - how can you go around talking about species, when one can not go back in time to test if two different-looking fossils can produce fertile offspring? To drive the point home, consider dogs. They come in all shapes sizes, and yet, as the reader can verify experimentally, they can cross-breed. They can even breed with wolves.

Suppose, now, that we take twenty dog skeletons and arrange them according to size. In the fantasy world of Darwinism, that would be indisputable evidence of evolution in action. Darwin wanted his evolution to be "lineal," i.e. across a straight line. The neo-Darwinists prefer branching trees, because those are more confusing, and better fit their new "evidence" - because they had decided to drop the "lineal" theory, since it implied directedness in the work of nature. But there is no problem in arranging our canine graveyard into a tree. The point remains - the bones represent no evolution, but just a bunch of dogs of differing sizes. Like humans and other animals, dogs have an in-built general shape/ form, along which they can vary to a great degree.

The Darwinian version of the above example is the supposed "evolution of the horse," one of the most-frequently cited examples of Darwinism on the offensive. The Darwinists have been rearranging horse skeletons for more than a century to fit the fossil record within their theories - but how do we know the horses were not interfertile, and thus the same extended species, possibly stemming from the same original gene pool?

Then there is the problem of what we can call parallel species. The horse and the donkey produce infertile offspring - the mules. Yet the two animals look alike. Thus, some of the bones, which the Darwinists said were branching species of horses - may have been parallel herds of donkeys.

Another interesting question with the branching is - how do we determine what constitutes a common ancestor? Let us ignore the insanity of trying to claim that both crocodiles and apes stem from

amoebas, and concern ourselves with the donkeys and horses. Though they do not necessarily have to originate from the same common ancestral species, let us suppose that they do. So what now? How can the Darwinists prove that both donkey and horse came from that older species? Can a new species mate with its ancestor of a different species? Meaning that, even if they find a reasonable looking bag of bones - how do we know that the bag of bones is unrelated to any existing species? And could not the creature have existed in parallel to its look-alikes, without "evolving" from or to them, and subsequently vanished?

Darwinism is, for all practical purposes, not only unproven, but impossible to prove by the standards that one should expect of serious people. The "evolution of the horse" is a children's sketch of a bag of bones.

Also see Chapter 6 of Taylor's *In the Minds of Men*, and Chapter 10 of Wells's *Icons*.

The problem of species has plagued Darwinism since its inception. Thus, there is, for example, Ernst Mayr's definition of species, which says that a species is a group of interbreeding animals, which is reproductively isolated from other such groups. By that definition, the American "Indians" and the Europeans of the 14th century were separate species, but they became the same species by the globalized 21st century. This is ridiculous!

There exist 10-15 definitions of species. This can not be stressed enough. The biologists do not even have a solid definition of species. How can one talk about evolution - the transmutation of species - without defining species?

But to go back to the monkey-to-human missing link. I feel that people of self-respect should demand a great deal of evidence in order to believe that men stem from monkeys. If men originate from monkeys, there should be missing link bones all over the place. Even those would not compose real proof, but they should be there.

Yet they are not.

In 1856, quarrymen in the German Neander valley found a few pieces of bone: ((Wikipedia) "Neanderthal 1") "a skull cap, two femora, the three right arm bones, two of the left arm bones, ilium, and fragments of a scapula and ribs") while doing their work. The top medical man of the age, now remembered as "the father of modern pathology," (Taylor, *ItMoM* 5ed, Ch.8) Rudolf Virchow, took a look at the bones in 1872, and explained that they differed from normal human bones largely because of "pathological changes," caused by diseases such as rickets and arthritis.

However, since then, dozens of additional "Neanderthal man" pieces of bone have been found. In some cases, the bones were mere fragments, but the Darwinists went ahead and said they had found Neanderthals. The bones tended to exhibit the same properties as had the original skeleton, bringing Virchow's view into doubt. An almost complete skeleton was discovered in France in 1908.

Meanwhile, the Neanderthal was deemed by some to be an evolutionary dead-end humanoid branch of the ape-to-man family tree, and so the Darwinists decided to portray the Neanderthal man as a half-monkey half-man, evidence of humanity's simian ancestry. The Darwinists hired artists, told them to draw monkey-men, crafted monkey-men exhibits, and flooded the museums, textbooks, and magazines, with monkey business. There was no evidence that the Neanderthal men ever were much different from modern humans. On the contrary, if anything, the French Neanderthal had a cranial capacity larger than that of many moderns - for all that is worth.

(Taylor, *In the Minds of Men* 5th ed, Ch. 8) Almost fifty years after the discovery of the La Chapelle-aux-Saints Neanderthal specimen, anatomists Straus of Johns Hopkins University and Cave of St. Bartholomew's Hospital Medical College reexamined these bones and in 1957 challenged Boule's earlier description (Straus and Cave 1957). Boule had been incorrect in claiming that the big toe was prehensile, which is a characteristic of the apes, and the pelvis also was not at all ape-like as had been claimed. Moreover, the individual had suffered from severe arthritis that affected the vertebrae and the

jaw. It began to look as if Virchow had been right after all, and in the 1960s a new view of Neanderthal man began to emerge as it was realized that he was true man and walked as upright as any man today (Brace 1979, 21). Gradually, new reconstructions were made, and one of these, by Krstolich, appeared in a lifesize diorama at Chicago's Field Museum. Oddly enough, however, this was confined to the basement while the original misinterpretation remained in place in the main exhibition hall, without a word of explanation, and was still there a quarter of a century later at the time this chapter was being written. It might be asked that if Neanderthal man was truly human, why did they all have pathological deformities similar to these described by Virchow? Ivanhoe (1970), a medical specialist, concludes after examining many of these skeletons that the individuals had all suffered from vitamin D deficiency and that this was not restricted to adults but included children. This deficiency is known to cause osteomalacia and rickets producing a subtle face change by increasing the size of the orbit (eye cavity), especially in the vertical direction. It is commonly believed that the widespread lack of vitamin D was due to insufficient sunlight, and this is one reason Neanderthal man is always associated with the ice age.

So it turned out that Virchow had likely been correct after all. Moreover, though the "species" debate still rages on, Neanderthals have been recognized as men, and labelled "Homo sapiens neanderthalensis." DNA evidence indicates that modern men carry some Neanderthal DNA. There had been interbreeding. Evidence exists of religious Neanderthal burials. So the Neanderthals were humans. They were not monkeys, there were not another "species" or "subspecies," they were humans! There are white humans, black humans, pygmies, Indians, American Indians, Danny DeVito, Arnold Schwarzenegger, and there were also "Neanderthal" humans.

And one has to ask, in light of all of this - why did they insist on presenting the Neanderthals as monkeys? Why keep the monkey-men exhibits at the Chicago Field Museum? Why resort to propaganda of the basest sort, if the science is any good? These days Neanderthal exhibits feature intelligent looking clothed humanoids.

Then there are the Cro-Magnons, who were humans, capable of artistic endeavours great enough to impress Picasso, who, upon gazing at the Cro-Magnon paintings, reportedly opined that "we have learned nothing new. We have invented nothing." The Cro-Magnons were humans, not another species, not monkeys, but humans.

Next came Eugene Dubois (1858-1940), the Darwinian fanatic who "discovered" the so-called "Java Man" in Java around 1891. Dubois studied at Jena, under the tutelage of the fraud Haeckel. Initiated by master Haeckel into the joys of Darwinism, Dubois repaired to Indonesia to look for the Missing Link. He hired himself a gang of Javans, and had them dig around for three years. (Taylor, *ItMoM*, 5th ed, Ch. 8) "[T]he prize for all this labor was a tooth found in September 1891, a skullcap found in October, a thigh bone the following August, and another tooth found in October. It seems that Dubois was not actually present when these finds were made and their exact location with respect to each other varies from one report to another. There was a consensus that the skullcap was found about fifteen meters from the thigh bone, while the teeth were found three meters from the skullcap (Bowden 1977, 124)."

Dubois "thought" for a bit, and decided that all the bones came from the same monkey-man, and so he named his grand discovery "Anthropopithecus erectus" - upright, man-like ape. Then he "thought" some more, and decided to rename the bag of bones to "Pithecanthropus erectus" - upright ape man. Proud of himself, Dubois went around the lecture circuit to propagandise his ape-man. For some reason, people did not take him seriously. Embittered, Dubois descended into academic obscurity. The "Java Man" is not a missing link. It is just a bag of bones. Disputes on the meaning of the Java bones continue. They can argue about them forever, fat on grants, tickled by occasional bursts of publicity (We found the Missing Link! This time it is the real one!), and taking a few minutes

now and then to point and laugh at the ponderings on metaphysics of the medieval Christian scholars.

The next Missing Link is a classic example of Darwinism in action: the Piltdown Man. In late 1912, Charles Dawson the Darwinist enthusiast proclaimed that four years earlier, the Missing Link had been discovered at the Piltdown gravel pit by a laborer. Dawson presented a few bone fragments, which (Wikipedia) "consisted of parts of a skull and jawbone."

Darwinist after Darwinist - David Waterston, Marcellin Boule, Gerrit Smith Miller - looked at the bones and extolled them as the Missing Link. In 1923, the anatomist Franz Weidenreich took a glance at the Link, and said that it consisted of (Wikipedia) "a modern human cranium and an orangutan jaw with filed-down teeth." The hoax survived for three more decades, before scientists conclusively showed that the Piltdown Man was a fraud in 1953.

Naturally, the Piltdown Man found his way into the museums, the textbooks, and the encyclopedias. Tellingly, some of those involved - top men, Royal Society - were knighted - Keith in 1921, Woodward in 1924, Grafton Elliot Smith in 1934. Piltdown provided a generation's worth of food for the indoctrination machine. These days, the Darwinists proudly claim that their own folks exposed the fraud. We were fooled once, they say, but our theory is valid anyway!

They can say whatever they want. As the proverb goes, fool me once - shame on you; fool me twice - shame on me.

Arthur Keith (1866-1955) was a major British Darwinist. He wrote, in a book called *Evolution and Ethics* (1946), that (Chapter 3 of said work):

Here we have expounded the perfectly sound doctrine of evolutionary isolation; even as an ethical doctrine it should not be condemned. No German must be guilty of the "greatest racial sin" that of bringing the fruits of hybridity into the world. The reproductive "genes" which circulate within the frontiers of Germany must be kept uncontaminated, so that they may work out the racial destiny of the German people without impediment. Hitler is also a eugenicist. Germans who suffer from hereditary imperfections of mind or of body must be rendered infertile, so that "the strong may not be plagued by the weak." Sir Francis Galton, the founder of eugenics, taught a somewhat similar evolutionary doctrine namely, that if our nation was to prosper we must give encouragement to the strong rather than to the weak; a saving which may be justified by evolution, but not by ethics as recognized and practiced by civilized peoples. The liberties of German women are to be sacrificed; they must devote their activities to their households, especially to the sacred duty of raising succeeding generations. The birth rate was stimulated by bounties and subsidies so that the German tribe might grow in numbers and in strength. In all these matters the Nazi doctrine is evolutionist.

Hitler has sought on every occasion and in every way to heighten the national consciousness of the German people or, what is the same thing, to make them racially conscious; to give them unity of spirit and unity of purpose. Neighborly approaches of adjacent nations are and were repelled; the German people were deliberately isolated. Cosmopolitanism, liberality of opinion, affectation of foreign manners and dress were unsparingly condemned. The old tribal bonds (love of the Fatherland, feeling of mutual kinship), the bonds of "soil and blood," became "the main plank in the National Social program." "Germany was for the Germans" was another plank. Foreign policy was "good or bad according to its beneficial or harmful effects on the German folk now or hereafter." "Charity and humility are only for home consumption" a statement in which Hitler gives an exact expression of the law which limits sympathy to its tribe. "Humanitarianism is an evil... a creeping poison." "The most cruel methods are humane if they give a speedy victory" is Hitler's echo of a maxim attributed to Moltke. Such are the ways of evolution when applied to human affairs.

I have said nothing about the methods employed by the Nazi leaders to secure tribal unity in Germany methods of brutal compulsion, bloody force, and the concentration

camp. Such methods cannot be brought within even a Machiavellian system of ethics, and yet may be justified by their evolutionary result.

Grafton Elliot Smith (1871-1937) was another major British Darwinist. He opined that the "Negro is a very primitive member of the human family, and yet in some respects is highly specialized. The average size of the brain is much smaller than that of the peoples of Europe and Asia. Moreover, anatomical peculiarities suggesting affinities with the apes are commoner than they are in most other peoples."³⁰ Some "scientist"!

Next came the Nebraska Man. It was popularized by Henry Fairfield Osborn in 1922, on the basis of - can you believe it? - a tooth handed to him by a Nebraska rancher, who claimed to have made his discovery in 1917. Osborn (1857-1935) was a notable American academic and eugenics enthusiast. His bonafides: 1891 - Professor of Biology at Columbia University; 1896 - Professor of zoology; one-time President of the American Society of Naturalists; briefly a vice-president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; President of the American Museum of Natural History between 1908 and 1933; etc, etc.

Osborn had established his own theory of the origins of men on the basis of the Piltdown Man. The theory was a variation on the theme of the common ancestor for apes and humans.

The tooth was announced to be an American ape, an example of evolution in action. In 1925, it was determined that the tooth belonged to a pig, thought to be extinct. In 1972, living herds of the same species of pig were discovered in Paraguay.

Now, we have some of the top men of the then-dominant Anglo-American academic establishment - Royal Society fellows and the like - proclaim that filed orangutan teeth and pig teeth are the hallowed Missing Link. Perhaps they were mere true believers - or perhaps they, or those behind them, were worse than that. But if the top "authorities" on Darwinism and evolution could made such colossal mistakes once, why should we believe them now? They were totally discredited more than once - why lend them credibility?

Next - the Peking Man. Between 1929 and 1937, (Wikipedia) "15 partial craniums, 11 lower jaws, many teeth, some skeletal bones and large numbers of stone tools were discovered in the Lower Cave at Locality 1 of the Peking Man site at Zhoukoudian, near Beijing, in China." Another bag of bones! The most "complete" specimens consisted of pieces of skull. The "cranial capacities" of the skulls were measured, and speculations were on made on whether they belonged to children or to adults. Imaginative illustrations and busts of what the Peking folks were supposed to look like were made and shipped off to the museums.

But it all started in 1921. A Swede and an American - Johan Gunnar Andersson and Walter W. Granger (a crony of Osborn) - went to China to dig for the Missing Link. They found two human molars. In 1926, Andersson published the findings.

Excited, the Canadian anatomist Davidson Black of the Peking Union Medical College decided to dig deeper. Such endeavours require financing. Thankfully, the Rockefeller Foundation came to the rescue and coughed up the dough in 1927. Black found another tooth, and tried to call it "Sinanthropus pekinensis" - but people dissented, and the Rockefeller Foundation told him to do better or lose the funding. Black came up with some more bones, the Rockefellers gave him a bag of money for his bag of bones, and he founded the Cenozoic Research Laboratory in 1928. Diggers continued to unearth bones until the Japanese hit the scene in 1937. A package of bones was shipped off to America in 1941, but it vanished on the way, never to be found. A few more bones have emerged from the dig site since. UNESCO made the Peking Man Site a "World Heritage Site" in 1987.

The bones were deemed a Missing Link, evidence for the "evolution" of humans, an ancestors to modern man, a "dead-end" like the Neanderthal, etc. Well, if the Peking folks had tools, then per-

³⁰Take from Donald A. Swan's April 1977 article for the *Mankind Quarterly*, *Sir Grafton Elliot Smith on "The Negro Race"*. Article available here: <http://www.unz.org/Pub/MankindQuarterly-1977apr-00283>. Accessed Jan 12, 2012.

haps they were normal humans? Has the Rockefeller Foundation cloned a Peking woman and tried to mate her with some noted Darwinist, to see what species she belongs to? No. Then what are they talking about? Peking Man may have been just another man, though how much one can garner from two bags of bone, one consisting of few teeth, the other missing for two thirds of a century, is debatable.

(Taylor, *ItMoM*, 5th ed, Ch. 9) Another notable to visit Chou K'ou Tien, at the invitation of Teilhard de Chardin, was his old professor from Paris, Marcellin Boule; however, when he actually saw *Sinanthropus pekinensis*, he was angry at having traveled halfway around the world to see a battered monkey skull. He pointed out that all the evidence indicated that true man was in charge of some sort of "industry" and that the skulls found were merely those of monkeys.

Taylor again:

As one reads the original reports, and most are available in English, there is great inconsistency from one author to another. The number of *Sinanthropus* skulls varies from fourteen to forty for the same period of time; the number of limb-bone pieces varies from three to eleven; the location of the pieces varies from "upper cave" to "lower cave"; and the signs of human habitation are played down by most and seemingly honestly reported by others. And then authorities, such as Teilhard de Chardin, shift their position from saying quite positively at first that the skull was like that of a large ape to saying that it is a true hominid or primitive man. In the light of this tangled web of contradiction and the fact that the original fossils are no longer available, one is left with an impression that the whole exercise was carried out in a most subjective manner by fitting appropriate facts to a preconception. The reader is left to draw his own conclusions from this more complete story of Peking man, which is claimed to be a true missing link.

The original 1921 expedition had been financed by the notorious Swedish banker-oligarch, Ivar Kreuger.

Davison Black, who was, in turn, a crony to Grafton Elliot Smith of Piltown knightly fame, was showered with awards, including a fellowship to the Royal Society in 1932.

It is also worth pointing out that Teilhard de Chardin managed to participate in both the Piltown and Peking operations.

The currently most popular Missing Link is the "Australopithecus," epitomized by the Ethiopian partial skeletal remains dubbed Lucy. It all started with Raymond Dart's 1924 discoveries in South Africa. Dart, who happened to be a student of Grafton Elliot Smith, found a part of a skull and a lower jaw. Enthused, he labelled the bones "Australopithecus africanus" - southern ape of Africa - and rushed to Europe to brag. Since his discoveries did not fit with the preconceptions held at the time, Dart was given the cold shoulder.

Interestingly,

(Taylor, Ch. 9) Everyone seemed to have had his own personal reasons for accepting or rejecting what was really ambiguous evidence for man's link with the ape, and an interesting example of this at the time was General Jan Christiaan Smuts. Smuts was being snubbed politically, losing his position as prime minister of South Africa. Not having a government to run, he was indulging himself in writing a book called *Holism and Evolution*. Published in 1926, this has become something of a bible to the fringe medicine set of today, but Dart's discovery served nicely to support Smuts's evolutionary thesis, while it was hoped that the ensuing publicity for man's origins in South Africa would further the political aims of himself as its supporter.

Smuts was one of the core members of Milner's group. Holism has become a catchword for the New Age cult.

It is generally thought that "Dart's child" was just some ape.

Robert Broom, a protege of Smuts's, laid claims to the discovery of another Missing Link (really a piece of skull) in 1938. In 1947, Broom and a John T. Robinson found another skull. They went on to have leisurely academic careers. Broom was a kook, believer in "spiritual evolution." He reported that spirits had told him where to dig for his "discoveries."

The next major development occurred at the Olduvai gorge in East Africa in 1959. Louis and Mary Leakey discovered what was later dubbed the Nutcracker Man - because the find consisted of a piece of skull and an overlarge jaw. Mary was a globetrotter's daughter, and Louis was a protege of Arthur Keith.

(Taylor, Ch. 9) There was other, more serious, counterevidence. In 1913 a German anthropologist, Hans Reck, had discovered in Bed II a complete human skeleton together with many fossils of extinct animals, just above the bed where *Zinjanthropus* was discovered (Bowden 1977, 173). Reck (1914) took great care to ensure that the human remains were not intrusive - that is, that they had not been deliberately buried or had not slipped down in a crevice from a higher stratum. During the 1930s there was much discussion of these remains, and Louis Leakey (1928) was party to this, having personally examined the remains in Germany. When Leakey announced *Zinjanthropus* to the press in 1959, he said nothing of the perfectly human remains found immediately above it forty-six years earlier. Had he done so, this would be seen as damaging counterevidence. However, suspicions had been raised within the scientific fraternity, and in 1974 Protsch attempted to carry out some carbon 14 tests on Reck's human skeleton, kept in Munich, but only the skull could be found; all the rest of the skeleton had disappeared. The result obtained was 16,920 years and, although the actual test conditions left a fairly large margin for error, it was far removed from the 1.75 million years claimed for *Zinjanthropus* (Protsch 1974; Straus and Hunt 1962).

Even Louis Leakey finally conceded that his find was not a proto-human, but an ape of the family of Dart's child, likely extinct.

Sage heads have pondered on the Olduvai bones for about half a century. They keep bickering and disagreeing with each other.

The Leakeys have staked their claim on Olduvai and have formed a Darwinian Dynasty of diggers and bone-lovers. Their son Richard is a great excavator in his own right. Having been tortured at school, the young Leakey quit at 16, started his own business, and had some success. Richard's greatest discovery came in 1972, when he unearthed yet another skull, or rather its shattered pieces, near Lake Rudolph. The find is known as "KNM ER 1470." Leakey wanted the skull to be a man's, but others said it was an ape's. To get an idea of the quality of the dating techniques, which have produced the numbers in our textbooks, observe that an initial test put the age of 1470 at over 200 million years. That did not fit the theories, and so another test was commissioned. Its results said 2.6 million years, which was deemed acceptable. Another test, by the same methods, gave the following estimate: "290,000 years to a maximum of 19.5 million." (See Taylor's book for the exact references.)

These discrepancies are important. Suppose a friend sent you a postcard that you never received, and upon inquiry, you were told that the postcard was sent between one month and 63 years ago. What would you think? And yet these numbers - on which even the Darwinists can not agree - pollute the textbooks, and keep changing to admit the newest theories.

The mother of all Missing Links is Lucy ("AL 288-1"), a half-complete skeleton unearthed in Ethiopia in 1974. Its discoverers were: Donald Johanson of the Rockefeller University of Chicago; and Yves Coppens and Maurice Taieb of France. The nickname stems from the famous Beatles song, thought to be about LSD.

Lucy's remains resembled those of a chimpanzee of a height of a meter-ten.

The intrepid explorers of man's past presented Lucy to the world in 1978. The usual bickering in the scientific community occurred, particularly because of the poor state of Lucy's skull. The press was far kinder to Lucy and organized yet another "Missing Link" blitz.

Was Lucy a possibly deformed human child? Or an extinct - or merely physically different - chimp? How much can we deduce from a bag of bones?

The usual dating farce put Lucy in the 3.1 to 5.3 million years old category.

Lucy has become the It Girl of the Darwinist crowd, the incontrovertible Missing Link, one of the sources of the "humans evolved from Africa" theory that has been concocted.

Most recently, another fairly complete skeleton - "Australopithecus sediba" - was announced as the "Missing Link" in 2010.

To sum things up, the most famous "Missing Links" have been: the Neanderthals and the Cro-Magnons, who were men with limited technological means, the latter demonstrably capable of art; the bag of bones discovered in Java by Dubois the disciple of the fraud Haeckel; the Piltdown Man, a ridiculous fraud, promoted by the Royal Society Fellows Smith, Woodward, and Keith, who, one has to say, lost all credibility with that debacle; the Nebraska Man pig's tooth of the eugenicist Osborn; the missing Peking bones of Smith's crony Black, the Rockefeller Foundation, and Teilhard, who is a suspect in the Piltdown affair; the African findings of Dart and Broom, the proteges of Smith and Smuts; the Leakey findings, Louis being a disciple of Keith; and Lucy of the University of Chicago's Johanson.

And we are supposed to structure the whole worldview of humanity on the basis of those vile frauds and pathetic fragments of bone?

The entire "Missing Link" catalogue consists of a few coffins' worth of bones and pieces of bones, which in all likelihood belonged to: 1) men; 2) monkeys; 3) extinct monkeys. It is utterly impossible to verify that any of the bones belongs to an "unknown" species - and even if it were possible, so what? If the dinosaurs went extinct, many of other critters must have followed them into oblivion. Which brings us to the next point.

What the fossil record *does* show is that there existed massive life forms like the dinosaurs and the mammoths, both of which are now extinct. What we *do* know is that there have been critters in the past, which are no more. What we *do not* know is that new organisms "evolve" from the existing ones. Now, the original creatures must have appeared from somewhere. So if the Darwinian theory is invalid, where did they come from? I don't know, and, unlike the Darwinians, I do not feel that I should speculate blindly.

In particular, there is absolutely no credible evidence that men stem from monkeys, or rather, that monkeys and men share a common ancestor. All we have is a bag of ambiguous bones, over which the "authorities" argue incessantly. There being at least two major historical Missing Link frauds (or should we say mass delusions?), we ought to be extremely sceptical in regard to what constitutes a theory of momentous significance to the human psychological outlook. Understand that Darwinism is not merely a value-neutral theory, like, say, Newton's "law" of gravity. Darwinism is a full-blown religion. Dawkins, the current top prophet of Darwinism, has made this clear by dedicating so much of his time to popularizing Darwinism *as an outlook*, by loudly proclaiming to be an "atheist," by vociferously attacking the old religion which his faith is trying to replace, and by directly equating atheism and pantheism.

Moreover, it should be clear to the reader in light of the history related above, that from the start, the Darwinist crowd has been composed largely of true believers, who took to their hunting having *internalized and accepted* Darwin's shaky postulates as holy truth. Dubois did not go to dig in the heat of Java, and the Royal Society Fellows did not fall for a transparent hoax, without the influence of a true belief.

And without ape-to-man, where does the Darwinist construct stand? If they can not build - forget solid, forget reasonable, forget plausible - even a remotely believable case for ape-to-man, why would anyone in his right mind believe their ravings about the other links? They have been digging for bones for a century and a half - and what do they have? A few carefully preserved (like relics, really) pieces of dogfood delicatessen, which would not fill even a run-of-the-mill garbage truck.

Furthermore, we have to ask why the media, the textbooks publishers, and the museums, keep perpetrating lies and frauds, and keep displaying artistic reconstructions of what a few lunatics think must have happened? Leave religion aside - many even of the most devout regard the Bible as a useful set of allegories. Why push imaginative paintings as reality? To drive the point home, consider the following:

(Wells, *Icons*, Ch. 10, p. 220) Just recently, National Geographic magazine commissioned four artists to reconstruct a female figure from casts of seven fossil bones thought to be from the same species as skull 1470. One artist drew a creature whose forehead is missing and whose jaws look vaguely like those of a beaked dinosaur. Another artist drew a rather good-looking modern African-American woman with unusually long arms. A third drew a somewhat scrawny female with arms like a gorilla and a face like a Hollywood werewolf. And a fourth drew a figure covered with body hair and climbing a tree, with beady eyes that glare out from under a heavy, gorilla-like brow.

This remarkable set of drawings shows clearly how a single set of fossil bones can be reconstructed in a variety of ways. Someone looking for an intermediate form to plug into an ape-to-human sequence could pick whichever drawing seems to fit best. (Not surprisingly, the strongly pro-Darwin National Geographic buried these revealing drawings on an unnumbered page among the advertisements at the back of the magazine.)

Between this factoid and the Haeckel fraud, one has to draw the obvious conclusions that **most (perhaps all)** of the little graphs and pictures we studied in high school and saw on the television set were pure fantasy. Yet images have power, they stay in the head, they bypass the guard of reason. Why is this done and who is behind it? Well, who controls the media, the schools, and the museums? Who owns the newspapers, the television stations, and the magazines; who came up with the General Education Board; who commands the foundations which fund the museums? The answers are obvious.

For more on the Missing Link, see, for instance, Chapters 7-9 of Taylor's book, Chapter 11 of Wells's *Icons*, and Chapter 6 of Johnson's *Trial*.

In the larger sense, the above arguments challenge evolution in general; let us focus on one specific problem relating to Darwinism: where and what is the magical change mechanism which must exist to provide the leap between species and the purported variation within species? In the old days, there was no inkling of the nature of the mechanism, but the Darwinists assumed that it had to exist. The discovery of the genes and the DNA was welcomed with glee. Eventually, it was decided that the genes were the answer, and that the magical mechanism amounted to "random" spontaneous mutations within single genes.

Since the genes and the DNA have been solidly established as the driving forces of inheritance, Darwinism has to produce the gene-change mechanism, or die. Note, moreover, that the mutation has to be *beneficial* to the organism. The Darwinists argue that there is no such thing - in their world, a single mutation will fare in different ways in different environments. I have yet to hear of an Iraqi mutant super-baby. All I hear are horror stories about depleted uranium.

The gene-change mechanism is vital in providing a demonstrable causal mechanism of Darwinian baloney. Without that the Darwinists only have pipe dreams threaded together from ambiguous evidence.

Unfortunately for them, in reality, mutations *damage* the genetic code. Mutating the genes, from what I can see, is like scrambling or erasing pieces of computer code. If properly written, the program may still run, but it will certainly exhibit abnormal behavior. A very good program that suffers damage in an unimportant module may work without apparent hiccups. And let me pre-empt the accusation that I am comparing a man-made phenomenon to nature's supposedly undirected great mystery. That DNA changes for the better (survivalistically speaking) without direction was and remains an unproven hypothesis. Absent pre-conceptions, we have computer code, and we have genetic code, and it is impossible not to make the parallel, though guardedly.

And so, genetic changes, from what we can see, only stem from *damage*, and lead to maladaptive (deleterious) mutations.

But there is another problem. Two standard examples of supposedly beneficial "mutations" are one providing slight HIV resistance, and one providing resistance to malaria. The second is officially recognized as a disease: "Sickle cell disease." So you may survive the malaria, but you remain anaemic - oh joy! And the former mutation makes you more vulnerable to the West Nile Virus. Thus there is absolutely no reason to regard either of the mutations as beneficial; on the contrary, the second one is obviously deleterious.

Extolling the glories of such mutations is like saying that it is great to be too sick to be drafted by the army in a time of war.

The Darwinists just say that the mutations were beneficial *at some point in time*, and will vanish if the environmental pressure they respond to favorably goes away. But such an argument explains absolutely nothing, since the claim can be made for any gene, that it appeared for reasons heretofore undetermined, and potentially - barring time or divination machines - indeterminable. We have an internally consistent theory, which makes postulates that are impossible to show, and which offers reasonable-sounding but useless explanations for everything.

But let us take a look at a few other classic supposedly beneficial mutation examples. The first is the four-winged fruit-fly. In 1978, Ed Lewis managed to breed two flies, one with two mutations on a certain gene, the other with a third mutation on the same gene, and the offspring was a fly with two pairs of wings. The second pair grew in the stead of the fly's "halterers."

Observe that 1) this was accomplished under laboratory conditions, and 2) the second pair of wings was dysfunctional, useless, and burdensome. It did not make the fly tougher - on the contrary, it rendered it incapable of flying. To make a parallel, imagine the Darwinists play around with your sperm or eggs, and produce for you a baby which has an additional useless pair of ears instead of legs. This would be worth many Noble Prizes (Lewis got one), and the baby would undoubtedly enjoy great success in the circus circuit, and some kind drunk (or perverted) person may even introduce the grown-up baby to the pleasures of coitus - but the lack of legs may prove something of a problem. The four-winged fly would, of course, have been doomed in the wilds (under "natural selection") - and yet it is a standard textbook example of the shape-shifting power of mutations. The often unstated logic goes: Look! If this can happen, then it is only a matter of time until we have a stock of Shiva-like neo-humans with fifteen arms and photographic memory!

Well, is there anything new about mutant freaks? The reader can go to a search engine and type "two-headed baby," and enjoy the results. Are these two-headed babies twice as smart? Does the opposite sex regard them as doubly attractive? Then what is the big deal with the fruit fly? I say, put a picture of Joseph Merrick the Elephant Man in the textbooks, along with the following caption: "Victim of a hideous mutation. Claims to be a man, not an elephant." Of course, such a picture would give people the idea that mutations produce freaks, and are bad - while the Darwinist nuts want to claim that mutations produce superheroes, and are good.

And one has to speculate, in the light of the history of eugenics and the *NSM200*, that the American top honchos knew exactly what they were doing when they stuffed Serbia and Iraq full of depleted uranium. Could they? Not only they could, but they did it. Would they? If they wrote *NSM200*, *The Limits to Growth*, and the other manifestos of Malthusianism and eugenics, dear reader, they would.

Another standard example is the improvement in resistance to antibiotics observed in viruses. The problem with viruses is that it is not even clear if they are a form of life. A virus can not "live" on its own, and can only appear within a cell. The way the Darwinists put it, the virus "spontaneously assembles" within cells. To them, this is evidence that life could have self-assembled in the first place. By this logic, excrement self-assembles in the bodies of mammals, and therefore excrement could have self-assembled itself in the primordial soup.

So, being incapable of reproduction, the viruses are not alive, and so can not "evolve."

A series of purported mutations have been induced in laboratory conditions in Richard Lenski's *E. coli* experiment. Since 1988, Lenski has been cooking *E. coli* under artificial conditions. Four of the twelve strands have lost their ability to repair their DNA. (Wikipedia, *E. coli* long-term evolution experiment). The bacteria "are thought to" have generated millions of mutations. Lenski "has estimated" that only 10 to 20 beneficial mutations have taken root. The darling of the authors is the strand which developed the ability to "utilize citrate as a source of energy." Ordinary *E. coli* can not do that when oxygen is present.

Now, this is not "natural selection," but *selective breeding*. One can do all sorts of things with selective breeding - that has been known for centuries. The Belgians have a genetically damaged cow (Belgian Blue), which produces excess quantities of lean meat. They maintain the line by deliberate linebreeding, which is a milder form of inbreeding. Another fun factor is artificial insemination.

Questions arise: are there "wild" *E. coli* which can "utilize citrate"? Yes. So what is the big deal? It has been shown that the machinery of using citrate was already present in the bacteria. Perhaps, the gene (or combination of genes) in charge of this business was activated under conditions of duress. Or, more likely, a mutation caused damage that was only advantageous in the artificial environment. For example, take some people with the "HIV resistance" mutation, close them for a few centuries in a room with a few other people, and spread HIV across the population. The mutants would prove "fitter."

Next, has a new species emerged? No. No new species means no evolution.

How genetically damaged in general has the *E. coli* population become? Things do not look good - one third of the groups have lost the ability to repair their DNA.

It looks like what really happened was, Lenski dumped a bunch of bacteria into a toxic environment (sugar, which can damage DNA), and let them stew. The bacteria are gradually disintegrating genetically, and the perceived and pre-conceived pseudo-beneficial mutations are the accidental outcomes of DNA damage in a fully artificial environment. Create an environment in which it is impossible to fly, and the four-winged fly may prove to be its king. In the real world, flies fly.

Michael Behe and some of his allies have unleashed broadsides at the experiment.³¹

Behe's main weapon in his criticism of Darwinism is the notion of irreducible complexity. The idea goes as follows: cells, organs, and organisms in general are complex, and consist of components, which can not exist in absence of each other. Such mechanisms can not develop under the Darwinian assumption of random, discrete mutations.

But then, one can always claim that one component "evolved" first, and then the others gradually caught up, interlinking with each other, etc. This is impossible to show, of course, because it occurred over millions of years and so on - but hey! it could have happened! Which is the exact same logic of "God made it so," except that the latter is less pretentious.

Then there is the issue with the primordial soup. That one is supposed to have been resolved by the Urey-Miller experiment. What university did Urey and Miller work at? Yes, that one again - the Rockefeller University of Chicago.

In 1952, Miller and Urey poured a bunch of gasses (water (H₂O), methane (CH₄), ammonia (NH₃),

³¹For example, see this: http://www.evolutionnews.org/2011/09/richard_lenskis_long_term_evo1051051.html, Jan 10, 2012.

and hydrogen (H₂) in a container, cooked the stew for a while, and then fished for amino acids, which are the "building blocks" of proteins. Lo and behold, they found some. The experiment has been repeated.

The problems with this wonderful development: First, how do we know that the Earth's atmosphere back in the day contained exactly those components in their right amounts? But this is useless, because the Darwinists will always say that there was plenty of time, and conditions changed, etc, etc. They can not show anything, but they just know it must have happened that way. Some of them have used "computer models" to show the Earth's atmosphere "may have contained" the compounds they want.

But the more serious problem is that amino acids by themselves mean nothing. You can write, at random, a number of letters (I suggest A, G, T, and C) on a piece of paper. And you will get words. But you will not get sentences. Even if you get sentences, you will not get anything carrying meaning. The same happens to apply to genetic code.

There are amino acids; fine - but so what? What we want is an organism capable of reproduction. That has not been forthcoming, and there is very good reason to believe - including basic statistical calculations - that it will never come.

Hence the Darwinian conundrum - they have to produce life in the lab, or abandon their claim for abiogenesis. And if they do produce life, they will have confirmed the possibility of intelligent design. A hopeless task.

Let us look at a purely mathematical total *reductio ad absurdum* of Darwinism. Below is a rough example of how the argument goes; others have made it before.

Estimates say that the Earth is 4.54×10^9 years old. A year has about 3.154×10^7 seconds. Let us be generous, and give the Darwinists 10^{18} seconds.

Next, estimates say that the Earth contains, say, 10^{50} atoms. The estimate for the number of atoms in the "observable universe" is 10^{80} . This includes iron, gold, and other such inorganic elements.

And finally, the human gene *dystrophin* has about 2.4 million base pairs of A, T, C, G. Let us take a smaller number - 10^6 . These base pairs are in a precise order and only work if arranged in that order.

Let us say that all atoms on Earth composed separate organisms. We allow each atom to make an attempt at adding an A, T, C or G once per second. Of course, most atoms on Earth are not even parts of separate organisms, organisms reproduce less often than every second, an incomplete gene would be as good as useless, and there are thousands of other necessary genes - but never mind all of that.

Now we apply Malthus's argument: geometric versus arithmetic growth. We are interested in the chances of one organism producing the specific gene we picked. Observe that the chance two organisms have of obtaining success is effectively equal to double the chance of the one organism succeeding. The difference is the square of the probability for success for one organism, which is minuscule enough to be ignored.

Thus, if p is the chance one of our atomic organisms has of mutating the first human chromosome, the chance all of them taken together have is of the order of $10^{50}p$.

To obtain the exact human *dystrophin* gene, unless there are cycles within that gene, our atomic organism has to produce the correct base pair 2.4×10^6 times in a row. One mistake and it has to start over. Suppose, for simplicity, that the organism has as many attempts as there are seconds. The chance of hitting the jackpot thus is $10^{18} \times 4^{-1,000,000}$.

Next, observe that $2^{10} = 4^5 = 1024 \approx 1000 = 10^3$. So $4^{-1,000,000} = 2^{-2,000,000} = (2^{-10})^{200,000} \approx (10^{-3})^{200,000} = 10^{-600,000}$.

Multiplied by the number of organisms and number of seconds, that yields $10^{-599,932}$. The number is too small to submit to comprehension. It is statistically equivalent to impossibility.

And we counter the argument that "It is unlikely, but still possible!" by saying that the real probability is far smaller, and that such fundamental problems such as the requirement for abiogenesis, irreducible complexity, and teleologism remain unresolved.

These calculations are accessible to any 10 year old. Exponents are glorified multiplication, and multiplication is glorified addition. The calculations have been doable since 1859, and have been made.

Richard Dawkins the science fiction writer has filled another few hundred pages with false metaphors and circular reasoning on this subject - *Climbing Mount Improbable* (1996). He offers computer models to back up his assertions - this is classic *petitio principii*, and a favorite trick of the Global Warmers.

The weakness of the above argument lies in my choosing, in the great tradition of Malthus, to allow the "gene pool" to expand only arithmetically rather than geometrically. The Darwinists can get their geometric expansion via the so-called "gene duplications" mutation. Sometimes entire genes duplicate. But then, there is such a thing as gene deletion. Who can tell whether duplications or deletions occur more frequently? The Darwinist will next say that the frequency does not matter, since those with duplicated genes survive and those with deleted genes die. All very fine, but whence the proof? So let the reader ponder the issue for himself. I feel that in turning the entire planet into organisms, for all time, just to make one of millions of genes, I was generous enough.

Another blatant *reductio ad absurdum* of Darwinism is the teleological argument. Namely, all the various organisms of the body are complex mechanisms serving a specific discernible purpose. Now, if you leave a pile of marble on the ground and wait for it to turn into a building, nothing will happen. If you leave a pile of steel and wait until it turns into a car, it will just stay there. If you tell the computer to randomly produce bits, it will never come up with a remotely complex program, though it will produce $a = 1$, which by itself is useless, and only has meaning within the artificially designed computer programming environment. There is no instance in the history of humanity of raw material magically turning into a mechanism with a discernible purpose. Observe that claiming that, say, dogs are an example of a complex "machine" having occurred at random is classic circular reasoning - the Darwinists assume what they have to show.

Humans can recognize teleological constructs, and the organisms of life are such structures. Hence, inductive reasoning suggests a null hypothesis of intelligent design. Again, I am not necessarily arguing for intelligent design - the point is that the evidence contradicts the Darwinian postulate of random development from lower to higher orders of complexity.

This is another basic argument, which has been made, has never been refuted, and is simply ignored or derided on dogmatic grounds.

Then there is the Cambrian Explosion problem. In the dreamworld of Darwinism, the soup spawned one puny organism, which "evolved" into mores stuff, etc, etc - and so the geological record has to show a gradually increasing rate of complexity of life on Earth.

The "geological record" itself is also rather unclear, since it goes along the logic of "deeper means older," which is a rule-of-thumb of debatable utility, but we let that pass.

The point is, the geological record shows simple organisms at the start (down deep), followed by a "Cambrian Explosion," in which, informs us the politically correct Wikipedia, "the rate of evolution accelerated by an order of magnitude and the diversity of life began to resemble that of today." Is that not wonderful!

(Wells, *Icons*, Ch. 3) The Cambrian explosion presents a serious challenge to Darwinian evolution. The event was remarkable because it was so abrupt and extensive - that is, because it happened so quickly, geologically speaking, and because so many major groups of animals made their debut in it. But its challenge to Darwin's theory lies not so much in its abruptness (it doesn't really matter whether it lasted 5 million years or 15 million years), or in its extent (it doesn't really matter that sponges preceded it, or that some types of worms appeared later), as in the fact that phyla and classes appeared right at the start.

Darwin's theory claims that phylum- and class-level differences emerge only after a long

history of divergence from lower categories such as species, genera, families and orders. Yet the Cambrian explosion is inconsistent with this picture. As evolutionary theorist Jeffrey Schwartz puts it, the major animal groups "appear in the fossil record as Athena did from the head of Zeus - full blown and raring to go."

Darwin knew about this and famously (and rather cautiously) said that the fossil record would vindicate him. The Darwinists have been digging like mad, but the problem remains. Some claim that the pre-Cambrian "fossil record" is so sparse, because the pre-Cambrian organisms did not fossilize properly. In other words, they are saying "We know it happened, and we also know that we will never find the evidence to show it happened - but you have to believe us!"

The "ape-to-man" gap is bad and significant enough, but it pales in comparison to the titanic pre-Cambrian to Cambrian gaping abyss.

At the same time, the textbooks contain the standard pictures of the "tree of life" - pathetic little organisms, followed by worms and such, and then lizards, birds, mammals, monkeys, and men. In reality there is a good deal of evidence that the whole gang appeared in a fairly sparse period of time. In light of the disappearance of, say, the dinosaurs, one gets the suspicion - which the evidence supports - that rather than increasing, the variety of life on the planet is decreasing, for better or for worse. Do not be too quick to blame the humans, unless you think that the ape-men ate the dinosaurs.

Whatever the case, the Cambrian Explosions presents a serious problem the Darwinian dogma.

We can make another simple argument for cultivating suspicion of the Darwinist constructs. Darwinism is Malthusianism - both Darwin and Wallace developed the concept of "natural selection" directly from Malthusianism (they said so and this is easy to check). Next, eugenics is applied Darwinism, was invented by Darwin's good pal Galton, was popularized by the grand-children of Darwin's crony Huxley, and *was the vogue of the day among Anglo-American (and other) academic circles (and the upper class in general) before eugenics suddenly went out of fashion in 1945*. Today, "scientists" deride eugenics as "bad science." Even the Darwinists pay lip service to the anti-eugenics backlash in order to preserve their prestige.

As any Darwinist will be quick to point out, the fact that eugenics is "bad science" does not mean that Darwinism is "bad science." Come, now! If today's academics regard the intellectual precursor and the intellectual successor of Darwinism as bad science, then should one not suppose that the intermediary is also bogus?

There is another intuitive argument to be made against free-marketizing of both the economic and biological varieties. Namely, competition does not work. Cooperation is the basis for survival and for civilization. The Darwinists love to claim that cooperation really is far-sighted selfishness - but that is a ridiculous argument in the context of their unconscious world. Darwinism is "nature red in tooth and claw," as the one-worlder Tennyson explained.³²

Competition makes absolutely no sense! Have a hundred people try to outcompete each other in building skyscrapers. Not one of them would get anywhere. Get them to work together, and marvel at the results. The same principle applies across the board. Look at ants - they cooperate. Wolves move around in packs. So do lions. Life is cooperation. This is not to say that the human-hive is some great ideal - individuality and community can and do co-exist - that being the essence of human society.

The physicists have an argument of their own, on which we touched a few sections above - namely, the so-called "second law of thermodynamics," i.e. Things Fall Apart. Leave a (closed) system alone, and it will strive for the lowest amount of potential energy. Now, I think that it is reasonable to suppose that in the larger universe, the total energy may be constant, or it may be decreasing but subject to occasional small boosts, which do not push the current value about some arbitrary

³²Look up Dr Stan Monteith's *Brotherhood of Darkness*; both the book and the YouTube speech will do.

base value (i.e. something like refuelling). My argument is philosophical more than anything else, and I would not sacrifice any sleep over it - for day-to-day purposes, the "second law" is perfectly serviceable. More importantly, it would be a long stretch to claim that energy can increase out of nowhere all the time, particularly in closed systems. Even the Perpetual motion machine only aims to preserve energy. Thus energy and complexity tend to decrease in the long-term. This directly contradicts the Darwinian claim that complexity increases "naturally" over time.

Let us stop and recap: 1) abiogenesis has not been proved and presents a logical conundrum to Darwinism: either the Darwinists synthesize life from scratch, thus proving that intelligent design of life is possible, or they leave a major gap in their theory; 2) there is a chasm in the fossil record before the Cambrian Explosion; 3) Darwinian theory is mathematically absurd; 4) it is also philosophically absurd for a number of reasons, notably teleology; 5) there is no clear definition of "species," nor an acceptable way of conclusively demonstrating that the former owner of a given batch of skeletal remains can not interbreed with an existing species; 6) no Darwinian mechanism of mutability has been demonstrated - on the contrary, mutations are universally deleterious (or "harmless" - one has to suppose that DNA has methods of repairing itself or surviving damage); 7) notorious frauds mar the history of Darwinism, notably Haeckel's work and the Piltdown man - meaning that the public ought to be extremely critical of the purported "evidence for" Darwinism; 8) speaking of which, the "evidence" for the "common ancestry" of ape and man is extremely sparse, totally ambiguous, and for a century since Darwin was pushed forward by a tightly-knit group and its disciples; 9) the media, the museums, and the textbooks keep pushing forward blatantly fraudulent pro-Darwinian images even long after the fraudulent origins of some such images have been exposed; 10) then we have the entire history of Malthusianism, eugenicism, Economic Liberalism, Utilitarianism, and cultist Pantheism, which is equivalent to an aerial-bombing-run's worth of alarm sirens.

One can raise additional arguments against the Darwinian Golem, but if the above is not enough, nothing will be enough - such is the nature of fanaticism and true belief.

Some Fun

Follows a quote taken from Fred Reed's essays. Reed's writing is notable both for its erudition and its hilarity.

Circling the Paradigm³³

Protecting the Theory at Any Cost

April 21, 2008

I think it a shame that discussion of evolution usually boils down to a pledge of allegiance either to Darwin or to the handling of snakes. This view admirably distracts attention from the observation that much of Darwinism doesn't square with observation or even make sense. Religion has nothing to do with it, being an innocent bystander.

I recently read *Understanding Human History*, by Michael Hart [astrophysics PhD from Princeton], which deals with the influence of intelligence on history. Hart is an astrophysicist, and his book is well worth reading - except when he deals with evolution, when he goes ditzzy. They all do. Permit me an example.

A standard theory among a large school of evolutionists is that intelligence is low among people in sub-Saharan Africa, where humanity apparently originated, because life in tropical climates doesn't impose great intellectual demands; when people migrated to colder climates, as for example in Europe, they had to evolve higher intelligence to survive. To most people it seems obvious that higher intelligence would be useful anywhere at all, so why, they ask, didn't it arise below the Sahara?

Hart replies that larger brains carry not only benefits but also costs and, by implication, that in some places the costs are greater than the advantages. The costs of larger brains

³³<http://www.fredoneverything.net/Hart.shtml>, Jan 9, 2012.

are, he says:

"1) Larger brains require larger amounts of energy.

2) Larger brains require larger heads, which create strains on the muscular and skeletal structure.

3) Larger brains (and larger heads) require wider female pelvises and the wider pelvises result in less efficiency in walking and running."

This is evolutionary boilerplate, and also absurd. The two are often seen keeping company.

Let's start with 1) that larger brains require more energy. A concrete example:

I once asked a list of ardent evolutionists why humans, in evolving from lower primates, had largely lost their sense of smell. Their answer was in two parts.

First, men evolved an upright posture, and evolved it in the savanna, where the comparatively unobstructed terrain allowed them to see all around them. They therefore did not need a sense of smell. This makes no sense. At night it obviously would be useful to know when predators were about. Lions are astute at using cover to approach their prey, and are the color of dirt. Horses, which have eyes at about the height of a man's, and have good eyesight, also have an acute sense of smell. The upright-posture stuff is sheer story-telling.

Second, I was told that brain tissue uses a great deal of energy, and that having olfactory lobes to allow a good sense of smell would require humans to find more food, causing a grave selective disadvantage.

Let's think about this. How much of an energy drain would a good olfactory lobe cause? A quick web search pulls up the assertion that rats have quite good olfaction, and use it extensively to find what they regard as food. Another quick search reveals that a rat's entire brain occupies two cubic centimeters. A man's brain is some 1350 cc. Let us assume that the rat's brain consists entirely of olfactory tissue, which of course it doesn't. So $2/1350 \times 100$ reveals that the rat brain is .148% of the human. Since according to Hart the brain uses twenty percent of the resting energy expenditure of a man, adding the additional two cc of olfactory tissue would increase the body's energy demands by .148%/5, or .03%. This minute sum, we are to believe, is so draining as to overcome the advantage of detecting predators at night or in brush.

I have heard of suspension of disbelief, but I am too weak a cord by which to suspend that much disbelief. What astounds me is that evolutionists believe it without effort. I encounter the Argument from Metabolic Burden repeatedly. Its virtue is that of being superficially plausible but not verifiable.

Now let's examine the claim that large heads weigh more, and thus burden the body.

It is a commonplace of evolutionary IQism that in Europe humans evolved brains larger by 100 cc; the increase allowed them to invent such things as computers.

If you are of European stock, you will doubtless have noticed the terrible musculo-skeletal strain caused by your head. One imagines the Vikings attacking Normandy with their heads lolling uncontrollably to one side, so crushing was the burden.

This is arrant nonsense. It is transparent nonsense. It virtually waves a flag saying "Look! Nonsense!" But few notice.

It never ends. Also in the book, Hart argues that men like women with large, firm breasts because this signals to them that the woman is young and healthy and will bear many children. This too is typical Darwinian story-telling. Does it square with observation? Does it make sense logically?

If selective pressure favored large-breasted women, then large breasts would quickly become the norm (at which point they would have no selective advantage, but never mind). Look around you. Do most women have particularly large breasts, or are they in fact a bit unusual? Do you see that women with small or average breasts are unhealthy? Do you note that women with moderate breasts remain spinsters? Do you see any connection

at all between size of breasts and conjugal state?

Note that "large" and "firm" work against one another. Large breasts begin to sag long before small ones, especially in the absence of brassieres. A bosomy woman on this reasoning would lose her attractiveness well before her planar sisters. Why does Hart think that large breasts indicate health? They probably indicate that the woman isn't starving, but they are perfectly consonant with countless diseases. Can you think of a disease that causes breasts to shrink?

And of course it is easy to make up counter-stories. E.g., Hart says that "wider pelvises result in less efficiency in walking and running." What does he think large breasts do? And anyway they would use more energy and (really do) cause musculo-skeletal stress and... .

What solemn nonsense it all is.

A second technique for explaining the inexplicable, or at least thus-far inexplicable, is the Argument from Sexual Attraction. When an animal exhibits some trait or structure that on its face seems to render survival less likely, it is said to attract fertile females.

Note the antennae on the beastie below. [Photograph of some kind of a deer with massive antlers pointing backwards.]

Such ornate headgear is so placed as to be useless in fighting: the animal would have to stand on its head to point them at an enemy. According to Hart's theory of cranio-mechanical burden, these decorations would cause far more stress than two cc of brain tissue, and ought to make the animal slower than it would be without them. Being slow is not a good thing in territory infested by cheetahs. Ah, but horns attract the ladies, so that the animal has more offspring.

This might make sense if (a) not all males had them and (b) they were tied to health and strength. Are they?

My favorite example is this: [Photograph of the reconstruction of a mammoth's skeleton, complete with a pair of gargantuan spiral-like tusks.]

A larger brain would cause crippling ergonomic stress, but having the weight of a small planet stuck on his jaw is a good thing for this fellow because it attracts females.

I see. Things that work against survival facilitate passing on one's genes. What could be more reasonable?

Nothing is too silly for Darwinian consumption. For example, Hart speculates that white and yellow people, who live in cold weather, have thin lips to conserve heat. Presumably this implies that the larger lips of Africans serve as radiators (and perhaps cause musculo-skeletal stress). My own explanation is that northern climes are windy and that large lips would act as sails, causing the heads of Caucasians, already mechanically stressed by 100 cc of extra brain, to flop sideways and cause neck damage.

Again, a staple of evolutionary anthropology is that people left Africa some years ago and went north, in Europe. In order to survive cold weather, they evolved larger brains so as to be able to make clothes, and remember to store food for the coming winter.

Well, OK. But Hart says that 1.5 million years ago *Homo erectus*, the Model T of humanity, lived in northern China and used fire to survive the cold. *Erectus*, says Hart, had a cranial capacity of only 1000 cc.

Now, anywhere you need fire to survive the winter, you also need clothes, as otherwise you can go no more than a short distance from the fire (unless you think *Erectus* had fur, but then why did he need fire?) You also have to be smart enough to remember that winter comes, unless you are going to reinvent clothing annually come fall. Thus we have that 1000 cc of brain is enough to survive the cold and that humans in Africa, at 1270 cc, were way overqualified and didn't need to evolve larger brains to survive cold.

Aaaaagh!

The entire Darwinian structure rests on the willingness to accept wild theories without examination. Permit me one other example to make the point. James Flynn, in his

book *Race Differences in Intelligence*, makes two fabulistic assertions. First, Asians, who supposedly are adapted to cold weather, have little facial hair because it would collect ice and cause frostbite. Second, northern peoples have pale skin so that sunlight can synthesize vitamin D.

As to the first assertion, I note that Asian peoples with little facial hair also have little pubic hair. If this is an adaptation to prevent an accumulation of ice, life must have been far harder than I had imagined. The idea that a covering of facial hair is a disadvantage in cold weather is counterintuitive, so I asked a friend who spent a dozen years with the Alaskan fishing fleet. Everyone wore heavy beards, he said, as protection against the cold.

However, if beards are bad in cold weather, why did Vikings have them? They certainly had the intelligence to notice that their faces were freezing, and they knew how to shave. On Flynn's theory, Viking women and children would have survived nicely, but the men would have died of frostbite. Who has been smoking what? [Cartoon of a hairy viking.] As for the second assertion, that pale skin allows the synthesis of Vitamin D in the far north, well, maybe. However, people in Scandinavian winters characteristically wear clothing. Look at the Viking fellow above and note how much skin is exposed. Reflect that in winter in the far north, hours of sunlight are few to almost none and what sunlight there is passes obliquely through thick layers of atmosphere. This filters out the ultraviolet needed to synthesize Vitamin D. If Flynn wants to sell his idea, he needs at a minimum to show that the amount of skin exposed in the available light produces sufficient Vitamin D in both Vikings and Eskimos. I'm waiting.

These are standard examples of Darwinian make-believe. The problem is that people do not ask questions. When they hear that "scientists said" something, people swallow their tongues and cease thinking. The behaviorists have been working on the creation of this habit for more than a century.

Then there are the endless Darwinian false metaphors and *non sequiturs*. The Darwinists despise and incessantly abuse language. We have already mentioned the tautology in "survival of the fittest" and the oxymoron in "natural selection." Let us also take a look at the drivel sprouted by the current top priest of Darwinism, Richard Dawkins. Having justifiably proclaimed that his *The Selfish Gene* should be read "like science fiction," Dawkins proceeded to take a series of plunges off the deep end.

In the Preface to the 1976 edition, he announces that "We are survival machines-robot vehicles blindly programmed to preserve the selfish molecules known as genes." In the real world, "machines" are constructs serving a purpose. They were built by someone and function under direction. Programming, which, by definition, is deliberate, is equivalent to conscious direction. When Dawkins says "machine-robot vehicle," he means a construct which happened by itself - the polar opposite of the common meaning of his words. When he says "blindly programmed," he utters an oxymoron. "Blindly" to him means unintentionally, except that he does not want to ever mention "intention" except to deny it. "Blind programming" is an expression sans meaning.

But Dawkins continues undaunted, writing that "This is a truth which still fills me with astonishment." He should be rightly astonished, since his "truth" is utter nonsense plain to all. "Truth" is a vague word, but we can accept that statements such as "the Earth revolves around its axis and around the sun," "Germany invaded Poland on September 1, 1939," "many people like pizza," and " $2 \times 2 = 4$," are "true." Dawkins's original statement is not even meaningful, let alone true. Accepting the meaning he wants his sentence to carry, we still can not say that it is true or even plausible. The man senses this, and expresses surprise at his own folly!

A sentence below, he says that "One of my hopes is that I may have some success in astonishing others." His hopes are justified, since it is indeed amazing that a grown man with scientific credentials could write such nonsense as his.

But all of that is almost nothing in comparison to the opening sentence of Dawkins's first chapter: "Intelligent life on a planet comes of age when it first works out the reason for its own existence." First, to produce an inductive argument, one needs at least *two* examples to work with. Unless Dawkins has access to unpublished proof of the existence of aliens, his argument is bogus, and he means "Intelligent life on Earth came of age (or will come of age) when man first worked (works) out the reason for his own existence." What does "come of age" mean? For a human, the moment of "coming to age" could be the moment when one achieves relative personal self-sufficiency. Analogues to humanity could be the adoption of agricultural life, or the entry into the industrial age. The time of "coming of age" could also be the time of self-realization, which is around, say, the age of seven. In broader terms, perhaps humanity came of age when it invented writing. Of course, Dawkins's meaning is clear to the initiated, idiosyncratic, and thoroughly doctrinaire.

And then, how does one define "the reason for one's own existence"? People older than about twelve are well aware that they exist, because their parents had sex. So what? Dawkins next makes clear, that to him the "reason for existence" is "evolution," which, by his own terms, is no reason at all; and the "coming of age" occurred in 1859.

At the start of the next paragraph, Dawkins lies through his teeth: "Today the theory of evolution is about as much open to doubt as the theory that the earth goes round the sun, but the full implications of Darwin's revolution have yet to be widely realized." Then why are there fully accredited, peer reviewed scientists - not all of them "Creationists"! - who revile Darwinism, which is what the neo-Darwinist Dawkins means by "the theory of evolution" (even though he says the opposite)?

And so on - hundreds and hundreds of pages of stupefying drivel.

The title of Dawkins's book summarizes his effort: "The Selfish Gene." The word "selfishness" implies agency, which Dawkins denies to genes. In his world there is no agency, just randomness, with the gene responding to "natural" stimuli. Dawkins's defilement of language is not the exception, but the rule among Darwinists - from the start!

Dawkins's other famous evolutionary manifesto, the 1986 *The Blind Watchmaker*, is even more daring in its dadaism. The watch is the standard metaphor for the ordered universe, in which everything has a purpose, and appears designed for that purpose. The philosopher Paley used the watch-metaphor for a standard argument for the existence of God early in the 19th century. The blind watchmaker, under ordinary circumstances, is the master watchman, who has become so good in deliberately, purposefully, carefully making watches, that even without his eyes, he still makes his watches. But for Dawkins, the "blind Watchmaker" is "nature," which purposelessly created (writing "created" without implying agency!) life. Here is how Dawkins puts it in Chapter 1 of the book:

All appearances to the contrary, the only watchmaker in nature is the blind forces of physics, albeit deployed in a very special way. A true watchmaker has foresight: he designs his cogs and springs, and plans their interconnections, with a future purpose in his mind's eye. Natural selection, the blind, unconscious, automatic process which Darwin discovered, and which we now know is the explanation for the existence and apparently purposeful form of all life, has no purpose in mind. It has no mind and no mind's eye. It does not plan for the future. It has no vision, no foresight, no sight at all. If it can be said to play the role of watchmaker in nature, it is the blind watchmaker.

In other words, Dawkins wants to imbue his metaphor with the exact opposite of its accepted meaning! This is like calling the white black, to borrow a simile from that other specimen, Bertrand Russell.

With a few nominal changes, Quigley's review of the works of Skinner, of Skinner himself, and

of behaviorism in general, can be adapted to the case of Dawkins and Darwinism, without losing any of its validity.

Who is this Dawkins anyway? Richard Dawkins (1941-) is the son of the country gentleman Clinton John Dawkins (1915-2010), who served in the British colonial service. Both of Richard's parents were zoology enthusiasts. Naturally, they indoctrinated their son from an early age. Dawkins took zoology at Balliol (Oxford), under the tutorship of the Noble Prize winner Nikolaas Tinbergen. Tinbergen (1907-1988) was a Dutch "ethologist and ornithologist." He won the Noble along with two close colleagues - Karl von Frisch (1886-1982) and Konrad Lorenz (1903-1989). Frisch was a notorious and vocal eugenicist. Before WWII, he worked at a Rockefeller-built laboratory in Munich. Lorenz was a hardcore behaviorist and a "friend and student" of Julian Huxley. Lorenz was also a Nazi (member of NDSAP) and a supporter of the Nazi eugenics programs. He wrote a book entitled *Civilized Man's Eight Deadly Sins* (1973). The number one sin was, of course, overpopulation. This means *life*. The number one sin of a good portion of the people on Earth, in Lorenz the Nazi's view, was that they were alive.

Tinbergen, who was another dedicated behaviorist, got his Noble Prize for a theory on autism, which advocated treatments propounded by such notables as Aldous Huxley, John Dewey (the destroyer of American education; opponent of eugenicism), Raymond Dart (the Missing Link hunter), G.E. Coghill (member of the American Eugenics Society), and C.S. Sherrington ((English) Eugenics Society). Julian Huxley was Tinbergen's pal. Another important influence on Tinbergen was Peter Medawar, the noted Noble Prize winner and member of the English Eugenics Society.

So Dawkins's mentor was a person immersed in an ocean of eugenicism. There is more, of course. Dawkins's second favorite biologist, after guess who, is Ronald Fisher (1890-1962), the noted eugenicist zealot.

Follows Dawkins's opinion on the subject of eugenics.

From the Afterword by Richard Dawkins

Herald Scotland, 20 November, 2006

In the 1920s and 1930s, scientists from both the political left and right would not have found the idea of designer babies particularly dangerous - though of course they would not have used that phrase.

Nobody wants to be caught agreeing with that monster, even in a single particular. The spectre of Hitler has led some scientists to stray from "ought" to "is" and deny that breeding for human qualities is even possible. But if you can breed cattle for milk yield, horses for running speed, and dogs for herding skill, why on Earth should it be impossible to breed humans for mathematical, musical or athletic ability? Objections such as "these are not one-dimensional abilities" apply equally to cows, horses and dogs and never stopped anybody in practice.

I wonder whether, some 60 years after Hitler's death, we might at least venture to ask what the moral difference is between breeding for musical ability and forcing a child to take music lessons. Or why it is acceptable to train fast runners and high jumpers but not to breed them. I can think of some answers, and they are good ones, which would probably end up persuading me. But hasn't the time come when we should stop being frightened even to put the question?

There you have it. Richard Dawkins is a *eugenicist* who hates to be caught agreeing with Adolf on this particular issue, *but* who happens to think that humans should be bred like cows - presumably like the Belgian Blue cow with its genetic damage.

Now, dear reader, this man is the top Darwinist of our time. His predecessors are the Huxleys, Fisher, and Galton. His mentor's closest colleague was a full-blown Nazi. What do you think Darwinism is all about? What is the end-goal? Here you have it - eugenicism. The dream of the creation of "superhumans." Now, supposing they manage to "enhance" humans - and they are working on it - their effort will come at a price, in both the literal and the metaphorical meaning of the word.

The one price will be a loss of what we identify as the essence of humanity. Then there will be the literal price - the process will be expensive. Who do you think will "benefit" from such expensive "enhancements"? And who do you think is destined to become a genetically bred human workhorse after the H.G.Wells-Aldous Huxley-Bertrand Russell tradition?

In 1995, Charles Simonyi, one of the less famous but still opulent Microsoft Oligarchs, offered to bombard Oxford with sweet dollars on the condition that the holder of the chair he proposed to endow would "be expected to make important contributions to the public understanding of some scientific field," and its first holder would be Dawkins. The offer was accepted, and Richard became the "Simonyi Professor for the Public Understanding of Science," i.e. the Microsoft Chair of Covert Malthusian-Eugenicist Brainwashing. He retained the position until 2008, and used his time to deliver blast after blast against Christianity. Simonyi spends half the year on his private yacht, and runs a network of foundations.

Darwinism is, and always has been, eugenicism and Malthusianism hidden under a shoddy mask of pseudo-science.

Dissenting Accredited Scientists and Notable Public Figures

One frequent Darwinist lie is that no serious people doubt evolution in general or Darwinism in particular. This is false, and the Darwinists know that it is false, because they keep arguing with the dissenters! In this section, we will take a look at the dissenting crowd. Observe that to condemn Darwinism publicly is dangerously close to committing academic suicide - hence there must be plenty of other dissenters who keep their views to themselves and their friends.

The Discovery Institute has published *A Scientific Dissent From Darwinism* list, which contains the signatures of more than seven hundred scientists of anti-Darwinist convictions. The names include plenty of people with PhDs from, and academic positions at, highly prestigious institutions. Counter-lists have been signed, notably a "Project Steve," which has over a thousand scientist Steves, Estebans, and Stephanies, who support Darwinism. They could get ten million Steves and it would still make no difference: Are there serious critics of Darwinism? Yes. So debate them, instead of playing with numbers.

We already mentioned that Francis Collins (1950-), one of the two key leaders of the Human Genome Project, went from atheism to a belief in God. Collins favors "theistic evolution," which contradicts key Darwinian postulates.

The other main leader of the HGP, Craig Venter (1946-), recently said that he does not agree with the "tree of life" ("common descent") view of the Darwinists (to Richard Dawkins's horror).³⁴

Keith Ward (1938-) is another theistic evolutionist. He is a Fellow of the British Academy, a member of the council of the Royal Institute of Philosophy, and an ordained priest of the Church of England. Of his academic credentials it should suffice to say that Ward was the Dean of Trinity Hall, Oxford, between 1975 and 1983.

A. E. Wilder-Smith (1915-1995) was a noted Creationist and anti-Darwinist. His bonafides (Wikipedia): Ph.D. (Physical Organic Chemistry), Dr. es Science (Chemotherapy), D. Sc.(Natural Sciences).

Edgar Andrews, (BSc, PhD, DSc, FInstP, FIMMM, CEng, CPhys.), Emeritus Professor of Materials at the University of London, is another notable anti-Darwinist.

We have also mentioned Michael Behe (1952-). He is a PhD in biochemistry (University of Pennsylvania) and a Catholic.

Then there is Michael Denton (1943-) a biochemist with a degree from King's College. He is an anti-Darwinist. Denton's notable work is *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985).

Phillip E. Johnson (1940-) was the at the top of his class when he studied law at the University

³⁴February 12, 2011 *What is Life?* panel, available here: <http://thesciencenetwork.org/programs/the-great-debate-what-is-life/what-is-life-panel>, Jan 9, 2012.

of Chicago. He is an emeritus professor of law at Berkeley. Johnson is an anti-Darwinist, a non-Creationist, and favors "intelligent design."

David Berlinski (1942-) has a Ph.D. in philosophy from Princeton University. He has taught at a plethora of the most prestigious universities. Berlinski is a "scathing" critic of Darwinism, but does not openly advocate "intelligent design." He "refuses to theorize about the origin of life."

Stephen C. Meyer (1941-) has a PhD in history and philosophy of science from Cambridge. He favors intelligent design.

A few more select names from the list mentioned above:

Lev Belousov - Prof. of Embryology, Honorary Prof., Moscow State University Member, Russian Academy of Natural Sciences.

Eugene Buff - Ph.D. Genetics Institute of Developmental Biology, Russian Academy of Sciences.

Maciej Giertych - Full Professor, Institute of Dendrology, Polish Academy of Sciences.

Paul Ashby - Ph.D. Chemistry, Harvard University.

Robert W. Bass - Ph.D. Mathematics (also: Rhodes Scholar; Post-Doc at Princeton), Johns Hopkins University.

Giuseppe Sermonti - Professor of Genetics, Ret. (Editor, Rivista di Biologia/Biology Forum), University of Perugia (Italy).

And so on and so on.

The Pew Forum has an interesting and instructive 1991 piece on the level of acceptance of evolutionism amongst different religious groups in the United States.³⁵

About four-fifths of Buddhists and Hindus accept evolutionism, topping the ranking. Why? Likely, because those two religions align with Darwinism in being pantheistic. Next are the Jews, with 77% acceptance. The "unaffiliated" ("atheists"?) embraced Darwinism at a rate of 72%. Follow: Catholics - 58%; Orthodox - 54%; Mainline Protestants - 51%; Muslim - 45%; "Historically Black Protestant" - 38%; Evangelical Protestant - 24%; Mormon - 22%; Jehovah's Witness - 8%. The Evangelicals tend to adopt the Biblical Creationist view, and should beware being railroaded on other issues, or being isolated from the mainstream of society.

Polls in America consistently find that more than half of the Americans feel that God created Man and the Universe.

From Wikipedia's *Level of support for evolution* article:³⁶

in 2005, Gallup found that 53% of Americans expressed the belief that "God created human beings in their present form exactly the way the Bible describes it." About 2/3 (65.5%) of those surveyed thought that creationism was definitely or probably true. In 2005 a Newsweek poll discovered that 80 percent of the American public thought that "God created the universe." and the Pew Research Center reported that "nearly two-thirds of Americans say that creationism should be taught alongside evolution in public schools." Ronald Numbers commented on that with "Most surprising of all was the discovery that large numbers of high-school biology teachers from 30% in Illinois and 38% in Ohio to a whopping 69% in Kentucky supported the teaching of creationism."

The National Center for Science Education reports that from 1985 to 2005, the number of Americans unsure about evolution increased from 7% to 21%, while the number rejecting evolution declined from 48% to 39%. Jon Miller of Michigan State University has found in his polls that the number of Americans who accept evolution has declined from 45% to 40% from 1985 to 2005.

³⁵<http://www.pewforum.org/Science-and-Bioethics/Religious-Differences-on-the-Question-of-Evolution.aspx>, Jan 10, 2012.

³⁶As of Jan 10, 2012.

The Darwinists may quip in return that a fifth of the Americans think that the Sun revolves around the Earth.³⁷ The reply to that would be that a fifth of the Americans do not know which nation America rebelled against in 1776. That fifth (and it has to be the same fifth) is terminally ignorant as a result of the decrepit system of education in the United States. Putting them aside, we still have a massive amount of people who reject Darwinism. This is not to say that the majority's opinion is the correct one, but to point out that Darwinism is anything but universally accepted. The self-reinforcing arrogant elitism of Darwinism is also worth noting - Darwinism being the cult of the "well-educated" (i.e. thoroughly indoctrinated) and the wealthy, the underclass's rejection of Darwinism feeds into the upper crust's belief that the poor are demented. The vicious circle is an ugly one.

Furthermore, from the same Wikipedia page, we glean that "A 1991 Gallup poll of Americans found that about 5% of scientists (including those with training outside biology) identified themselves as creationists." And yet the hack Dawkins claims that 1) there is a consensus, and that 2) rejecting Darwinism is equivalent to rejecting the notion that the Earth rotates around the Sun. Poll the scientists on their opinion about the Earth and the Sun!

Another strong indication of how things really stand are the results of the 14th February, 1986 Oxford Huxley Memorial Debate. Then and there, Dawkins and Maynard-Smith and allies argued with Andrews and Wilder-Smith and their allies. At the end of the gruelling altercation, a vote was taken. The evolutionists got 198 votes, and the creationists got 115 (150?) votes. Now, this is Oxford! This is not Biblebelt, USA; this is the center of evolutionism and the home of Dawkins. The audience consisted not of illiterate country bumpkins but of the dons of a most august institution. The ostensible victory of the Darwinists was, of course, a Pyrrhic victory, a Borodino, perhaps a Stalingrad.

Which brings up the question: how much debate is there really, on Darwinism? Whose side is the media on? Whom does the academy favor, and why? And we get back to the core question: who owns the media and the academia (many key universities are either outright *private*, or heavily dependant on grants from *private* foundations)? And from whom has the academic priesthood inherited its power, but from the clerical priesthood?

Because if the Darwinists could suffer such a reversal at their home ground, then how could they claim their own infallibility, and the existence of a widespread consensus? The result of the Oxford debate, by itself, taken outside the context of this discussion, should force one to at least take a serious look at the problems with evolution and the potential credibility of the Creationist side.

Tellingly, particularly since 1986, Dawkins has tended to avoid debates with Creationists, because, in effect, that is beneath him, and would give the Creationists "the oxygen of respectability." Well, Richard! Much better to wallow in the authority bestowed upon one by the Oligarch from Microsoft, and snipe from the Microsoft Chair at Oxford - no? What better chance to improve the position of your side than by defeating your opponents in debates? That is exactly what the Creationists want to do - why not give them a fair fight?

The 1986 debate was covered-up.³⁸

The debate includes a classic Dawkinism, in which the good professor compares the evidence for the supposed reality of Darwinism to the evidence for the reality of the Roman Empire. The difference being, of course, that the records of the Roman Empire are historical records made by humans, fully intelligible to any human who wants to make the effort to read them, while the so-called "fossil record" consists of a large pile of bones totally open to interpretation.

³⁷Mentioned here: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/3742/New-Poll-Gauges-Americans-General-Knowledge-Levels.aspx>, Jan 10, 2012.

³⁸For an interesting email exchange between Dawkins and a creationist, look up Paul G. Humber's article *Debating Dawkins*, from *Creation Matters*, vol.8, num. 4, July-August 2003; I found the article here: http://www.creationresearch.org/creation_matters/pdf/2003/cm08_04_rp.PDF, Jan 10, 2012. The debate itself can be found online in mp3.

Some quotes; from Chapter 2 of Behe's *Darwin's Black Box*:

Over the past 130 years Darwinism, although securely entrenched, has met a steady stream of dissent both from within the scientific community and from without it. In the 1940s the geneticist Richard Goldschmidt became so disenchanted with Darwinism's explanation for the origins of new structures that he was driven to propose the "hopeful monster" theory. Goldschmidt thought that occasionally large changes might occur just by chance - perhaps a reptile laid an egg once, say, and from it hatched a bird. The hopeful-monster theory didn't catch on, but dissatisfaction with a Darwinian interpretation of the fossil record bubbled up several decades later. Paleontologist Niles Eldredge describes the problem:

No wonder paleontologists shied away from evolution for so long. It never seems to happen. Assiduous collecting up cliff faces yields zigzags, minor oscillations, and the very occasional slight accumulation of change - over millions of years, at a rate too slow to account for all the prodigious change that has occurred in evolutionary history. When we do see the introduction of evolutionary novelty, it usually shows up with a bang, and often with no firm evidence that the fossils did not evolve elsewhere! Evolution cannot forever be going on somewhere else. Yet that's how the fossil record has struck many a forlorn paleontologist looking to learn something about evolution.

...

It is not just paleontologists looking for bones, though, who are disgruntled. A raft of evolutionary biologists examining whole organisms wonder just how Darwinism can account for their observations. The English biologists Mae-Wan Ho and Peter Saunders complain as follows:

It is now approximately half a century since the neo-Darwinian synthesis was formulated. A great deal of research has been carried on within the paradigm it defines. Yet the successes of the theory are limited to the minutiae of evolution, such as the adaptive change in coloration of moths; while it has remarkably little to say on the questions which interest us most, such as how there came to be moths in the first place.

University of Georgia geneticist John McDonald notes a conundrum:

The results of the last 20 years of research on the genetic basis of adaptation has led us to a great Darwinian paradox. Those [genes] that are obviously variable within natural populations do not seem to lie at the basis of many major adaptive changes, while those [genes] that seemingly do constitute the foundation of many, if not most, major adaptive changes apparently are not variable within natural populations

Australian evolutionary geneticist George Miklos puzzles over the usefulness of Darwinism:

What then does this all-encompassing theory of evolution predict? Given a handful of postulates, such as random mutations, and selection coefficients, it will predict changes in [gene] frequencies over time. Is this what a grand theory of evolution ought to be about?

Jerry Coyne, of the Department of Ecology and Evolution at the University of Chicago, arrives at an unanticipated verdict:

We conclude - unexpectedly - that there is little evidence for the neo-Darwinian view: its theoretical foundations and the experimental evidence supporting it are weak.

And University of California geneticist John Endler ponders how beneficial mutations arise:

Although much is known about mutation, it is still largely a "black box" relative to evolution. Novel biochemical functions seem to be rare in evolution, and the basis for their origin is virtually unknown.

[etc.]

And so on in the same vein.³⁹

Lynn Margulis's famous quote will serve to provide a fitting conclusion to this section. Margulis (1938-2011) got her PhD in biology at Berkeley. She was a professor at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. She theorized that symbiotic (i.e. *cooperative* rather than *competitive*) relationships drive evolution. Dawkins and Mayr admired her work. Margulis was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1983; and also to the World Academy of Art and Science, the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Clinton gave her a National Medal of Science. The Linnean society of London gave her one of their precious Darwin-Wallace Medals. Margulis was a 9/11 Truther. She was also a Gaian.

And she had this to say, emphasis mine:

(Wikipedia) She did however, hold a negative view of certain interpretations of Neo-Darwinism, excessively focused on inter-organismic competition, as she believed that **history will ultimately judge them as comprising "a minor twentieth-century religious sect within the sprawling religious persuasion of Anglo-Saxon Biology."** She also believed that proponents of the standard theory "wallow in their zoological, capitalistic, competitive, cost-benefit interpretation of Darwin - having mistaken him... **Neo-Darwinism, which insists on [the slow accrual of mutations by gene-level natural selection], is in a complete funk."**

Conclusions

Darwinism, like its more recent spawn of "neo"-Darwinism, is a full-blown religion, complete with a God ("nature" or Man, depending on which sect one looks at), a Messiah (Darwin), a priesthood (led today by the high-priest Dawkins), a vast and impenetrable collection of scriptural dogma, a variety of sub-cults (notably the eugenics one), and a rich iconography.

The religion of Darwinism is overtly Malthusian, anti-scientific, and anti-human. Its intellectual origins can be found in the writings of the ubiquitous Malthus and Bentham. Darwinism is the pseudo-biological equivalent of the pseudo-economics of the "Free Market." Both creeds preach that "nature" should be the ultimate arbiter - meaning that the ruthless, the lying, the violent - those who "survive" or "make profits" should be not only in charge, but the objects of veneration.

Though Darwinism has polluted and emaciated science for more than a century and a half, its most pernicious influence is religico-philosophical, rather than epistemological. People will continue to look at how things work with or without Darwinism. The problem is that Darwinism has undermined the worldview of modern civilization. Its morally and intellectually repugnant doctrines have permeated the consciousness of the modern man, though not as deeply as the Darwinian Priesthood would want its ideas to sink in.

Evolution sans Darwinism, as a doctrine, is no great problem, as long as the various theories around

³⁹More quotes can be found here: http://www.warneveryone.com/evolution_scientists_quotes.htm, accessed on Jan 9, 2012.

it do not actively sabotage human society. Understand that the problem is a philosophical rather than scientific one - there is very little real science - as defined implicitly via the "scientific method" - in evolutionary theory. What there is, is a great deal of - theory. So let the evolutionist do their ponderings - but when they come up with something like eugenicism, those of heart and sound mind must protest, or prepare for debacles of the kind seen in World War II and beyond.

"Intelligent design" and "evolution" may be impossible to "prove" in any truly convincing manner. The question here is not about "God" and the "transmutation of species." The big question is: on what foundations will people construct their society? Will they permit the insidious Oligarchs, who need Darwinism as a *raison d'être*, to push down the creed of hidden rule and cooperation at the top, dog-eat-dog at the bottom - the creed of the human herd governed by the "high minded" shepherds; or will humanity, in the age of the Internet, the exploration of space, and the nuke, finally learn from the many lessons of history?

We shall see.

Chapter 10

More Problems

10.1 The Mass Perversion of Society

Having looked at the origins of the 1960s drug-movement, the 1960-70s radical feminist movement, and, tangentially, at the environmentalist movement, let us briefly deal with the so-called "Sexual Revolution."

10.1.1 Maddog Kinsey

The so-called "Sexual Revolution" rested, in popular pseudoscientific-ideological terms, on the two notorious *Kinsey Reports*, so named after their author, the pedophile homosexual exhibitionist voyeur adulterous fraud Alfred Kinsey of the University of Indiana. Kinsey made free sex, pornography, and homosexuality cool and acceptable. His pseudo-scientific authority, combined with the mass-media driven sexualization campaign, which had been gathering steam since the Roaring Twenties, and with the singular conditions of the 1960s, generated the mass promiscuity, everything-goes, "do it if it feels right" world that we know and enjoy today.

Dr. Judith A. Reisman (1935-, PhD in Communications from Case Western) is a good reference for everything Kinsey. A classic book of her's on the subject is *Kinsey: Crimes & Consequences*, first published in 1998. I have the second edition (2000).¹

Also see the samizdat documentaries *The Kinsey Syndrome* and *Kinsey's Pedophiles*.

Alfred Charles Kinsey (1894-1956) was born in New Jersey to a housewife with little formal education and a professor at the Stevens Institute of Technology. His parents were poor, and Kinsey had a dirty, unhealthy childhood. He contracted Rickets and developed a stoop, which saved him from the WWI draft.

(Ch. 1) Kinsey's father exhibited puritanical tendencies, and had a poor relationship with his son. Once he found his feet, Kinsey ceased contact with his parents. An obvious though guarded conclusion one should make, is that, likely, Kinsey's libertine tendencies developed as a strong reaction to his parents' puritanism. Another strong factor leading to reaction was Kinsey's physical frailty. He was (Reisman quoting an official biographer) ""physically inferior to other boys" and was the "shyest guy around girls you could think of."" His high-school yearbook photograph caption quote the classic Shakespearean misanthropic line, "Man delights me not; no, not woman either." Kinsey's biographer and intimate crony, Pomeroy, wondered how the mouse-like Kinsey, with his "abysmal ignorance of sex," metamorphosed into the world's foremost libertine and supposed "expert" on coitus.

The official Kinsey public image was the picture perfect family man in father. In reality, Kinsey was a maniacal pervert, whose activities should have landed him in jail. Though disinterested in girls

¹The subject of Kinsey is rarely mentioned in the NWO literature from what I have seen. An explicit reference to Kinsey can be found Wormser's *Foundations* book. Thanks to Alan Watt to pointing toward Reisman's work.

in his young adulthood, Kinsey was an avid lover of "biology" of the behaviorist-Darwinian type. Indeed, Darwin was a special favorite of Kinsey's. Following a two year stint at Bowdoin College between 1914 and 1916, Kinsey hit Harvard's Bussey Institution, which was, at the time, one of America's major eugenicist haunts. Alfred learned his lessons, and argued for the mass sterilization of the underclass prior to World War II, together with a breeding plan for the "superior" types, of whom undoubtedly Kinsey was an excellent example. Julian Huxley was acquainted with Kinsey's "work"; and his brother Aldous's *Brave New World* British Oligarchical manifesto is as Kinseyan as one could wish.

Though uncomfortable around women, Kinsey enjoyed being with boys. He joined the Boy Scouts when he was 17. One of his favorite pastimes even in conjugal adulthood was the sleeping in tents with little boys. There are indications that Kinsey went on such naturalistic expeditions armed with a batch of nudist magazines. He did state, at some point, that his research began even during the scouting trips, which were such "good times."

This is interesting in light of Kinsey's claims that boys are sexual from birth and usually undertake sexual adventures with other boys at an early age. In his later years, Kinsey used his reputation to remove a masturbation warning from the Boy Scouts handbook.

It is said that Kinsey was religious as a child, but gave up on God because of the overwhelming demonic power of masturbation. The story suggests that while in college, Kinsey prayed to God to stop him from masturbating, enjoyed himself anyway, and then succumbed to guilt, and eventually to atheism.

At Indiana, Kinsey was extremely friendly with one Ralph Voris, whom Kinsey called "Mr. Man." The mad doctor preferred "cowboy homosexuals" to the citified dandies. In his opinion, backed by no data, the old Western pioneer types were serious men who took sex where they could find it. If the wife was not around, other cowboys, and, presumably, cows, sheep, and apertures of any sort, provided quick relief to the busy hardy outdoorsmen.

In a notable episode in the 1930s, Kinsey went on a trip with two of his students. The three men frolicked in the nude and pleased themselves with group masturbation sessions. The young men had a hard time keeping Kinsey "at an arm's length." Among Kinsey's accomplishments on those trips were spontaneous urinations in full view of his students.

Nor was this episode in any way unique. Kinsey would walk around naked whenever he could, particularly in the outdoors.

Maddoc married his wife Clara Braken in 1921. Though a thorough atheist, Kinsey went through the motions of going to church, and, ironically, initially Clara rejected him, because he was "too churchy." After the wedding, Alfred took his Clara on a mountain-climbing trip. The couple went to sleep thoroughly exhausted every night. The sex guru failed to do his manly duty for the duration of the honeymoon.

Kinsey and Clara had three surviving children, who surrendered their sexual history to Pomeroy and Kinsey at the latter's request. The family went on nudist vacations and wallowed in nudist magazines. Kinsey often shaved nude in presence of his children.

A dedicated atheist, Kinsey cherrypicked his staff to avoid having to deal with believers.

One of Kinsey's great prides in life was his pornographic collection.

(Ch. 2) After Voris "The Man" died, Kinsey raided his office and confiscated incriminating evidence. A picture of Voris stood on Kinsey's desk until the latter's demise.

Kinsey and his cronies dodged the WWII draft by pretending to engage in important research.

Alfred's semi-official sexual research began in 1938, when the University of Indiana asked him to teach a course on marriage. Until then, Kinsey was known for his expertise on - gall wasps. Sex sells, and Kinsey's course prospered. His colleagues were disgusted with him, but he managed to get Rockefeller funding.

Follows a random piece of Kinsey wisdom:

Knowing what I do of the human animal, I cannot believe that the love and affection which the older males bestowed upon Greek boys, and their aesthetic admiration for the bodies of Greek youth, could have failed to arouse specific sexual response which found their outlet in overt sexual relations.

So if Kinsey failed to "aesthetically admire" the bodies of American youth, it was not for a lack of desire. The man was a rabid pedophile. His relationship with Voris was blatantly homosexual. His group masturbation sessions make him an exhibitionist and a voyeur.

Having established these points, let us curtail the revolting examples of Kinsey's perversity, and hurry across the major point concerning his research. The reader can find all the dirty details in the given reference.

Among Kinsey's few intellectual predecessors in "sexology" were Magnus Hirschfeld (1868-1935) and Harry Benjamin (1885-1986) of Berlin. Back in the twenties and thirties, there were three spectacularly debauched cities in the world - Weimar Berlin, Third Republic Paris, and occupied Shanghai.² Prostitution, promiscuity, and perversity were rampant in all three cities in that age. Berlin also had a few famous sexologists. Hirschfeld, a PhD, was something of a self-hating homosexual who fought for the decriminalization of homosexuality in Imperial Germany. In the Weimar era, he campaigned for worldwide "sexual reform." He was a renowned expert of coitus, known as the "the Einstein of Sex." Isherwood the friend of Aldous Huxley knew Hirschfeld and visited his Institute of Sexology in Berlin. The Nazis demolished the wonderful Institute and burned Hirschfeld's books. The sex-guru fled to Paris by route of Zurich and Vienna. There he had a heart attack and died.

Benjamin was a specialist on "transsexualism." (The following is even in Wikipedia) In 1948, Benjamin decided to aid Kinsey in kindly helping a boy who "wanted to be a girl." The mother - presumably either severely brainwashed, bullied, temporarily insane, or bribed - agreed to the project. Benjamin treated the child with estrogen, and arranged to ship him off to Germany to cut him - but the mother ceased contact with the sexologist crew. Benjamin continued to treat people with estrogen, claiming several hundred victims before the grim reaper put an end to his spree.

Hirschfeld was an advocate for pedophilia.

One particularly important personage in the Kinsey story is Herman B Wells (1902-2000), the long time University of Indiana chieftain. Wells was the son of a banker. After obtaining a baccalaureate in "business administration" and a Masters in economics, Wells worked as a field secretary for the Indiana Bankers Association between 1928 and 1937. His work had a major effect on the state's banking laws. In 1937, Wells obtained the presidency of the University of Indiana. He held the post until 1962. Crucially, during his tenure, Wells propped up Kinsey when the latter's perverse "research" attracted yet unwanted attention. The University of Indiana blossomed under Wells's guidance and became a major American educational institution.

The man's other appointments included: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; American Council on Education; U.S. delegate to the 12th General Assembly of the United Nations; Vice chairman, National Commission on Humanities, 1964-1965; Member, President's Committee on U.S.-Soviet Trade Relations, 1965.

It is worth repeating that Kinsey's funding came from the Rockefeller Foundation, which was interested in sex research.

Kinsey only hired people who agreed to give him their sexual histories. (Ch. 2, p. 29) "Even his coauthors had to agree to be filmed in intimate sexual situations on the Indiana campus and in Kinsey's attic." Even the Rockefeller foundation complained that Kinsey's gang lacked competence.

²For a quick introduction into the topic, look up the 2005 three-piece documentary *Legendary Sin Cities*. The series contains references to academic literature for further research. One can get an idea of what Paris was like from Hemingway, Scott Fitzgerald, and Miller's novels; for Berlin we have Aldous's pal Isherwood, on whose writings the movie *Cabaret* (1972) was based.

In particular, the group lacked a trained statistician. Though he engaged in wife-swapping and homosexual activities with his cronies, the publicity-aware Kinsey always made sure to portray his gang and himself as a group of model family-loving Americans.

Reisman identifies one Robert Yerkes as "Kinsey's Rockefeller Foundation mentor." Yerkes (1876-1956) was a hardcore eugenicist, (Wikipedia) "psychologist, ethologist, and primatologist." He was a Harvard PhD in psychology. His were the notorious WWI army intelligence tests, which conclusively "proved" that immigrants fresh from the boat are dumber than immigrants who have had the fortune to arrive some years earlier. Terrified by these remarkable results, Yerkes heroically fought "race deterioration." Yerkes was in charge of the National Research Council's (NRC) sex research operation, which collaborated closely with the Rockefeller Foundation.

When Kinsey's *Male* and *Female* sexuality books came out (1948, 1953 respectively), the Rockefeller combine exerted its influence to spread and popularize the works.

(Ch.2, p.37) Allen Wallis, past president of the American Statistical Association, recalls, "Yes, the book was promoted commercially in a big way and they were taking sort of a holier-than-thou attitude, saying we're not promoting it at all, it's just that the public is naturally interested in the subject."

More evidence can be found in the book to the effect that Kinsey's books had massive backing from the controlled media.

What did Kinsey's books say, and how "scientific" were they?

In Kinsey's Darwinian-behaviorist world, sexual behavior was a (Ch.3, p. 49) "closed Darwinian system of simple mammalian behavior: a stimulus provided, followed by a genital response, produces an orgasmic "outlet." Kinsey applied Pavlovian conditioning to sex, contending that *all* [emphasis in the original] sex is conditioned by environment, and that love, jealousy, fear, anger, shame, and similar emotions have no emotional meaning independent of sex. From the start, Kinsey denied explanations for human behavior that conflicted with his evolutionary assumptions."

Kinsey's "research" was, at best, classic behaviorism and complete bunk in terms of "science." But it was worse than that - it was a fraud.

To begin with, Kinsey's research was based on the "sexual histories" that he assiduously collected from everyone unfortunate enough to cross his path. Two problems arise: 1) those histories were totally subjective, and 2) where did Kinsey find his victims?

To get an idea of the character of Kinsey's data, consider this:

(Ch. 3, p. 50) For his database, Kinsey classified more than 1,400 criminals and sex offenders as "normal," on the grounds that such miscreants are essentially the same as normal men.

...

(p. 51, emphasis in original) It is unclear how many subjects - prisoners or otherwise - the Kinsey team surveyed. The map legend on page 5 of the 1948 *Male* volume claims that each of the 427 dots represents 50 or more interviewees, which would total 21,350 persons. Yet on page 10, Kinsey asserts that the final sum of his subjects is 12, 214. This leaves 9,136 (43 percent) of his "subjects" unaccounted for.

...

But in his 1949 review of the *Male* volume, W. Allen Wallis, University of Chicago statistician and past-president of the American Statistical Association, concluded that Kinsey interviewed a total of 4,120 men at most. ... This approximation is supported by former senior Kinsey team member William Simon, who had, with a colleague, sought (with little success) to clean up the Kinsey data for the Russell Sage Foundation. Simon told psychiatrist Arno Karlen that data from only 4,500 total males and females were actually used for the Kinsey studies. Karlen quotes Simon:

Kinsey interviewed 18,000 people and used only a quarter of the cases in his two reports. Some of the data are still on file, but haven't ever been coded on the IBM cards for statistical study yet.

So Kinsey blatantly and shamelessly cooked his data.

To recap, 1) Kinsey's assumptions were utterly absurd and completely outside the field of human reality; 2) his methodology was awful, his reports were highly subjective and untrustworthy, the claims of the "subjects" being impossible to check, and the incentive for lying being overwhelming; 3) the data was thoroughly cooked; 4) a huge proportion of Kinsey's male subjects were prisoners and sexual offenders, i.e. people unrepresentative of mainstream America; 5) Kinsey's team had no statistical expert of any sort.

Follows an excerpt from Reisman's quote of Dr. Albert Hobbs, a sociologist from the University of Pennsylvania:

(p. 54) Kinsey, in his studies of sexual behavior, violated all three of the precepts necessary to scientific procedure. He denied, flatly and repeatedly, that he had any hypothesis, insisting that he merely, in his words, "presented the facts." Yet to any observant reader, Kinsey obviously had a two-pronged hypothesis. He vigorously promoted, juggling his figures to do so, a hedonistic, animalistic conception of sexual behavior, while at the same time he consistently denounced all biblical and conventional conceptions of sexual behavior. He refused to publish his basic data. He kept secret not only his hypotheses, but also refused to present the basic facts on which his conclusions rested. He also refused to reveal the questionnaire which was the basis for all of his facts. In addition, it is possible to derive conclusions opposite to Kinsey's from his own data.

Another fascinating piece of information is the following (Reisman's words, now):

(p. 55) In 1954, the American Statistical Association (ASA) published *Statistical Problems of the Kinsey Report: A Report of the American Statistical Association Committee to Advise the National Research Council Committee for Research in Problems of Sex*, by Cochran, Mosteller, Tukey, and Jenkins. Jones documents the fact that the ASA yielded to unrelenting pressure from the Rockefeller Foundation and the National Research Council to alter their original conclusions that Kinsey's statistics were meaningless.

For further examples of Kinsey's fraud, refer to the original. In effect, Kinsey simply published the extremest conclusions he thought the public could possibly swallow, masking his "discoveries" with vague, unverifiable numbers, which were more or less arbitrary.

One branch of Kinsey's data requires special attention - namely, his child-research. Some of Kinsey's data came from the childhood memories of his interviewees; but those were not good enough for the noble professor, and he "sought more direct sources." Kinsey commented below a table in his book: "317 preadolescents who were either observed in self-masturbation or who were observed in contacts with other boys or older adults. [T]his is a record of a somewhat select group of younger males and not a statistical representation for any larger group." Kinsey had to do the "delicate job" of interviewing the children practically on his own. What, precisely, the research consisted of is unclear.

Another notable fact regarding Kinsey's methodology is his definition of marriage. For Kinsey, a married woman was any woman who had lived with a man for at least a year - and that included prostitutes. For Kinsey, "rape" and "criminals" did not exist, and child molesters were just "partners." Like his fellow behaviorists, Kinsey constantly abused language.

Gonzo Kinsey took a negative view of the cautious research of his colleague Havelock Ellis, whom Reisman describes as the "sex partner" of Margaret Sanger of Planned Parenthood. Ellis (1859-1939)

was a notable British sexologist and the first president of the English Eugenics Society.

Now, pornography was illegal in the United States until, roughly, *Playboy's* inception in 1953. *Playboy* only broke through on the basis of Kinsey's "research." Hefner was a great admirer of Kinsey. But back in the 1930s and 1940s, pornography was criminal. So what did Kinsey do? (Ch. 4) He constructed himself a sound-proof "laboratory" at the University of Indiana, which was in effect a porn-film studio. So, apart from his overt moral and intellectual crimes, Kinsey committed *legally punishable* crimes. And not once or twice by mistake, but repeatedly and with arrogance! Kinsey had another pornographic studio in his attic.

Among the films shot were pieces of sadomasochistic homosexual pornography.

Many of the wives of Kinsey's team members had the privilege of becoming pornstars.

To go back to the Rockefeller Foundation again - (p. 80) the head of its medical division (which was in charge of the Kinsey project) considered the financing of Kinsey "one of the most significant things we ever did."

(Ch. 7, p. 165) One of Kinsey's most outrageous crimes was his correspondence and abetting of the notorious Nazi child-murderer Dr. Fritz von Balluseck. The man was Gestapo, had tortured children in occupied Poland during the war, had managed to somehow evade the post-war purge, had continued his activities in post-war Germany, and had finally fallen into the hands of the law during the investigation of the brutal murder of a ten-year-old girl. The authorities managed to obtain Balluseck's diary. Its contents were beyond human.

Kinsey had corresponded with the Nazi animal, and refused to relinquish the letters upon request. The Kinsey reports are partly based on the "research" done by a Nazi war-criminal mass-murderer. Von Balluseck also committed incest.

(Ch. 9, p. 280) Kinsey was a devout admirer of Aleister Crowley, the noted pervert and lunatic.

Kinsey's Indiana Institute of Sex Research survives until today.³ A second Institute was formed at Berkeley in 1976 - the "Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality." It can bestow degrees. Its first head was Kinsey's top crony, Pomeroy.

What Kinsey's reports said is quite clear - everybody has sex with everybody and everything else all the time; sex is just fine and psychologically beneficial; marriage is meaningless; parenthood is meaningless; etc, etc. Among Kinsey's more insidious "findings" was the claim that humans are "naturally" bisexual. This does not make sense even in the evolutionary dreamworld, since males who managed to hit the right targets would have higher chances of "spreading their genes" - but never mind that. The idea that homosexuality is in any way "natural" is too absurd to argue. On top of his other manipulations of data, Kinsey explicitly sought homosexual "subjects," whom he listed as average members of the American population in his final report. Pure fraud.

Follows Reisman summary of Kinsey's findings:

(Ch. 7, p. 169) The Kinsey team contended that if Americans would follow their analysis of human sexual conduct, they would eventually arrive at a socio-sexual paradise. Here is a summary, prepared by this author, of the key findings that were to pave the way to Kinsey's nirvana:

- All orgasms are "outlets" and equal - whether between husband and wife; boy and dog; man and boy, girl, or baby - since there is no such thing as abnormality or normality.
- As the aim of coitus is orgasm, the more orgasms from any "outlet," at the earliest

³Current full name: "Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender, and Reproduction."

age, the healthier the person.

- Early masturbation is critical for sexual, physical, and emotional health. It can never be excessive or pathological.
- Sexual taboos and sex statutes are routinely broken, so they should be eliminated. That includes laws against rape and child rape, unless serious "force" is used and serious harm is proven.
- Since sex is, can be, and should be commonly shared with anyone and anything, jealousy is passé.
- All sexual experimentation before marriage will increase the likelihood of successful long-term marriage, while venereal diseases and other socio-sexual maladies will be reduced dramatically.
- Human beings are naturally bisexual. Religious bigotry and prejudice force people into chastity, heterosexuality, and monogamy.
- Children are sexual and potentially orgasmic from birth and are not harmed by "consensual" incest or sex with adults. Indeed, they often benefit from such practices.
- There is no medical or other reason for adult-child sex or incest to be forbidden.
- All forms of sodomy are natural and healthy.
- Homosexuals represent ten to thirty-seven percent of the population or more. (Kinsey's findings were fluid on this point.) Some educators have interpreted his findings to mean that only four to six percent of the population is exclusively heterosexual, so it is "heterosexual" bias that should be eliminated.

Each of these "findings," gleaned by Kinsey's reports, has been disproven by credible research and actual human experience over the past fifty years. Yet "accredited" AIDS and sex education in elementary, secondary, college, graduate, and post-graduate schools is almost predicated on the Kinseyan "variant" sex model.

In 1948, the Kinsey model began to permeate the educational establishment. It would indoctrinate doctors, teachers, ministers, social workers, attorneys, the military, and United States Supreme Court Justices.

For all practical purposes, Kinsey's fraud was the fundamental basis of the so-called "sexual revolution" in America - and since America is the cultural model for the world, for the whole "global" society. Kinsey's junk "science" enabled the whole gamut - the legalization of pornography, the debasement of the medical literature, the destruction of marriage, the hedonistic decoupling of sex from procreation and love, the rampant rise in the incidence of venereal disease, the introduction of "sex education" at the schools (the purposes of that scam is to *promote* promiscuity at an early age), the homosexualization of the population, the absurd creation of the "gender studies" pseudo-academic discipline, the abortion craze, etc, etc. Via systematic brainwashing on the part of the controlled foundations and mass-media, the Kinseyan cancer spread across the entire planet. The details can be found in Part III of Reisman's book. The usual suspects - in particular, the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations, and the Skull and Bones *Time-Life* - were prominent in the affair.

For example:

(Ch. 8, p. 205) How could a man who has been dead for over 40 years have an impact in America today? *Westlaw* is the most widely used database for legal cases and law review journals. A preliminary search for the years 1982-2000 yielded roughly 650 citations to "Alfred Kinsey." For comparison, citations for the famed Masters and Johnson sex research team during the same period turned up only 92 citations. The Kinsey list does not include the many additional cits to the ALI-MPC. Combining Kinsey's *Westlaw* citations with those located via the *Social Science Citation Index* and the *Science Citation*

Index yields a total of approximately 5,796 - compared to about 3,716 for Masters and Johnson. Kinsey is roughly double the citations for such luminaries as Sigmund Freud, Abraham Maslow and Margaret Mead.

... Moreover, articles citing to the MPC [Model Penal Code] are exponentially greater than the 650 direct citations to Kinsey. Lawyers and judges will cite the original "case" for authority, spinning off into copy-cat citations impossible to ascertain.

...

Kinsey's more than 6,000 citations in law, social science, and science journals attest to his considerable influence. But they do not indicate the extent to which his views have been further magnified by such key change agents as Ernst, Ploscowe, Wechsler, Tappan, Guttmacher, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Another interesting point is that

(Ch. 8, p. 220) ... Christenson [notes that] pre-Kinsey, the adulterous male or female spouse forfeited child custody, while dad supported his children in any case. Once "fault" was eliminated from custody proceedings, adulterous, promiscuous moms have retained custody of children while wronged father continues to pay child support. On the other hand, based on their higher incomes, under "no-fault" divorce, felons - even convicted incestuous fathers - have gotten custody of their children.

Christenson observes below that "no-fault divorce undermines rather than reinforces marriage as a social ideal." Of course it does - that is the exact goal! Successful marriage makes people stronger, and so it has to go. Atomized individuals are far, far easier to control and manipulate than nuclear families. Moreover, fewer marriages means fewer children.

The Rockefeller-Carnegie-funded ALI-MPC (American Law Institute - Model Penal Code) has been pushing for "normalizing" rape (p. 221); lowering the age of consent to ten (p. 233); normalizing pedophilia (p. 235); abortions of all sorts (o. 246-); etc. We will briefly look at pedophilia and the age of consent in the next subsection.

Follows a Reisman quote from the documentary *The Kinsey Syndrome* (around the 2 hours 21 minutes mark):

When the Vatican II comes through, and the whole notion of liberalizing the Church emerges, this group of sexologists - or psychologists who are trained by them - go into the clergy, goes into the Catholic Church, to help decide who makes a good priest. They throw out all the orthodox applicants, and people who kind of are unsure - or who are very sure, who are rather homosexual or something - they get put through - and the folks who are not quite as stable in a way, in terms of their orthodoxy - they are permitted into the clergy to a great extent. And several of our key dioceses, the training places, where the clergy are trained, bring in - pornography! From the Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality. Trained priests the same way the medical profession has been trained. Desensitizing the priests on issues of homosexuality, and promiscuity, and bisexuality, and everything else, using that pornography, to desensitize them, and condition them, and in many cases - to seduce them.

The reader can draw the necessary connections.

In chapters 9 and 10 of her work, Reisman establishes the link with the eugenicists. The cast in her horror show features our perennial favorites plus too many petty others to bother to list.

In summary: 1) Kinsey was a criminal and a pervert; 2) his research was pure, transparent fraud; 3) he was funded by the foundations, particularly the Rockefellers; 4) his "findings" were spectacularly

publicized using the controlled press and the foundations; 5) the entire field of sexology was spawned by two types: a) pathological basket-cases, patsies, psychopaths, and true-believers like Kinsey, and b) gurus of eugenics like Havelock Ellis; 6) the cumulative snowball effect of the Kinsey affair has had a colossal detrimental effect on American and world society.

Reisman's works are evidently having an effect, in light of the release of the 2004 hagiographic biopic on the maddoc, *Kinsey*.

The Kinsey affair is notable in being a definitive example of covert social engineering in the 20th century. The eugenicists invented sexology, they found a useful idiot like Kinsey and build him up into a "scientific" authority, they used the Kinseyan legacy to surreptitiously propagate their agenda via the media and the foundations, and they turned society on its head.

Moreover, the goals of the eugenicists were blatant and clearly stated in print. By definition, they wanted to get the underclasses to have fewer babies. Next, they wanted to break the family in order to more easily indoctrinate and control people. Aldous Huxley was explicit on this:

(*Brave New World Revisited* (1958), Ch. 3) It is worth remarking that, in 1984, the members of the Party are compelled to conform to a sexual ethic of more than Puritan severity. In *Brave New World*, on the other hand, all are permitted to indulge their sexual impulses without let or hindrance. The society described in Orwell's fable is a society permanently at war, and the aim of its rulers is first, of course, to exercise power for its own delightful sake and, second, to keep their subjects in that state of constant tension which a state of constant war demands of those who wage it. By crusading against sexuality the bosses are able to maintain the required tension in their followers and at the same time can satisfy their lust for power in a most gratifying way. The society described in *Brave New World* is a world-state, in which war has been eliminated and where the first aim of the rulers is at all costs to keep their subjects from making trouble. This they achieve by (among other methods) legalizing a degree of sexual freedom (made possible by the abolition of the family) that practically guarantees the Brave New Worlders against any form of destructive (or creative) emotional tension. In 1984 the lust for power is satisfied by inflicting pain; in *Brave New World*, by inflicting a hardly less humiliating pleasure.

The excerpt was worth reprinting. Huxley plainly describes exactly what the Anglo-Americans were doing at the time when he wrote his book. This is Huxley, the grandson of Darwin's Bulldog, the brother of the founder of UNESCO, the founding-father of LSD abuse, and the insider of and the spokesman for the British Oligarchy. *Brave New World* always was the end-goal, and the Oligarchs are working toward it with much success.

Moreover, in light of this obvious example of social engineering, the fact that pseudo-scientific frauds can become commonplace wisdom sheds light on Darwinism, AGW, neo-liberal economics, and so on and so forth. Yes, a ridiculous scam *can* conquer the academic ivory tower and the public mass-mind. We have described the mechanism of control repeatedly, with many examples. Yes, the Oligarchs are power-mad eugenicists. Yes, they are pushing for a Brave New World Order.

10.1.2 The Fallout

Let us go over a few matters that should be plain, and then look at some statistics.

To begin with, men and women arrive on the world scene in about equal numbers. Why this is is irrelevant to the present discussion. There are about as many men as there are women. So one man per woman makes perfect sense. Monogamy in the sense of sticking to one person is not some random moral anachronism, but how things are.

From there on, should people stick together for good, or should couples separate under certain conditions? In light of such phenomenons as jealousy, the feeling of betrayal at the discovery of one's partner's infidelity, children's need for role models of the both sexes, etc, it is clear that it is preferable that people should stay together. But misfortunes occur, and staying together is not always possible, and so, for better or for worse, there is divorce. Fair enough.

Now, what are the effects of promiscuity? Venereal diseases spread more quickly and more widely, the ability to bond with the other sex decreases, the fetishization of the other sex and of sex itself occurs, marriages become more prone to disintegration, more children grow-up in unstable or single parent homes, and so on.

In regard to the last point, children learn by imitation. A child needs both a male and a female role model to, literally, figure out what men and women are about. Single-parent or single-sex parents households are no good. Extended family households provide multiple role-models for the maturing infant. Moreover, children need contact with adults. Keep them with other children and they will grow up infantile - which is a major problem with school. Furthermore, school-teachers can end up assuming the role of remote, surrogate, overbusy parents, which can present problems.

Sex is a part of life and a wonderful part at that - fine! But, as people have known for centuries, there are very good reasons for insisting on monogamy and fidelity. This is not to say that society should necessarily lynch the adulterous and the nymphomaniacs, or despise or ostracise them - but surely it is not a good idea to actively promote rampant sex? Have risqué movies and literature, ignore exhibitionistic adultery, and so on, but is there a reason, other than insanity and deliberate sabotage, to make the whole thing look like a good idea? This is a serious problem infecting the entire modern society.

Then there is pornography. The argument has been made that pornography is "free speech." Then how come it was not free speech before the 1950s? A century and a half of first amendment, and nobody thought of the right to print pornography? Ridiculous. Of course, the purpose of pornography is to sexualize the population at an early age, and to obsess the horny young with sex so that they become good Brave New Worlders. This is obvious, and pornography should probably be censored. What good is there in it? Let there be quasi-pornography of the pre-Hays code semi-subtle Hollywood style, or of the Pre-Raphaelite type - but what good could possibly come out of *Hustler* and *Penthouse*?

I suppose I should disclose that, yes, I have watched pornography; yes, it is addictive; and yes, in retrospect, seeing the stuff in the first place was not a good idea. But then, I doubt that there are many people with access to Internet, especially among men, who have failed to find some pornography. This is natural - humans are interested in sex.

With the Internet around, parents' control over the influx of pornography is severely limited. I doubt that a clever child could not find ways to bypass a pornography filter. Moreover, the child can trivially obtain pornography from friends at school. So the only defence for those serious about protecting their children from the pornographic menace is home school plus a limitation of the child's access to computers. This is a sensible approach, and many are taking it. After all, people somehow managed to live without computers until 20 years ago.

The alternative is to tell the child that pornography is stupid and lame, and forget about the whole thing. Let the youngster show some responsibility. Too much discussion on the issue will have an effect opposite to the intended.

Besides, let us suppose for the sake of argument that straight, pedestrian, one-on-one porn is a fair deal. The problem is that some of the stuff out there beggars belief! Look up Part 2 of Pulitzer winner Chris Hedges's *Empire of Illusion* (2009). It will tell you that:

There are some 13,000 porn films made every year in the United States, most in the San Fernando Valley in California. According to the Internet Filter Review, worldwide porn revenues, including in-room movies at hotels, sex clubs, and the ever-expanding e-sex world, topped \$97 billion in 2006. That is more than the revenues of Microsoft, Google,

Amazon, eBay, Yahoo!, Apple, Netflix, and EarthLink combined. Annual sales in the United States are estimated at \$10 billion or higher. There is no precise monitoring of the porn industry. And porn is very lucrative to some of the nation's largest corporations. General Motors owns DIRECTV, which distributes more than 40 million streams of porn into American homes every month. AT&T Broadband and Comcast Cable are currently the biggest American companies accommodating porn users with the Hot Network, Adult Pay Per View, and similarly themed services. AT&T and GM rake in approximately 80 percent of all porn dollars spent by consumers.

So the *AT&T* and *GM* conglomerates once aided the Nazis and now make billions from pornography. Selling sex-media over the Internet is a wonderful way of making profits: production costs are near zero. Practically the whole revenue is a profit. The addiction feeds the demand. The peddling of pornography is the artificial manufacturing of demand of the highest order.

Next,

The largest users of Internet porn are between the ages of twelve and seventeen. And porn producers increasingly target adolescents. "The age demographic has moved downwards, especially in the UK and Europe," explained Steve Honest, the European director of production for Bluebird Films. "Porn is the new rock and roll. Young people and women are embracing porn and making purchases. Porn targets the mid-teens to the mid-twenties and up."

This is normal in the context of the for-profit monetize-everything terminally consumptionist modern society. Once this generation grows up and takes over, who knows, maybe the pedophiles will finally have their day.

Follows a description of the glamorous lifestyle of the pornstar:

She ["Nadia Styles"] had been promised \$1,000 for her first film. She was handed \$600 when the scene was done. She also contracted gonorrhea. Porn stars are tested for HIV and sexually transmitted diseases once a month, but "people do so many scenes between tests that a month is a long time." She began, once she had treated her gonorrhea, to do films three or four times a month. She would have several more bouts with gonorrhea and other sexually transmitted diseases during her career. She got pregnant and had an abortion. The demands on her began to escalate. She was filmed with multiple partners. Her scenes became "extremely rough. They would pull my hair, slap me around like a rag doll."

"The next day my whole body would ache," she recalls. "It happened a lot, the aching. It used to be that only a few stars, people like Linda Lovelace, would once do things like anal. Now it is expected."

But what the viewer sees is just good clean fun.

There is the precious cinematic practice of "ATM." The M is for "mouth."

Back in the 1970s, porn was relatively simple and, shall we say, prudish. But materialistic hedonism of the Benthamite variety works as follows: pleasure is only relative. People are adaptable - a person submerged in a state of constant pleasure will soon begin to regard his predicament as normalcy. Thus, to feel pleasure again, the person would require a more extreme stimulus, perhaps combined with pain to relieve the boredom which results from mistaking necessities for desires. In pornographic terms, hardcore porno started out simple in the 1970s, and has been getting progressively worse, until today the Internet has vast doses of everything you can imagine and more.

Now, pornography is something the feminists ought to be screaming about. It is one place where they can really do some good. The female pornstars are something between punching bags and pinholders. Many of them develop shellshock and descend into drug-addled catatonia. Alcohol abuse is universal. The male pornstars are often women-haters and develop various problems with their

organs. There is no need to go into the details. Venereal disease is king in the porno industry. But of course, this rarely reaches the screen after the make-up, the lighting, and the cutting.

Then there is gangbang porn, of which Hedges gives a rather candid example: a girl and sixty-five suitors have a pool-party. Hedges looks at the act with a war-correspondent's eye, it is unbelievable and awful. That kind of stuff should be criminal. Porn-peddlers go in the slammer once in a while when they really overdo it, but by and large, anything goes. Free speech and all that.

According to a pornstar Hedges interviewed, 90% of the girls were also prostitutes. Of course, pornography annihilates the line of legality between prostitution and casual sex. Today most cell phones have cameras. So all a prostitute has to do is get a permit for shooting pornography, if even that. And voila - she is not a prostitute - she is an actress and an entrepreneur.

And through the lense of the camera, this type of travesty acquires the dressings of respectability and normality. People internalize the pornography. The implications are colossal. Internet-driven pornucopia has been metastasising for more than a decade. Before that there were the video cassettes, which were limited at least in some degree. But now the floodgates have opened. We can say that Victorian prudishness is bad; and perhaps society should have a debonair attitude toward sex - but I do not see any remotely reasonable argument in defence of the type of pornographic tsunami that is drowning the modern world. How can you have a society with this going on in the background? Worse, we may well have passed the point of no return. How can the Internet pornography be regulated in any meaningful way? There always being the Kinseyan crowd quietly pushing forward from the murky recesses of their foundations.

Most likely, a segment of society will, at some point, react very strongly against the tidal wave of pornography. People will start dropping off the Internet and locking their computers in the attics. How widespread such a movement could become is debatable. What is clear is that modern society faces yet another grave problem.

Let us quickly summarize modern ultra-feminism. Henry Makow, the author of *Cruel Hoax* (2007), is an expert on the subject.

As we have seen, modern feminism is the handwork of the Rockefeller gang and their various allies, and is, largely, a social engineering operation designed at smashing the family, taxing the housewives, and better indoctrinating the children.

Now, it is common knowledge that decades ago women were repressed to some degree. That is disgusting and was justifiably condemned and resisted. But modern feminism has crossed boundaries it should have stayed away from. Modern feminism is anti-feminine. Housekeeping and childrearing are not merely honorable and difficult "jobs" - they are absolutely necessary! Selling the notion that women should realize themselves professionally by out-competing the men is insane and insulting to women. It implies that housekeeping and childrearing are pathetic activities unworthy of strong women. What a farce - who is supposed to look after the children and do the cooking, then? Someone has to do it - who will? If nobody cooks at home, a couple ends up having to eat outside - and somebody has to cook for them and serve them - and who is that someone but the duped former housewife out in the world to make a career for herself? The whole thing is ridiculous. Moreover, flipping burgers may nominally raise the GDP, but it does not increase the prosperity of the nation - on the contrary. The difference between cooking at home and cooking at the burger-joint, is that the former can be pleasant and builds up relationships, while the latter can only be boring and divides the family; and of course the former is non-taxable and non-monetizable, while the latter is both.

Nor is housekeeping any sort of a dead-end. Cleaning the house need not take all day. In the spare time, the housewife can do whatever she wants - art? Let her practice drawing or the piano! Academia? Let her read books. Sport? Let the woman do gymnastics. Let her study and take the bar exam. There is a plethora of things she can do. The idea that college or a corporate job are

necessary for personal development is false.

At the same time, given maternity leaves, women can pursue prestigious careers. Take the academia. There is nothing to stop a woman from doing research while on maternity leave! She can catch up on her teaching duties once her primary, maternal, duties have been fulfilled. But society has to make sure mothers have the opportunity to raise their children - and modern American society fails in that regard.

Then there is the notion of women competing with men - what an absurdity! Men are physically stronger and more aggressive than women and thus better (on the average) at all jobs requiring strength or aggression. Why compete? Open up the colleges and let women do whatever they want - but why make a race out of it, and scream about discrimination?

But the more serious problem is that by making women compete with men, the feminists insult the femininity of women and the masculinity of men. Without going into the details, it is fairly obvious that women in the Western world, and particularly in North America, are becoming more masculine, while the men are becoming more feminine. There are other, non-psychological, more sinister yet reasons for this, as we will see soon; but the process is evident. And it is pure folly. Women and men are fundamentally different psychologically and physiologically. They should have different roles in society. The idea of somehow trying to make them equal in the full sense of the word is absurd. Equal before the law - fine. But equality in all regards is impossible without synthesizing the male and the female, which can lead, and has led, only to trouble.

In its extremes, ultra-feminism promotes frank man-hatred and extreme "sister-love," i.e. lesbianism. So now feminism has gone from justifiably condemning ultra-patriarchal abuse, to promoting man-hating. What a farce!

Lest someone interprets the above as some kind of a "patriarchal" or "misogynistic" diatribe, let us ask: How is flipping burgers or droning away inside the corporate cubicle better than keeping house? Moreover, somebody has to keep the house; the husband can mow the lawn and do woodwork and so on, but the women are the ones endowed with the maternal instinct. This is basic stuff everybody knew half a century ago!

And of course, any kind of spouse-abuse - violent or psychological - is despicable and not really unworthy of discussion.

In regard to homosexuality - there is nothing "natural" about it. Humans have sexual organs designed for highly specific purposes. Putting them in the wrong places is not a good idea. The notion of arguing that homosexuality is anything but an aberration beggars belief. How can people take this stuff at all seriously?

Now, violence against homosexuals is criminal like any other unprovoked violence. Nothing to talk about here.

Next, there is the issue of discrimination. Homosexuals complain about being discriminated against. One has to ask - how do people tell that a person is gay so they can discriminate against him? Because if one insists on being tolerated in exhibiting a behavior objectionable to most, one's case is very weak. On the other hand, obviously, mistreating somebody on the suspicion of his homosexuality or whatever else, is mean-spiritedness and prejudice, and is a personal rather than social problem. Society can not go around sanctioning every heel. The situation becomes impossible when the television propaganda machine keeps pumping out conflicting messages; and these days the messages are becoming overtly pro-homosexual.

In fact, if any piece of media crosses the always rising line of political correctness, barrages and salvos of judgemental anger arrive from all directions. It is blatantly obvious that homosexuality is being promoted - look at the *Simpsons* episode on the subject (8.15 - *Homer's Phobia*), and at the TV show *Will and Grace* (1998-2006). Now, Dr. Richard Day told Dr. Dunegan why this is happening, and we have had mountains of evidence confirming the allegations made in *New Order of the Barbarians*. The Malthusians and the eugenicists want to promote homosexuality so that people have fewer babies and so that the "inferior" types dumb enough to fall for homosexuality - their words, not mine! - unbreed themselves out of the so-called gene pool. The Malthusians know

homosexuality is aberrant! And so do we, for that matter.

Promoting homosexuality is also a blatant attack on the family. This is clear in the ongoing debate about "gay marriage." "Gay marriage" is a contradiction in terms. Marriage means and has always meant the union between a man and a woman. Redefining the term to mean "union between consenting adults" or whatever else *kills the original meaning of the word and damages the underlying concept*. There can not be a "gay marriage" - it is absurd, impossible to seriously consider! Makow has pointed out that gays *do not want to marry anyway*. In those places where "gay marriage" was legalized, what happened? The bulk of the gays - 86% to 98%⁴ did not get married even when they could. That is because most gays are promiscuous and often change partners. Why on Earth would anyone in his right mind want to undermine the institution of marriage for the benefit of, what, less than 0.1% of the population? If the left-wing feely-touchy pseudo-socialists want to help the gays, let them create the following new social institution: Gayage. It can offer tax benefits and whatever else the legal advantages of marriage are.

Then there is criminal idea of letting homosexual couples adopt children. This is insane. If lesbians want to have children, let them read a biology textbook and figure out how the process goes and follow the correct steps. As for the gays, no children for them. Single-parent households are bad enough; double-single parent households are too much. Forget the "rights" of the gays - what about the rights of the children?

What causes the aberration of homosexuality? There can be two causes: psychological imbalance and physiological imbalance. In regard to the former, a society, which promotes homosexuality, will obviously produce homosexuals, since children learn to a large degree by mimicking.

Then there is hormonal imbalance.

Mercury causes homosexuality in male ibises

Nature, 1 December 2010⁵

Exposure to mercury pollution could be hitting some wild birds' reproductive prospects hard by causing males to pair with other males.

American white ibises (*Eudocimus albus*) from south Florida that consumed methylmercury (MeHg), the most toxic and easily absorbed form of mercury found in the environment, were more likely to engage in same-sex pairings - a phenomenon unknown in wild populations of this species with no exposure to the pollutant.

...

So for the ibises 1) poison causes homosexuality, and 2) homosexuality is not normal. Does the same hold for humans? Yes. We will look at the various ways, in which people are poisoned these days, a section or two below.

Gayness is not "natural." If a few people are "born" gay, that is either because 1) they were poisoned in the womb or in their youths; or 2) they were subjected to brainwashing while at a susceptible age. This is a public health problem, not a social "rights" issue.

Besides, arguing on obvious first principles with brainwashed people will not work, and the brainwash jobs are not to blame - we were all brainwashed, and it takes a huge effort and a great deal of luck to get past the conditioning. The correct argument in this situation is to point out that the whole "gay rights" farce stems from the fraudulent research of Kinsey.

The eugenicists, it is always the eugenicists in action! Consider the following (emphasis mine):⁶

⁴Search "Study Assesses How Many Gays Marry if Legal" or something along those lines.

⁵<http://www.nature.com/news/2010/101201/full/news.2010.641.html>, Jan 11, 2012.

⁶Thanks to Henry Makow (*Homosexual Adoption is Child Abuse*) and "The Independent Revolutionary Times" blog for the reference; the document quoted is known as the "Jaffe-Berelson memo".

U.S. Population Growth and Family Planning: A Review of the Literature

Robin Elliott, Lynn C. Landman, Richard Lincoln, Theodore Tsuoroka

Family Planning Perspectives, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Oct., 1970), pp. i-xvi

Guttmacher Institute

...

(p.ix) Examples of Proposed Measures to Reduce U.S. Fertility, by Universality or Selectivity of ImpactUniversal Impact - Social Constraints:

- Restructure family: a) Postpone or avoid marriage; b) Alter image of ideal family size
- Compulsory education of children
- **Encourage increased homosexuality**
- Educate for family limitation
- Fertility control agents in water supply
- **Encourage women to work**

Selective Impact Depending on Socio-Economic Status - Economic Deterrents/Incentives:

- Modify tax policies: a) Substantial marriage tax; b) Child tax; c) Tax married more than single; d) Remove parents' tax exemption; e) Additional taxes on parents with more than 1 or 2 children in school
- Reduce/eliminate paid maternity leave or benefits
- Reduce/eliminate children's or family allowances
- Bonuses for delayed marriage and greater child-spacing
- Pensions for women of 45 with less than N children
- Eliminate Welfare payments after first 2 children
- Chronic Depression
- Require women to work and provide few child care facilities
- Limit/eliminate public-financed medical care, scholarships, housing, loans and subsidies to families with more than N children

Selective Impact Depending on Socio-Economic Status - Social Controls:

- Compulsory abortion of out-of-wedlock pregnancies
- Compulsory sterilization of all who have two children except for a few who would be allowed three
- Confine childbearing to only a limited number of adult
- Stock certificate-type permits for children
- Housing Policies: a) Discouragement of private ownership; b) Stop awarding public housing based on family size

Measures Predicated on Existing Motivation to Prevent Unwanted Pregnancy:

- Payments to encourage sterilization
- Payments to encourage contraception
- Payments to encourage abortion
- Abortion and sterilization on demand
- Allow certain contraceptives to be distributed non-medically

- Improve contraceptive technology
- Make contraception truly available and accessible to all
- Improve maternal health care, with family planning as a core element

The Guttmacher Institute was created in 1968 as a "semi-autonomous division of The Planned Parenthood Federation of America" to "advance sexual and reproductive health." Planned Parenthood always was and still is a eugenicist flagship with massive foundation support. The proposals listed above were made in earnest. The current "Science Czar" in the Obama White House, John Holdren, wrote a book along the same lines.

So, yes, they are deliberately promoting homosexuality as a "eugenical" means of curbing population growth. Yes, they invented ultra-feminism to swindle women into joining the wage-slave workforce. This has nothing to do with misogyny or with "homophobia" - it never did, that was never the point. It is one thing to be a "homophobe" and to hate specific people for their "sexual orientation," but quite another to be against "homosexuality" as a principle without imputing anything on particular individuals. Thus we could have a person of atheistic convictions who interacts with and befriends the believers around him.

Most of the remaining points on the list above hardly require any elaboration - though the "make housing more expensive" and "chronic depression" ones arouse suspicion. The housing boom, for example, was an obvious bubble, which made housing unaffordable to the student-loan-debt crushed young people. And with the Second Great Depression around, many politicians say that people will have to suffer for a while, as if the Depression is a punishment from the Holy Free Market. Why suffer? Why not fix things?

To summarize regarding homosexuality: 1) it is not "natural," it is an aberration stemming from psychological or physiological imbalances; 2) homosexuals should not be persecuted or bothered - but they in turn should not wear their homosexuality out on their sleeves; 3) "gay marriage" is a patent absurdity and an attack on the concept of marriage between a man and a woman; 4) as Makow correctly puts it, child adoption by homosexual couples is child abuse; 5) homosexuality is being promoted by our eugenicist/Malthusian hidden overlords for obvious reasons.

Next let us look at "abortion." Abortion means infanticide. I would not dream of condemning the women who have suffered abortion - the process would be horror enough in itself. Nor would I argue here that abortion should be strictly illegal or that abortionists should be punished by the law of the land - that is a subject beyond the present discussion.

The problem is that abortion is infanticide. Perhaps a society is justified in practising infanticide in certain circumstances, though I have troubles coming up with a non-trivial example I can myself respect. But one should ask: how does drowning a one day old baby constitute murder, while sucking out the brains of a three-month-old fetus does not? "Intact dilation and extraction," a.k.a. "partial birth abortion" is indescribably ugly, but was legal in the United States for a while, before the Bush Senate banned it in 2003.

For the quick lowdown on abortion, look up the Guttmacher Institute's pamphlet *Facts on Induced Abortion In the United States*. The following figures are from the August 2011 version of the pamphlet.

In 2006, 1.5% of the abortions in the United States flushed out fetuses older than 21 weeks. Now, James Elgin Gill of Canada was born prematurely on 20 May 1987 in Ottawa, Canada. He had had 21 weeks and 5 days worth of gestation. Supposing the laws in the US and Canada were the same, James would have been protected by the law outside of his mother's womb, but not inside the womb. How does this make any sense? A person of 21 weeks of gestation is either a human being or not. James provides the counter-example to the claim that 21 week old fetuses are not fully human. Legalisms and nominalisms aside, he was a human being. Therefore, ignoring abortions induced by

the mother's health, 1.5% of the 2006 abortions in the United States were blatant murders. There are more than a million abortions annually, meaning that in excess of 15,000 legal murders were committed in the United States in 2006.

Let us stop and try to assimilated that number. For comparison, there were about 1,250 executions in the United States between Jan 1, 1976, and Jan 1, 2012.⁷ Some liberals protest against the death penalty, and for good reason - while the argument that those who kill in cold blood forfeit their lives is reasonable if harsh, the problem with the death penalty arises from human error: if it can be shown that there are cases, in which an innocent person went to the gallows, then the death penalty should be abolished - and there are plenty of such cases.

Fine; but where are the liberals when it comes to abortion? They are for it, because they conflate abortion with women's rights! Never mind the women - what about the babies? How can one argue against the death penalty, but for abortion, when every year more than 15,000 post-21-weeks abortions occur, and there have been cases of children born around the 21 weeks mark? This is classic cognitive dissonance/ double-think, and a blatant example of the effects of systematic brainwashing. Furthermore, the number of victims on 9/11 was about 3,000. In the same year, assuming the 2001 numbers were similar to the ones in 2006, more than 15,000 infants were systematically murdered with the full backing of the law. In consequence of 9/11, the United States went to war and slaughtered thousands of Afghans in a Nuremberg-level war-crime. And yet the abortions continue!

Speaking of Nuremberg, it has been argued that the tribunal regarded the Nazi program for the promotion of non-Aryan abortions as a crime against humanity. See, for example, the papers written on the subject by Dr. John Hunt.⁸

Some more numbers from the Guttmacher paper:

- Nearly half of pregnancies among American women are unintended, and about four in 10 of these are terminated by abortion. Twenty-two percent of all pregnancies (excluding miscarriages) end in abortion.
- At least half of American women will experience an unintended pregnancy by age 45, and, at current rates, one in 10 women will have an abortion by age 20, one in four by age 30 and three in 10 by age 45.
- Eighteen percent of U.S. women obtaining abortions are teenagers; ... Women in their 20s account for more than half of all abortions; women aged 20-24 obtain 33% of all abortions, and women aged 25-29 obtain 24%.
- Thirty-seven percent of women obtaining abortions identify as Protestant and 28% as Catholic.
- Forty-two percent of women obtaining abortions have incomes below 100% of the federal poverty level (\$10,830 for a single woman with no children). Twenty-seven percent of women obtaining abortions have incomes between 100-199% of the federal poverty level. [So 69% of abortions occur to women with an income of below \$21,660.]
- Three-fourths of women cite concern for or responsibility to other individuals; three-fourths say they cannot afford a child; three-fourths say that having a baby would interfere with work, school or the ability to care for dependents; and half say they do not want to be a single parent or are having problems with their husband or partner.
- Nearly 60% of women who experienced a delay in obtaining an abortion cite the time it took to make arrangements and raise money. ... In 2009, the average amount paid for a nonhospital abortion with local anesthesia at 10 weeks' gestation was \$451.
- In 2008, 1.21 million abortions were performed, down from 1.31 million in 2000. However, between 2005 and 2008, the long-term decline in abortions stalled. From 1973 through 2008, nearly 50 million legal abortions occurred.

⁷See this: <http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/executions-year>, accessed Jan 11, 2012.

⁸For example, look up the paper called *Abortion and the Nuremberg Prosecutors: a Deeper Analysis*.

The 28% of "Catholics" who support abortion should be aware that Canon 1398 automatically excommunicates anyone who procures an abortion. The Church postulates that life begins at conception.

Evidently, abortions *target the poor*. The larger question must be asked - how can a developed modern society possibly have people who "can not afford to have children"? Something is deeply wrong.

And we know *exactly* what is wrong. The abortionist craze was, from the start, a Malthusian-eugenicist mass-murder campaign. Planned Parenthood was a eugenicist front from its inception! It is that simple! Women's "rights" and "choice" have absolutely nothing to do with it. "Rights" and "choice" are pleasant-sounding slogans to entice the more "liberal"-minded.

Abortion is eugenicist driven mass infanticide. Fifty million abortions have taken place in the United States since *Roe v. Wade* in 1973. The popular opinion on the issue of abortion is split into two about equal halves. The reader can draw his own further conclusions.

Follow some additional post-Kinsey statistics.

On the decline of marriage:⁹ The proportion of never married Americans has risen from 15% in 1960 to 27% in 2008. The proportion of married people has fallen from 72% in 1960 to 52% in 2008. The proportion of widowed people has stayed steady at around 7-9%. The higher one's education, the more likely one is to marry. 39% of the population thinks that marriage is becoming "obsolete." At the same time, only 4% of the people think that the rise in single-parent households is good. 24% think it does not make a difference, and 24% think the development is a bad thing.

Since the Rockefellers kicked off their neo-feminism in 1975, the share of mothers in the work force has risen from 47% to 71%. The rate peaked around 2000, and has remained steady since then. "Illegitimate" children accounted for 5% of the births in 1960, but 29% of the births in 2008.

On the homosexualization of America (and by proxy, the Western world):¹⁰ The official "estimate" for the "LGBT" (lesbian-gay-bisexual-transgender) proportion of the population of America is 3.5%, but the real figures are more likely in the 1-2% range. In adherence with the program of squeezing the heartland between the coasts, elucidated by Dr Day to Dr Dunegan, the "gayest" (Wikipedia figures; must be overestimates) American cities are San Francisco (15% gay), Seattle (13% gay), and Boston (12% gay). New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, Phoenix, San Diego, and Dallas are 5-7% gay. Atlanta and Minneapolis are also gayer than 10% gay.

Now, these statistics demolish the claim that homosexuality is "genetic," i.e. "natural." If homosexuality were natural or genetic, the rate of incidence of homosexuality would be evenly spread - and it is not. The explanations that homosexuals flee to the gay ghettos does not suffice. Moreover, it is more likely that the converse process takes place - homosexuality spreads away from the so-called "LGBT communities."

Homophiles claim that the findings indicating that homosexuals are more likely to commit acts of violence, to catch STDs, etc, are mythical. This is not entirely true. The following information can be gleaned from the 1979 book *The Gay Report* by gay activists Karla Jay and Allen Young.¹¹ Gays are indeed significantly more promiscuous than heterosexuals. Moreover, homosexuals engage in orgies, acts of sadomasochism, etc, at rates far higher than those of the average population. Specifically, quoting Rogers:

Accusations of promiscuity had long been levelled at the gay community. As Jay and

⁹Taken from Pew Research: <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1802/decline-marriage-rise-new-families>, Jan 12, 2012.

¹⁰Data taken from Wikipedia's *LGBT demographics of the United States* page. The figures are generally referenced to academic papers.

¹¹As reviewed here by Gregory Rogers: <http://www.narth.com/docs/reporton.html>, Jan 12, 2012.

Young's research indicates, these fears were justified. According to the study, 35% of respondents admitted to having had 100 or more different sexual partners throughout their lives (p.249); 18% admitted to having had between seven and 60 such partners in the previous month alone (p. 248), and 18% to having had three or more in the previous week (p. 248). 38% said the longest relationship they had ever had did not last longer than a year (p. 340). For lesbians the average relationship lasted 38 months (p. 302). In answer to the question "how often do you go home to have sex with someone you have just met?" a total of 50% answered under the "always," "very frequently" or "somewhat frequently category" (p. 251). Jay and Young sum up, "Clearly, then, the one-night stand is within the experience of an overwhelming majority of gay men" (p. 252). Furthermore, 77% of respondents had taken part in "threesomes" at least once, while 59% had taken part in orgies or group sex (p. 587). 38% had partaken of sadomasochistic practices at least once and 23% had practiced urination in association with sex (p. 555). 24% admitted to having been paid for sex (p. 260).

What are the corresponding average numbers for the overall population? Robert J. Samuelson of the *Washington Post* tells us that:¹²

Jan. 11 2010

You may think that the last place to find a portrait of a nation is a book full of numbers. But turn to page 673 of the *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, and you find these intriguing figures.

...

And sex? The stat abstract has that, too. Among men 15-44, the median number of sexual partners in their lifetimes is 5.4. Almost a quarter of men (22.6 percent) say they've had 15 or more partners. Among women, the median number of partners is 3.3, and almost a tenth (9.2 percent) say they've had 15 or more partners.

The numbers speak for themselves.

Homosexuals tend to belong to the more thoroughly brainwashed ("college educated"), better paid segment of the population. The study found that 60% had college degrees.

Writes Rogers, in regard to pedophilia and bestiality.

Rumours of pedophilia and child molestation by gays have also long persisted. In the study, 23% of respondents admitted to having had sex with youths aged 13-15 (p. 275), while 19% felt positive about sexual activity within this age group (p. 276).

Also noteworthy is that 13.5% of respondents admitted to being guilty of bestiality (p. 555). Gay publication *Fag Rag* ran an article entitled "Bestiality as an Act of Revolution" (p. 567). (At this point I should say that there are a number of quotes on the matter by respondents on pages 567-568, but I will not tarnish these pages by citing them, surely in St. Paul's words "too shameful to mention in secret.")

...

Interestingly enough, 50% of male respondents had had their first sexual experience aged 15 or less (p. 107). The figure is 20% for lesbians (p. 52). This, of course, points toward an environmental cause of homosexuality, implying that homosexual development might come about as a result of being abused at a young age and is the result of stunted emotional/psychological development, rather than having a genetic root. It could also account for the relatively high level among gays of sexual interest in teenagers, the theory running that, having been abused at so early an age, gays did not develop emotionally past that age, and so are attracted to persons of a like young age. Notably, in the study

¹²<http://www.deseretnews.com/article/705357560/The-US-Statistical-Abstract-has-things-to-tell-us-will-we-listen.html?pg=2>, Jan 12, 2012.

many gays reported negative feelings in their first sexual encounter, which later became more positive (p. 107).

On mental instability:

The study contributed little to the question of psychological/emotional problems among gays. However, it did indicate that a full 40% had either attempted or seriously contemplated suicide, with the figure at 39% for lesbians (p. 728). 12% of male gays and 18% of lesbians were currently seeing a psychologist or psychiatrist for any reason (p. 722).

This strongly suggests that homosexuality is indeed a "mental illness."

The numbers come from an academic-level report endorsed by the gay community! There is no reason to expect things to be much different today. Let us stress again that condemning homosexuality is separate from hating homosexuals. The so-called "LGBT" people are victims more than anything else. Moreover - as should be obvious - one does not go around trying to figure out if this or that person is a homosexual or not.

Finally, as Michael Parenti has observed, the petty "minority rights" movements almost universally miss the bigger picture - namely, that the fundamental problem is and always has been that of *economic* "rights." The question always has been: does the bulk of the population have the "right" to extract the full benefit of its labor, or are people cattle for a tiny controlling Oligarchy? Whether the Oligarchy is of the slave-owning variety, or of the wage-slaver gonzo free-market type, or of the communist-technocrat camp, is, in a sense, tangential. Moreover, as George Carlin pointed out, there are no "rights" - there are only privileges, which people have to win for themselves. Messiahs arrive once in a while, and are usually killed. Decent, responsible government can occur, but only with the help of the population.

Moreover, there is the more abstract aspect of the problem. Namely, as long as people have enough to eat and roofs above their heads, they can and will tolerate an aristocracy. But beyond that, people have to have stable communities, access to the finer things in life - nature, love, and peace - and some kind of a family around them. I pose that ultra-feminism, "gay" privileges, abortions, and the other attacks on the family, do indeed tear apart the fabric of the larger society.

With a thorough disgust, we should perhaps now look at the ultimate horror pertaining to the current trend of thought - namely, pedophilia. The Wikipedia article on the subject references to studies claiming that it "is estimated to be lower than 5% based on several smaller studies with prevalence rates between 3% and 9%." The validity of the figures is impossible to evaluate, but it is certain that the problem exists. Most offenders are male. My attention was once brought to the bizarre MSNBC series *To Catch a Pedophile*. The show bated pedophiles. Twelve episodes were filmed. The duped criminals ended up behind bars. *To Catch* was curtailed after a sting operation entrapped one Louis Conradt, a Texas D.A. Conradt took the honorable way out.

One has to ask if Conradt was not merely the tip of an iceberg. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* The Nebraska debacle springs to mind.

For an idea of the increasing prevalence of pedophilia, consider the following numbers, taken from David Finkelhor and Richard Ormrod's December 2001 U.S. Department of Justice study *Offenders Incarcerated for Crimes Against Juveniles*. 72% of those locked up for violence against juveniles under 12 were perverts, as were 58% of those who committed acts of violence against 13-17 year olds. Now, "Between 1991 and 1997, the number of violent offenders in State prisons increased by 33% (from 327,960 to 436,030)" and the share of criminals locked up for crimes of juveniles jumped from 19% to 22%. That was an increase of 33614 violent offenders who targeted juveniles - an increase of 54%. Rap music was exploding at that time, and the Internet pornography was still developing. The given numbers are ambiguous, but I think that a good case can be made for claiming that the problem of pedophilia is getting worse.

Why? The answer should be blatantly obvious to anyone who has surfed the Internet or watched

television. Take Britney Spears. Her first album, *...Baby One More Time*, came out in January 1999, and sold in the millions. Spears was born on December 2, 1981. She had recorded the video for the song *...Baby One More Time* in August 1998, at the age of 16. That video was on MTV for months and months and months. In the video, Britney is a half-naked Catholic school girl. The text is *explicitly* sexual. Her next major music video was for the song *Oops!... I Did It Again*. It was recorded in March 2000, a few weeks after Britney had turned 18. She wears a bright red tight latex overalls. Both the lyrics and the video are overtly sexual.

It must be understood that pornography does not necessarily have to entail penetration. It is easy to create a highly sexualized video, which features no shots of genitalia. The Britney Spears *Baby One More Time* video *is child pornography*, there is no doubt about that.

The above is a qualitative example of a kind the reader can unearth across the board. Britney was omnipresent at the end of the 20th century, there was no hiding from her. And the message implicit in her songs could not be clearer. It was blatant.

Then we have the rap music, which burgeoned during the 1990s, and which glorified violence and sex with "bitches." Again - the propaganda was blatant! It should be stated that the early rap music tended to be underground, DIY, and political in character. But in the 1990s, the recording studios took over, killed the political message, and threw in the violence and the pornography.

Those who have paid attention will have noticed that the overtly crude, hyper-sexual "comedy" genre has reached lows unimaginable a generation ago. Take, for example, the 1999 picture *American Pie*. Its 1970s equivalent would be, perhaps, *Animal House* (1978). The two movies are almost in different dimensions! And things are getting worse.

But the more frightening development in Hollywood concerns the so-called "slasher" pictures. Those started with a few atrocities in the late 1970s, notably *Halloween* (1978), *Friday the 13th* (1980), and *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre* (1974). The situation has exacerbated since, and today we have the popular movie series *Saw*, which had seven entries between 2003 and 2010. The contents of those "films" are blood-curdling beyond description. And I say this having seen a fair amount of movies, many of them violent. The *Saw* franchise has grossed nearly a billion dollars at the box office alone. Then there is the pornography. The flagship series of Larry Flint's *Hustler* is called *Barely Legal*. Filming a girl at the age of 17 years and 11 months is illegal, but a month later it is fine. The girl, of course, has hardly changed; and moreover, with sufficient make-up, a sixteen year-old and an eighteen year-old may look indistinguishable.

Now, there are two very basic and very well-known facts about humans. Namely, 1) they like sex; and 2) they imitate what they see. Therefore, the effect of the millions of sexualized images bombarding the population are entirely predictable! Drowning the male population in quasi-child-porn of the MTV variety will invariably have certain easily predictable effects - among them, an increase in the incidence in acts of pedophilia.

An argument can be made for the legalization of sex with *sexually mature* (in the biological sense), consenting people. In the old days, men and women frequently married at very early ages. I am not defending the view, but the argument can be made.

But there is absolutely no defence for molesting sexually immature children. It is an unforgivable abomination.

And so, we *know* that the Kinsey reports endorsed pedophilia, we *know* the Rockefeller Foundation fully backed Kinsey, we *know* that the controlled media broadcasts, literally, child pornography - and therefore we have to reach the inescapable conclusion that the social engineers are trying to legalize and normalize - or at least spread - pedophilia. Why are they doing this great evil? It is hard to tell, but the following points make some sense: 1) the threat to a society's children spreads terror amongst the population, and scared people are easier to control; 2) the abuse of the sexual urge allows the controllers to channel the population's efforts and energy into self-destructive behavior; 3) run-of-the-mill child abusers end up behind bars, providing a "eugenical" triumph to the Oligarchical cabal; 4) perhaps the Oligarchical crowd is into child abuse and wants to come out in the open?

To summarize our findings, 1) there is a concerted effort toward breaking up the family and decreasing world-wide birth-rates on the part of the Oligarchical eugenicist social engineers; 2) one of the main weapons in the arsenal of the social engineers has been the utterly fraudulent report of the pervert Kinsey; 3) over the past half-century, the social engineering effort has had notable success, and has exercised a significant pernicious influence on society.

10.2 The Poisoning of the World

From the European Science Foundation's 2010 *Science Policy Briefing 40*, entitled *Male Reproductive Health*: (emphasis mine)

In Europe there is a growing demand for use of assisted reproduction techniques, and a growing body of evidence points towards adverse trends in male reproductive health, including reduced semen quality, increased incidence of testicular cancer and increased or an already high incidence of congenital reproductive malformations (cryptorchidism and hypospadias).

...

Semen quality has been declining throughout the past half century in industrialised countries. Studies indicate a significant [about] 50% decrease in semen quality in men without fertility problems (dropping sperm counts from $113 \times 106/ml$ to $66 \times 106/ml$). There has been a lot of discussion about these results and different attempts to reanalyse the data within the scientific community. Nevertheless, the question of temporal changes in semen quality still remains controversial, and there are reports of unchanged or even increasing semen quality in some regions. However, **recent prospective investigations have, in accordance with the reported adverse trend, found a remarkably poor semen quality among young men from general populations in Northern Europe.** Approximately 20% of young men in various European countries had a sperm concentration below the lower WHO reference level ($< 20 \times 106sperm/ml$) and 40% of the men had a sperm concentration below the level that has been associated with prolongation of the waiting time to pregnancy ($40 \times 106/ml$). These trends in semen quality may also have wider implications for health in general, as men with poor semen quality seem to have increased mortality rates and shorter life expectancy.

...

Cryptorchidism (undescended testis) and hypospadias (incomplete fusion of the urethral folds that form the penis) are among the most common congenital malformations in human males. These two congenital abnormalities share common risk factors and are both associated with reduced fertility. Cryptorchidism is also associated with poor semen quality and a considerably increased risk of TGC (38). The incidence of these malformations appears to have been increasing in the Western world over recent decades, with an apparent levelling off in hypospadias incidence in most European countries during the 1980s.

To put it bluntly, based on data from the most prestigious world organizations, the quality of the sperm of the men in the Western countries has been declining drastically over the past half-century. This is a colossal problem, a threat to the very existence of the Western culture. And yet nobody talks about it! Nobody is even aware of the issue! How can this be?

Now, the quality of the sperm did not just magically fall by its own volition. There is only one credible explanation for the debacle - namely, that people are being poisoned. People in the western world are being poisoned.

There are only four ways in which such poisoning can be accomplished: via the air, via the water, via the food, and via medications, including vaccines.

Potables

Statement on Fluoridation, June 3 2011

nader.org, Ralph Nader's website

In a statement released in Washington, DC today (Friday, June 3) consumer advocate Ralph Nader, responding to growing media coverage and developments in the Atlanta area on the risks posed by water fluoridation, said,

"It's way overdue for this country to have an extended and open scientific and regulatory debate on fluoridation. There should be no mandatory fluoridation without the approval of people in a public referendum preceded by full and open public debate with disclosures. There is an old Roman law adage that says, 'What touches all should be decided by all.'" This statement is being sent to the editors of the Atlanta Journal Constitution. In recent weeks statements calling for a repeal of mandatory fluoridation in Georgia have been made by a number of prominent civil rights leaders including former Atlanta mayor Andrew Young, Rev. Gerald Durley, and Bernice King, daughter of Martin Luther King Jr.

This is Ralph Nader, a three-time serious presidential candidate, a man of impeccable reputation and public standing, an all-round great American hero.

The fluoridation mania gathered steam in the 1930s and 1940s, and became the official policy of the U.S. Public Health Service in 1951.

Whence fluoridation?

From Wade Frazier's paper *Fluoridation: A Horror Story*:¹³

In short, fluorine is the most reactive element known to science ("reactive" means its affinity to bonding with other elements). In nature, fluorine is found bonded to other elements, never floating around by itself, and is rarely found in its ionic state. The industrial processes of the nineteenth century created the most toxic pollutants that humanity had seen to that time. Taking ore from the earth and removing the metal, especially in aluminum refining, created hazardous waste.

In its ionic state, fluorine is highly toxic. Fluorine bonded to metallic ore in the earth was liberated during the refining process and is difficult-to-impossible to safely dispose. The aluminum refining industry was the biggest and most influential fluoride polluter around 1930, and in America only one company was in the aluminum business: ALCOA.

Fluorine is also useful in producing artificial chemicals such as Teflon and Freon, because of its unique properties. Those unique properties also made fluorine indispensable in refining uranium to extract its most radioactive isotope, which made the nuclear age possible.

...

There is no arguing that fluorides are deadly poisons. No scientist will argue the point, as it is universally accepted. Among the hazards of fluoride are dental fluorosis, skeletal fluorosis, sterility, birth defects, cancer and brain damage.

Dental fluorosis progresses with an increase in the fluorine ion concentration that teeth are subject to. Dental fluorosis progresses as follows. First, the teeth develop a mottled look. Flecks can be seen on the enamel. Tooth mottling can begin at less than one part per million (PPM), which is the concentration added to the water supply in communities that fluoridate their water. As the concentration rises to two PPM, the teeth discolor, gradually turning brown. Accompanying this process, the teeth become hard and brittle. The teeth then begin chipping and disintegrating. In Frank McClure's *Water Fluoridation, The Search and the Victory*, there is a color photo section showing the disease's progress. In advanced cases, the teeth are reduced to blackened stumps (images of this

¹³Found here: <http://www.ahealedplanet.net/fluoride.htm>, Jan 12, 2012.

process are easily available on the Internet). With skeletal fluorosis, the skeleton disintegrates.

In 1916, G.V. Black and F.S. McKay presented the first study of tooth mottling. Tooth mottling was common in children in Colorado, Texas and other western states, and an effort was launched to determine its cause. In Colorado the condition was known as "Colorado Brown Stain," and in Texas it was "Texas Teeth." In 1931, three independent studies concluded that tooth mottling was caused by fluorine ions in the water supply, and it has been generally accepted ever since. Usually the fluorine ions were naturally occurring.

...

By the turn of the 20th century, industrially created airborne and waterborne fluorides were becoming a major health hazard. In 1901, one study found that fluorides "are much more toxic than the other compounds that are of significance in the industrial smoke problem." As early as 1850, people and livestock were being poisoned by fluoride emissions from the iron and copper industries. In 1930, the world's first major air pollution disaster happened in Belgium's Meuse Valley, where thousands of people became violently ill, and sixty people died. The world's foremost authority on the issue, Kaj Roholm, concluded that airborne fluorides were responsible. The fertilizer industry was mainly responsible in that instance. As late as 1970, the U.S. Department of Agriculture stated that airborne fluorides "caused more worldwide damage to domestic animals than any other air pollutant."

In America, with its industrialized economy, there was only one aluminum company in the 1930s, in the standard monopoly situation. The Aluminum Company of America, ALCOA, was probably the world's biggest fluoride polluter at the time.

On the heels of the discovery that fluoride caused tooth mottling, Public Health Service (PHS) scientist Trendley Dean, the first director of the National Institute of Dental Research, was sent west. As Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon had authority over the PHS, and Mellon founded and was the controlling shareholder of ALCOA. Dean's mission was to research communities where naturally occurring fluoride was high in the water supply, to see how much fluoride children's teeth could absorb before disintegrating. There was an obvious conflict of interest in Dean's research. Dean announced his results and made the statement that fluoride in the water supply decreased tooth decay in children.

...

The only unmistakable trend is the one showing dental fluorosis increasing with fluoride concentration, which was expressly what Dean went west to determine. Black and McKay noted that mottled teeth did not seem to have a higher incidence of tooth decay, and Dean extended those findings, although that was not his job. A man was specifically assigned to investigate the damage a particular chemical did to teeth, but somehow concluded that the chemical was actually good for teeth. To paraphrase Dean's findings: "As children's teeth disintegrate, they may have fewer cavities." Dean is known today as the "father of fluoridation." It has now been admitted by virtually everybody involved in the fluoridation issue, even by Dean himself (given under oath on a witness stand), that his early data gave zero evidence that increasing fluoride concentration in the water supply reduced tooth decay.

Dean later became one of fluoridation's propagandists, but was initially cautious with his suggestion. Dean's questionable suggestion regarding the potential dental benefits of fluoride was all that ALCOA-related scientist Gerald Cox (he worked for the Mellon Institute in Pittsburgh) needed to begin proposing that the nation's water supplies be fluoridated. In 1937 Cox announced, "It is possible that fluorine is specifically required for the formation of teeth." Cox was the first to suggest the compulsory fluoridation of entire communities. Ironically, the PHS spent the ten years after 1931 trying to eliminate

fluorine ions from the water supply, given the tooth mottling findings. Cox partly based his fluoridation suggestion on the work of Gerald Armstrong, who in 1938 published findings that decayed teeth seemed to have lower fluorine content than healthy teeth. In 1963, Armstrong published a reinvestigation of his 1938 findings, and concluded that his earlier findings were wrong, and that there was no detectable difference in the fluoride content of healthy and decayed teeth. The discovering scientists themselves admitted that the two major scientific findings of the 1930s that showed that fluoride might be good for the teeth, and were the basis of later campaigns to compulsorily fluoridate water supplies, were worthless.

Naturally occurring fluoride in the water supply is usually composed of fluorine and calcium atoms. What component of dissolved calcium fluoride might have a positive effect on bones and teeth? The calcium aspect was ignored, while the fluorine component was obsessively pursued. The fluoride compounds artificially added to the water supply are sodium fluoride and fluosilicic acid, which are industrial waste byproducts. By the 1950s, the National Institute of Dental Research (NIDR) became a corrupt organization that produced "research" that fluoride polluters used to protect themselves from liability lawsuits.

If the data supporting fluoridation is analyzed, it quickly becomes evident that all the pro-fluoridation people have in their favor are highly uncertain statistics. The theories are conflicting, as is the data. While fluorine is found in bones and teeth, so are other elements that nobody says are essential for health (and even toxic), and more than 80% of fluorine given to humans and animals in experiments is immediately excreted. The same mechanisms that supposedly protect teeth also cause tooth mottling. It is quite the double-edged sword. Even giving the pro-fluoridation forces the benefit of the doubt regarding their statistics, their data on the benefit of fluoride amounts to one tooth per mouth, not an exciting benefit. It is an alarmingly small benefit when the undeniable harm caused by fluoride is considered. Benjamin Disraeli said, "There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies and statistics." Fluoridation data is a classic case of statistical gamesmanship. Even if the motivation of most pro-fluoridation researchers were not suspect, their empirical and statistical methods are. Many astute criticisms have been leveled at the methods of fluoridation researchers regarding uncontrolled variables, omission of pertinent data, mathematical errors, and outright bogus science.

Among the giants of the early days of fluoridation research were Trendley Dean, Frank McClure, Harold Hodge, Edward Largent, Wallace Armstrong, David Ast, and Gerald Cox. Dean worked for ALCOA owner Mellon at the PHS. Gerald Cox worked for the Mellon Institute. Largent was the most visible member of the research teams at Kettering Laboratories at the University of Cincinnati, funded by ALCOA and several other fluoride-polluting companies. Largent was a consultant for Reynolds Aluminum. McClure was one of fluoridation's greatest cheerleaders, working for the industry-influenced National Institute of Dental Research. Armstrong was a comrade-in-arms with Dean and McClure, promoting fluoridation. Hodge had a sinister relationship to the fluoridation issue, recently discovered through declassified U.S. documents, also tainting Ast.

...

None other than Edward Bernays, the "father of public relations" and one of the greatest propagandists of all time, designed Ewing's public relations campaign for fluoridation.

Et cetera - in short, 1) fluoride is a poison; 2) there is no good evidence it does much for the teeth; 3) it is in our water supply; 4) the profits are great; 5) the eugenicists have repeatedly called for putting sterilizing agents in the water supply; 6) the quality of male sperm has been decreasing.

Then there is "Aspartame," the artificial sweetener. Its manufacturers had a tough time obtaining the FDA's approval. They hired Bush I's crony Donald Rumsfeld (1932-), fresh from his stint at

Ford's White House (where he was chief of staff; Bush I was head of the CIA). Rumsfeld used his government connections to legalize Aspartame. The chemical was added to all sorts of drinks. A huge controversy surrounds Aspartame. The claims have been made that Aspartame is highly poisonous. The official line is that Aspartame has been tested again and again, and found safe. Let us look at the recent heads of the American FDA (Food and Drug Administration). As a rule of thumb, let us curtail our expose to two conflicts of interest per person. Note that, in principle, one major conflict of interest should be enough to totally discredit a person. The reader can hunt for additional examples of corruption at his leisure.

The current FDA "Czarina" is Margaret Hamburg (1955-). She has been in charge since 2009.

Henry Schein Appoints Dr. Margaret Hamburg to Board of Directors¹⁴

Nov 03, 2003 (BUSINESS WIRE) - Henry Schein Inc. (Nasdaq:HSIC), the largest provider of healthcare products and services to office-based practitioners in the combined North American and European markets, announced the appointment of Margaret A. Hamburg, M.D. to its board of directors. Dr. Hamburg has over 15 years of public health experience, holding policy positions in both the Clinton and Reagan administrations, as well as the Giuliani and Dinkins administrations in New York City.

Margaret Hamburg elected to Rockefeller Board of Trustees¹⁵ November 2, 2005
Rockefeller University's Trustees have elected Margaret Hamburg, M.D., a former New York City Health Commissioner, Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services and one of the youngest people ever elected to the prestigious Institute of Medicine, to serve on the university's Board.

The woman's predecessor was Andrew von Eschenbach (1941-). He was FDA Czar between 2006 and 2009.

Andrew von Eschenbach, M.D., Former FDA Commissioner and Leading Prostate Cancer Expert, Elected to Viamet Pharmaceuticals Board of Directors¹⁶
Business Wire, January 19, 2011

The man is also listed on the boards of directors of OncoCyte, a subsidiary of BioTime, a stem-cell research company. He is on the board of advisors of the Arrowhead Research Corporation.

From Wikipedia:

Lester Mills Crawford (born March 13, 1938) is an American veterinarian and former Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

Crawford resigned as head of the Food and Drug Administration in September 2005 after a stormy two-month stint. On October 17, 2006, he pled guilty to a conflict of interest and false reporting of information about stocks he owned in food, beverage and medical device companies he was in charge of regulating. He received a sentence of three years of supervised probation and a fine of about \$90,000.

The previous Bush FDA Czar was Mark McClellan (1963-, head of FDA 2002-2004). As of early 2012, he is (Wikipedia) "Director of the Engelberg Center for Health Care Reform, Senior Fellow in

¹⁴From Henry Schein's official website: <http://phx.corporate-ir.net/phoenix.zhtml?c=74322&p=irol-newsArticle&ID=465709&highlight=>, Jan 12, 2012.

¹⁵Rockefeller University's official website: <http://newswire.rockefeller.edu/2005/11/02/margaret-hamburg-elected-to-rockefeller-board-of-trustees/>, Jan 12, 2012.

¹⁶<http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20110119005210/en/Andrew-von-Eschenbach-M.D.-FDA-Commissioner-Leading>, Jan 12, 2012.

Economic Studies and Leonard D. Schaeffer Director's Chair in Health Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution." The Brookings is a major foundation. McClellan was also a Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, which is a notorious neo-con lair.

Clinton's last FDA Czar was Jane E. Henney (1947-). She was in charge between 1998 and 2001. Her service was rewarded with a directorship at the massive pharmaceutical company AstraZeneca. Henney is also on the board of directors of the private foundation/ think-tank The Commonwealth Fund, which was founded in 1918 by Anna Harkness, the wife of Stephen Harkness of Standard Oil. From MarketWatch, a subsidiary of Dow Jones & Company:¹⁷

Dr. Jane E. Henney, MD, is Independent Director at CIGNA Corp., a Professor at University of Cincinnati, Independent Director at AmerisourceBergen Corp., and a Trustee at Commonwealth Funding, Inc. She is on the Board of Directors at The Commonwealth Fund and China Medical Board of New York, Inc.

Dr. Henney was previously employed as Non-Executive Director by AstraZeneca Plc, a Member by Association of Academic Health Centers, Commissioner-Food & Drugs by US Food & Drug Administration, Vice President-Health Sciences by University of New Mexico, Deputy Director by National Cancer Institute, and Vice Chancellor-Health Programs & Policy by University of Kansas.

The previous FDA head-honcho, who served between 1990 and 1997, under both Bush I and Clinton, was David Aaron Kessler (1951-). Kessler has a law degree from the University of Chicago. He is on the board of directors of Tokai Pharmaceuticals, a newly minted privately-held pharma-company. Kessler is on the board of advisors of Everyday Health, Inc., in its own words "the largest provider of online health solutions to consumers, healthcare professionals and brands."

The second last FDA boss we will mention is Frank Edward Young (1931-), head of the FDA between 1984 and 1989. From Forbes:¹⁸

Currently, Dr. Young is a part time partner of Essex Woodlands Health Ventures, which currently has over \$2 billion under management. Additionally, he is the chairman of Cosmos Alliance, an investment club, and a director of Agennix, Inc., La Jolla Pharmaceuticals Company, Light Sciences Oncology and Elusys Therapeutics, Inc.

Finally, the FDA Czar between 1981 and 1983 was Arthur H. Hayes Jr. (1933-2010), a Rhodes Scholar. He was the one to approve Aspartame.

People may trust the FDA at their own risk. The above information, of course, is only the tip of the iceberg. There should a law mandating that the FDA boss swears a legally-binding oath to never affiliate himself in any way with the private industry or with private foundations. The FDA head should only ever work in the academy or at the governmental level.

Everybody knows about the obesity epidemic, because it is so obvious. You can see it every time you go outside: there are fat people everywhere. And yet thirty years ago things were different. From Wikipedia, *Obesity in the United States*: "Estimates have steadily increased, from 19.4% in 1997, 24.5% in 2004 to 26.6% in 2007, to 33.8% (adults) and 17% (children) in 2008." And also "Between 1986 and 2000, the prevalence of severe obesity (BMI = 40 kg/m²) quadrupled from one in two hundred Americans to one in fifty." Similar developments can be observed across the "globalized" ("OECD") world.

Questions arise: How did this happen? The population did not change, the "gene pool" did not change, it is not like the Americans were starving before - so the diet must have changed. What

¹⁷<http://www.marketwatch.com/investing/stock/ci/insiders?pid=49351>, accessed Jan 12, 2012.

¹⁸<http://people.forbes.com/profile/frank-e-young/37665>, Jan 12, 2012.

changed in the diet and how come nobody noticed? Why has not the government done anything to solve the problem? If the American government has the power to go conquer nations left and right, it has the power to halt the "obesity epidemic." Obviously, the obesity epidemic is far more dangerous to America than the Muslim Menace - so where is the reaction?

Various serious people who have studied the problem have figured out the cause of the obesity epidemic. Robert H. Lustig of the University of California at San Francisco has recently gained publicity with his lecture *Sugar: The Bitter Truth*. In short, the doctor says that: 1) sugar (fructose) is poisonous; 2) it is causing the obesity epidemic; 3) corn syrup in the "soft" drinks is particularly problematic.

Among the doctor's findings: in 1982, it was decided to shift America to a low-fat diet. So the American diet went from 40% fat to 30% fat. What made up the balance? Fructose, and particularly HFCS (high-fructose corn-syrup), which is a cheap substitute for cane sugar. Introduced in the 1980s, today HFCS can be found in almost all processed foods and practically all "soft drinks." The soft drinks are the worst in terms of causing obesity.

Now, alcohol (ethanol) is fermented sugar. Everybody knows that alcohol is a poison. This is not to deride drinking - which can be fun - but let us face it - if you drink too much at once, you get a headache, and if you drink too much over a prolonged period of time, you risk suffering grave injury or death. So if alcohol is a poison, and alcohol is made of sugar, then what about sugar? It turns out that sugar (fructose) is also a poison, and behaves much like alcohol. It causes all sorts of problems, including obesity. Crucially, fructose does not register in the brain, meaning that one does not feel satiation when abusing fructose. Moreover, under the free-market baloney, HCFS, being so cheap, has found its way into all sorts of food, in order to lower costs.

HCFS has spread everywhere! And the Americans barely realize the cataclysm which engulfs them, because they are like the slowly boiling frog. For example, I can say with absolute certainty that there is practically no real bread in the American grocery stores. There are some rubbery concoctions resembling bread, but they are to bread as masturbation is to sex. Bread used to be a staple diet for many cultures for centuries and centuries - and now there is no bread in the American stores! Insanity! Worse, Lustig reports that in some stores, only one bread on the shelves upon shelves of bread lacked HFCS. Bread should not contain sugar. Bread consists of: flour, water, and yeast, plus perhaps some salt and a few other minor additives. There should be no sugar in the bread! The North Americans are being systematically poisoned - and they do not seem to realize it.

Another problem comes from the introduction of the women into the workforce and the destruction of the extended family. It is easier to cook for many than for one. People do not cook as much in today's atomized society. They do not have the time and the strength. Hence, people eat more processed foods, which are poisonous.

All of this is very well understood. For example, Lustig mentions a British study, in which the soft drink machines were removed from a few schools. The results? The students in the pop-free group of schools remained as they were, while the students in the schools which kept their soda-pop machines grew fatter. It is known that: 1) the Americans are eating less fat than before; 2) they are ingesting more fructose and more processed foods than before; 3) they are getting fatter. Everybody knows! This is not rocket science.

So why are the authorities not taking measures? Ban fructose! Declare fructose a menace to society - and ban it! Tax it the way cigarettes are taxed!

But nothing of the sort is happening. We have to ask why. There are three possible answers: 1) the people in charge are utter nincompoops who do not understand the problem; 2) the people in charge want to intervene, but can not, because of political pressure; 3) the people in charge understand the obesity development and approve of it.

We disregard the first option as absurd. There are no indications for the second option - and besides, if those who are *really* in charge wanted to change things, they would have done so by now. Thus, we are left with the third option - it is all on purpose. Why precisely? 1) For short-term profits, including profits from the medical industry; 2) for Malthusian/"eugenical" reasons.

How can you defend yourself from the mass poisoning of the public through sugar? 1) Do not ever drink "soft" drinks; 2) avoid eating any sweets - eat fruits instead; 3) cook for yourself as much as possible, and avoid processed foods like the plague. Exercise by itself will *not* do the job. For the fluoridated water: I suspect that people sell fluoride-cleansing filters. Bottled water is not necessarily a good solution, because it tends to be tap water, and because the plastic bottles release more poison.

Food and GMOs

A major aspect of the poisoning campaign is the toxication of the world food supply. It is *clear* that the food is being poisoned in light of the obesity epidemic and the mass decline in sperm quality. The fructose/ processed foods problem is one side of the issue. Another sinister machination can be found in the GMO (genetically-modified organism) drive.

The top reference on the GMO scam, that I know of, is William Engdahl's *Seeds of Destruction* (2007).

There are two major strands to the GMO fraud: 1) the eugenics angle; and 2) the domination of the world's food supply angle. In brief, 1) GMO is poison; 2) GMO is patented and designed for control, meaning that by swindling and brow-beating nations into adopting GMO-based agricultural arrangements, a few colossal corporations are acquiring control over the world's food supply - with the predictable consequences of mass starvation and great profits.

The rush for the development of genetically-modified foods took place during the Reagan era.

(Ch. 1) Some years before the first commercial GMO product hit the market in the US, the Reagan Administration had been moving quietly to open its doors wide to Monsanto and other private companies which were developing gene-manipulated products. The key actor within the Reagan Administration on decisions pertaining to the new field of genetically modified products was former head of the CIA, Vice President George Herbert Walker Bush...

This new and wonderful field of GMOs was highly unregulated, and, between the powerful corporations and the Reagan administration's pernicious love for deregulation, things would stay that way.

The main player in the game was Monsanto, the original co-developer (the other one being Dow) of the notorious Vietnam-era Agent Orange. Company representatives bartered with Bush during the Reagan years, and when Bush became president, he made sure to avoid "hampering" the biotech field with "unnecessary regulation."

The framework that Bush put in place was simple. In line with the expressed wishes of the biotech industry, the US Government would regard genetic engineering of plants and foods or animals as merely a simple extension of traditional animal or plant breeding.

But the best part is that:

Despite serious warnings from research scientists about the dangers of recombinant DNA research and biotechnology work with viruses, the US Government opted for a system in which the industry and private scientific laboratories would "voluntarily" police themselves in the new field of genetically engineered plants and animals.

In other words, the US government wanted *both* a for-profit gonzo free-market *and* an honor-based system. It is impossible to have both. Under the greed-is-good logic, the goal is to swindle everybody. Government scientists complained, but their warnings were not heeded.

The malignant hand of the foundations was behind this scam as well:

At that early stage, few paid any attention to the enormous implications of genetic engineering on such a mass scale, outside a small circle of scientists being financed by the largesse of a handful of foundations. And no foundation was more important in the financing of this emerging sector of biotechnology than the Rockefeller Foundation in New York.

Bush I crossed the Rubicon in the name of America, when in 1992 he signed an Executive Order proclaiming that GMOs are "substantially equivalent" to regular crops. That was like saying that Frankenstein is substantially equivalent to his maker. Of course, "substantial equivalence" is an obvious fraud - as many have pointed out - but that did not stop Bushy and his allies. In effect, the GMOs were left unregulated - a folly with potentially disastrous consequences.

Furthermore,

Ironically, while companies such as Monsanto argued for "substantial equivalence," they also claimed patent rights for their genetically modified plants on the argument that their genetic engineering had created substantially new plants whose uniqueness had to be protected by exclusive patent protection. They saw no problem in having their cake and eating it too.

This is one subtle point that most people are unaware of. The biotech companies **own patents to genes and seeds**. They claim to own life.

And so, the US government has not been testing the GMOs, because everybody knows that corn is safe, and since the GMO corn is equivalent, why bother to test it? And when some testing occurred, the government accepted the results provided by the industry tests.

The first mass-marketed genetically modified product was the milk of cows treated with the hormone rBGH. This hormone increased milk output by 30%, but caused all sorts of pains and troubles to the unfortunate animals. "Farmers began to report their cows burned out by as much as two years sooner, and that many cows had serious hoof or udder infections as a by-product of the rBGH hormone treatment, meaning that some of them could not walk." The FDA looked at the data the industry had given it, and blasted all who complained against the GMOs. The same farce, which we have seen over and over, was repeating itself: an insane, anti-scientific, anti-human point-of-view was being imposed on the academia via brute force. For example:

In 1991, a scientist at the University of Vermont leaked to the press that there was evidence of severe health problems affecting rBGH-treated cows, including mastitis, an inflammation of the udder, and deformed births. Monsanto had spent more than half a million dollars to fund the University of Vermont test trials of rBGH. The chief scientist of the project, in direct opposition to his alarmed researcher, had made numerous public statements asserting that rBGH cows had no abnormal levels of health problems compared with regular cows. The unexpected leak from the upstart whistleblower was embarrassing for both Monsanto and the University receiving Monsanto research dollars, to say the least.

The US General Accounting Office, an investigative arm of the US Congress, was called in to investigate the allegations. Both the University of Vermont and Monsanto refused to cooperate with the GAO, which was finally forced to give up the investigation with no results. Only years later did the University finally release the data, which indeed showed the negative health effects of rBGH. By then, however, it was too late.

Since it is hard to estimate the prevalence of whistleblowers, who can tell how many more such events have taken place?

Meanwhile, Monsanto agents were infiltrating the FDA. Writes Engdahl, still in Chapter 1, "In 1991, the Food and Drug Administration created the new position of Deputy Commissioner for Policy to oversee agency policy on GMO foods." The first commissioner was a Washington lawyer whose firm had faithfully serviced Monsanto - Michael R. Taylor. Worse,

Monsanto's chief scientist, Margaret Miller, also assumed a top post in the FDA as Deputy Director of Human Food Safety at the beginning of the 1990's. In this position, Dr. Miller, without an explanation, raised the FDA standard by 100 times for the permissible level of antibiotics that farmers could put into milk. She single-handedly cleared the way for a booming business for Monsanto's rBGH hormone. A cozy club was emerging between private biotech companies and the government agencies that should be regulating them. It was a club more than a little fraught with potential conflict of interest.

Taylor had to help the FDA decide whether or not GMO products should be labelled. He thought about it and decided there was no need for labelling. In another exercise in lunacy and fraud,

At the same time, again under Taylor's guiding hand, the FDA ruled that risk-assessment data, such as data on birth defects in cattle or even possible symptoms in humans arising from consumption of GMO foods, could be withheld from the public as "confidential business information."

After he left the FDA, Taylor became "Vice President of Monsanto for Public Policy."

The rBGH milk hit the shelves in 1994, without a warning label. "When Monsanto's Posilac [rBGH] caused leukemia and tumors in rats, the US Pure Food and Drug Act was rewritten to allow a product that caused cancer in laboratory animals to be marketed for human consumption without a warning label. It was as simple as that." Thus, a new, potentially highly dangerous agent was added to American food supply without warning and without control.

It is hard to tell whether the top corporate honchos are simply callous in pursuing their profits and do not care if a few "useless eaters" perish in the process, or if they are actively attempting to murder people. But it all amounts to the same thing.

Thus,

The short-term rat study was submitted by Monsanto to the FDA but was never published. The FDA refused to allow anyone outside the administration to review the raw data from this study, saying that publication would "irreparably harm" Monsanto. Monsanto has continued to refuse to allow open scientific peer review of the 90 day study. This linchpin study of cancer and BGH has never been subjected to scrutiny by the scientific community.

Therefore, the only studies people heard about were those that showed that GMO is harmless or good.

To be clear: as I am sure the reader realizes, all studies made by people paid by the industry - and this includes university departments operating under industry grants - are to be considered tainted by default. Unfortunately, in reality, the majority of studies are studies of that type! And so people are told that "peer-reviewed" studies say this and that - as if peer reviews by scoundrels, mercenaries, and ignoramuses are anything to brag about.

Strangely enough, under heavy pressure from the Veterinary Medical Association and the Royal College of Physician, Health Canada rejected rBGH in 1999. That event shows one crucial aspect

of the Big Game. To a large extent, the Oligarchs rule by illusion. Thus, whenever any stronger political body causes glitches in the Oligarchical matrix, the whole systems risks collapsing. The EU also banned the corrupted milk. But the poor Americans kept swilling their foul milk. A few prospective whistleblowers were silenced. The government finally went after the milk in 2004, but not too vigorously.

Meanwhile, more sinister developments had taken place. Big Agra was going for the seeds of all the major staples of the human diet. And they had powerful backing.

It was no coincidence that the Rockefeller Foundation and Monsanto were talking about a global strategy for the genetic engineering of plants. The genetic revolution had been a Rockefeller Foundation project from the very beginning. Not only, as Conway reminded in his public remarks, had the Rockefeller Foundation spent more than \$100 million for the advance of the GMO revolution. That project was part of a global strategy that had been in development for decades.

The following point is critical:

At the 1999 press conference, Conway declared, "The Rockefeller Foundation supports the Monsanto Company's decision not to commercialize sterile seed technologies, such as the one dubbed "the Terminator." He added, "We welcome this move as a first step toward ensuring that the fruits of plant biotechnology are made available to poor farmers in the developing world."

Conway had gone to Monsanto some months before to warn the senior executives that they risked jeopardizing the entire GMO revolution and that a tactical retreat was needed to keep the broad project on track.

Now, "Terminator seeds" are seeds, which only germinate once. I.e. to have a second crop, you have to buy more seeds. The implications are obvious. Moreover, one has to ask the question: why do such seeds *at all exist*? There could be only one possible application for them. And if the most powerful Agrabusiness corporations in the world, backed by the Rockefeller Foundation, invented those seeds, *they mean to use them*.

Again, the existence of "Terminator" seeds is an *ipso facto* condemnation of their owners and creators.

Chapter 2 of Engdahl's book, entitled *The Fox Guards the Hen-House*, examines the interplay between the industry and the academia.

There is, for example, the story of one Dr. Arpad Pusztai, a member of the Royal Society Edinburgh and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. In the 1990s, Dr. Pusztai was put in charge of a massive research project into the GMOs. His goal was to prepare regulatory guidelines for the Scottish government.

Writes Engdahl,

More significant, in terms of what followed, the Pusztai research project was the very first independent scientific study on the safety of gene-modified food in the world. That fact was astonishing, given the enormous importance of the introduction of genetically modified organisms into the basic human and animal diet.

So what did Pusztai find out? The page bearing his name on the politically correct Wikipedia informs us that "In 1998 Pusztai publicly announced that the results of his research showed feeding genetically modified potatoes to rats had negative effects on their stomach lining and immune system. This led to Pusztai being suspended and his annual contract was not renewed. The resulting controversy became known as the Pusztai affair."

Moreover, as Engdahl points out, Pusztai was biased *in favor of* the GMOs before conducting his research. After seeing the results of his study, Pusztai announced that he would not eat GMOs. He

was fired, along with his wife. His papers were locked and he was told to keep quiet. The media, along with bribeable or brainwashable colleagues, ravaged him.

On the other hand, "In defiance of these attacks, by February 1999, some 30 leading scientists from 13 countries had signed an open letter supporting Pusztai. The letter was published in the London Guardian, triggering a whole new round of controversy over the safety of GMO crops and the Pusztai findings." This gives the reader an idea of one potentially effective mode of combating the NWO.

Now, the Guardian piece called for the heavy artillery. Soon enough, the British Royal Society, that oh-so-prestigious and credible Darwinist AGW organization came out and said that Pusztai's findings were bunk, etc, etc. "It was later revealed by a peer review that the latter had drawn its conclusions from incomplete data. Furthermore, it refused to release the names of its reviewers, leading some critics to attack the Society's methods as reminiscent of the medieval Star Chamber." Now, if the rBGH was bad for the cows, and the GMO potatoes were bad for the rats, then it is only natural to assume that GMOs *are bad for humans*. And indeed, I do not intend to make a great effort at providing additional evidence in regard to that point. The reader can conduct his own research; but it is quite clear that GMOs are toxic to the human population.

Moreover, any serious person who is paying attention knows the GMOs are poisonous, poorly researched, and awfully regulated. And yet the GMOs are slowly taking the world, pushed forward by the power of the US government, and encountering, in many places, only perfunctory resistance.

The lack of resistance stems from high-level corruption, greed, and ignorance. That is fairly clear. What is more interesting is figuring out the aims and the ambitions of those who push the GMO tsunami. Our other main aim should be to ascertain the extent of the GMO worldwide penetration. Furthermore, the players in the GMO game are, yet again, our usual suspects - the Royal Society, the Rockefeller Foundation, and their allies and henchmen. Indeed, as Engdahl points out, the big four Agribusiness companies in the world consist of three American internationals, and one Swiss player dominated by Anglo-American interests.

The fat cats of agribusiness by Eric Reguly¹⁹

Global and Mail, Dec. 30, 2010

That rosy view of corporate agriculture is the conventional wisdom. But it could be that the opposite is true: As agribusiness muscles into food-supply chains, neither the farmer nor the consumer will reap the benefits from enhanced efficiency. Several food economists think the rise of agribusiness brings as many problems as solutions, but they're being quiet about it.

Their silence is not hard to explain. The various United Nations food agencies, including the Food and Agriculture Organization, are financed largely by wealthy countries where corporate agribusiness giants - Monsanto, Dupont, Syngenta [the Swiss player], Bayer, BASF [German], Dow AgroSciences among them - are national champions and big employers. Germany's BASF and Bayer have more than 100,000 employees apiece, and come equipped with lobbying and PR departments the size of small cities. They are almost immune from official criticism, especially at the UN.

The World Bank has been a bit braver. Three pages buried in its 2008 world development report dealt with the rising power of Big Agribusiness, and highlighted some potentially alarming trends.

The market share of the biggies is on the rise, leading to questions about the potential abuse of economic power. In 2004, the top four suppliers of agrochemicals had a 60% share of their market, up from 47% in 1997. In the seed market, the four biggest players had a 33% share in 2004, up from 23%. In some specialized sectors, concentration is much higher. Monsanto's worldwide share of the market for transgenic soybean seeds, which are easy to protect against weeds, was 91% in 2004.

¹⁹<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/rob-magazine/the-fat-cats-of-agribusiness/article1849336/>, Jan 12, 2012.

And what are the end-results? "Is the concentration harming or helping farmers? Makkis research suggests that farmers are getting ripped off."

But let us go back to Engdahl's research. Part II of his work is called *The Rockefeller Plan*. Aaron Russo explained what the plan is - as Alan Watt has pointed out, in the lyrics of Leonard Cohen, who perhaps knows more than we do, "The Future" amounts to "Give me absolute control over every living soul."

Engdahl's thesis focuses on the alleged Kissinger quote, "If you control oil, you control nations. If you control food, you control people." (The quote continues: "And if you control money, you control the world.") That the Anglo-Americans are trying to control the world's oil is obvious. That they are also trying to control the world's food supply, is clear in light of the GMO craze.

(Ch. 3) Kissinger played a key role in the creation of the world grain market and in the boosting of the power of the US grain giants in the 1970s. Moreover, writes Engdahl, "No one group played a more decisive role in that reshaping of global agriculture during the next two decades than the Rockefeller interests and the Rockefeller Foundation."

The idea was to make the US the grain-basket of the world, under the dogma of the Ricardian pseudo-free-market efficiency fraud - the US can produce the cheapest agricultural goods, and therefore the US should be in charge of producing the real food, while everybody else should be making bananas and coffee. Which is all very fine, except that it is impossible to feed a nation with bananas and coffee. If one nation dominates the world's agriculture, that nation dominates the world. In more explicit terms, if a few huge corporations *controlled by private hands* dominate the world's food supply, a few people can decide the fate of the entire world from behind the scenes.

Another aspect of the scam was the idea that small farmers are "inefficient," and Big Agra can do everything better and more cheaply. The small farmers would have to go to the city to join the jobless "service," "post-industrial" economy.

The process of dividing and conquering the world food supply at every level has been going on for three-four decades, with grave consequences. The world's farmer classes are collapsing, the cities can not cope with the resulting urbanization, and the ravaged national economies are unable to provide useful employment for the millions of the dispossessed. All of this has been accomplished under the guise of the "free-market."

Engdahl quotes an economist who makes the same argument we have been propounding repeatedly in this work:

(Ch. 3, p. 50-51) According to economist J.W. Smith:

Highly mechanized farms on large acreages can produce units of food cheaper than even the poorest paid farmers of the Third World. When this cheap food is sold, or given, to the Third World, the local farm economy is destroyed. If the poor and unemployed of the Third World were given access to land, access to industrial tools, and protection from cheap imports, they could plant high-protein/high calorie crops and become self-sufficient in food. Reclaiming their land and utilizing the unemployed would cost these societies almost nothing, feed them well, and save far more money than they now pay for the so-called "cheap" imported foods.

And that is exactly how things work. GATT and NAFTA have further exacerbated the problem. We will look at two select cases of farmer suffering some paragraphs below.

Chapter 4 of Engdahl's *Seeds* looks at the notorious Kissinger-signed Malthusian *NSM200*. Chapter 5 (*The Brotherhood of Death*) highlights the Rockefeller infatuation with eugenics and Malthusianism. In summary,

As [Dr.] Jameson Taylor [he is on the staff of the Mississippi Center for Public Policy] expressed it,

For Rockefeller, the proper care of sheep ... requires nothing more than an equalization of supply with demand. If supply - i.e., food, water and space - cannot meet demand, supply must be increased and demand must be decreased. The Rockefeller Foundation has used this two pronged approach to great effect. The supply shortage has been addressed by ... advanced medical practices and increased crop yields. The demand problem has been solved by culling the herd via birth control and abortion.

As Engdahl points out, people tend to regard the idea that the top honchos are mad Malthusians playing out their dreams as conspiracy theory - when it is trivially easy to check the membership lists of the British and American eugenics societies, as well as the eugenics literature, and make the necessary conclusions.

Chapter 6 of Engdahl's book looks at the Rockefeller's activities in the 1940s and 1950s.

Part III, starting with Chapter 7, analyses the origins of Big Agra, the "agribusiness" oligopoly. The title of Chapter 7 provides a useful summary: *Rockefeller and Harvard Invent USA "Agribusiness."* The Rockefellers simply tried to repeat what they had done for the oil business - attain a massive controlling monopoly. The family farmers were squashed, vertical integration ensued, and Big Agra was born.

With that came the evil of the factory farm. For the dirty details of this particular travesty, look up David Kirby's *Animal Factory* (2010), and Eric Schlosser's *Fast Food Nation* (2002). In short, the "factory farms" raise livestock in conditions of unimaginable brutality and awful hygiene. Thus we are presented with a triple problem: on the economic side, the factory farms demolish the small farmers and concentrate wealth; on the ethical side, what is being done to the animals is abject evil; and on the public health side, the factory farms present a danger to the well-being of society.

The issue is well worth studying and is enough to drive one to vegetarianism. The problem with vegetarianism is that the vegetarian foodstuffs are also horribly contaminated with GMOs and factory-farm garbage.

There is a tie with Big Pharma here - to prevent the animals from dying in their own filth, the factory-farmers fill the poor critters with antibiotics. The profits are great, and the antibiotics find their way into the humans who eat the factory-meat, disrupting people's immune systems.

Engdahl's Chapter 8 begins with the following quote: "Food is power! We use it to change behavior. Some may call that bribery. We do not apologize." The author? Catherine Bertini (1950-; CFR, Trilateral, etc), Executive Director, United Nations World Food Program, former us Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Who created the GMO revolution? The usual suspects:

(Ch. 8, p. 152) In 1985, the Rockefeller Foundation initiated the first large-scale research into the possibility of genetically engineering plants for commercial use. At the time they termed it a "major, long-term commitment to plant genetic engineering." Rockefeller Foundation funds provided the essential catalyst for the worldwide scientific research and development which would lead to the creation of genetically modified plants, the Gene Revolution. Over the following two decades, the Rockefellers would spend well over \$100 million of foundation monies directly, and several hundred million indirectly, to catalyze and propagate research on the development of genetic engineering and its application to transform world food production. Clearly, it was a very big issue in their strategic plans.

The plans for using genes to implement eugenics-type programs had existed since the field of genetics had developed (with Rockefeller support) in the 1930s and 1940s.

Risks entailed weren't interesting to the Rockefeller group. Their methodology went back to what was termed "reductionism" by Rene Descartes, and to the method of Charles Dar-

win, namely that living creatures were machines whose only goal was genetic replication—a matter of chemistry and statistics. The Rockefeller methodology was an extension of the belief that a complex life form could be reduced to a basic building bloc or “elementary seed;” from which all traits of the life form could be deduced. It was of little interest to Weaver and others at the Rockefeller Foundation that scientific reductionism had been thoroughly refuted. “Who pays the Piper picks the tune.” They had a social agenda and their reductionist genetics supported that agenda.

The problem with genetic engineering of the vulgar, grab the gene and stick it in, type, from my perspective, is as follows: the genes are not merely discrete components, which you can remove and stick wherever you want. Each gene, I strongly suspect, interacts with its fellow genes at least in some degree. Now, in computer programming, one generally tries to isolate the different modules of a program in order to be able to work on one module in vacuum of the rest of the program. But there are limits to such efforts, and there always is at least some degree of inter-dependency between the modules. Thus, it may be possible to take one module from one program, and substitute it for a similar module in another program - and the program may even work - but it will, without a doubt, not function as it was intended to function - and it will not function better. Moreover, the problems that will arise may be imperceptible, may only emerge in the long-term, and may be insoluble in practical terms.

To put it bluntly, I am certain that it will be discovered that genetic engineering does not work in the sense that it allows humans to “improve” things. It may be possible to create shiny bacteria, or other such curiosities, but ultimately, no stable, harmless (to themselves and to the environment) organisms will be created via genetic engineering. Cloning is another matter.

In order to do true genetic engineering, people have to crack the genetic code. To crack a code, one needs: 1) some idea of the underlying language; and/or 2) some idea of the type of encryption the code has. Now, in real life, there are exceedingly simple encryptions that are next to impossible to crack. Moreover, the underlying language of the genetic code may be incomprehensible to humanity. Since the genetic code resembles a programming language so much, it is fair to suppose that it is one.

And so the genetic engineering madness is doomed to failure. There might be some limited good uses for genetic engineering, but the kind of things the Rockefellers are trying to do will lead to trouble, including for themselves. Such is the folly of hubris.

As Engdahl has also noticed, the problem with scientists is that they either *do not or refuse to* understand the basic implications of greed and excessive pride. For too many, the logic goes as follows: “I have a PhD! I am great! People as great as me do not make mistakes, and therefore my colleagues know their business.” What one needs to realize is that the PhD can be viewed as an award given for service, rather than as a recognition of intellectual achievement. The logic also says that: “Having grants is prestigious. Prestige is equivalent to intelligence. Only the smartest people get grants and prestige. The market, and also some very smart and prestigious people, decide who gets the grants.” This is blindness on account of greed and pride. Scientists must realize that they do not necessarily win grants for being great genuises (though, certainly, capable researchers in the less political sciences - if there are any - obtain useful grants for real research), but for advancing science (really, technology and doctrine) in a direction favorable to those who give out the grants - namely the rich, powerful owners of the foundations and the corporations, rich enough to also dominate the public grant-making institutions.

This is not to say that people should be self-flagellating monks. One has to have enough to provide for one’s needs; and one deserves to take quiet contentment in one’s real accomplishments. Hubris and rapacity, however, have been recognized as great evils for ages - the world literature is full of warnings in regard to both - and so we must be careful. Please interpret the last argument in philosophical rather than moral terms.

The point that the Rockefellers and their cronies operate under delusions, and in effect do not

know exactly what they are doing, bears repetition. Their great wealth, connections, and secrecy allow them to turn defeats into victories. Thus, it is very hard to tell to what extent they are opportunists, and to what extent their plans achieve fruition.

Are they bunglers or masterminds? As the 9/11 and WWII evil farces suggest, the top honchos are a little bit of both. They are only human, though, I have to admit, to my own amazement, that they may be driven by what we may metaphorically call demonic forces. If no such forces exist, whence psychopathy? But let us stay away from the metaphysical, and focus on the hard, discernible, undeniable reality.

In 1984, the Rockefeller gang decided to map the rice genome, with the obvious intention of eventually attempting to control the world supply of that fundamental staple crop, rice. As one would expect, they covered their tracks by claiming to be looking for ways to solve "world hunger." Solving the problem of world hunger is not hard - just let the nations develop their agricultural bases. But that can not happen under the obscene Ricardian "free-market" doctrine.

The scientists involved in the project gladly licked the hand that fed them.

For an example of the mechanics of the process,

(p. 162) The core driver of that earlier rice revolution had been the Philippines-based Rockefeller Foundation-created International Rice Research Institute (IRRI). It was not surprising then, that the IRRI, with a gene bank containing more than one-fifth of the world's rice varieties, became the prime vehicle to proliferate the Rockefeller Foundation's new gene revolution in rice; They banked every significant rice variety known.

IRRI had been used by the backers of the Green Revolution to gather control of the irreplaceable seed treasure of Asia's rice varieties, under the ruse that they would thereby be "protected."

The big companies picked seeds from this oh-so-benevolent outfit, frankensteined them, and patented the results.

The goal was to introduce, under the guise of humanitarian concerns, a patented, controlled seed into the Asian agriculture. Once the seed spread, the owners of the patent would be in charge. A major push toward a development of this type came with the aptly named "Gloden Rice" seed.

Part IV of Engdahl's work deals with the spread of the GMO menace.

(Ch. 9) Argentina, emaciated by the manufactured debt crisis, had the misfortune to be the first "guinea-pig." The cancer spread from there.

In a short space of just eight years, worldwide acreage planted with GMO crops grew to 167 million acres by 2004, an increase of some 40-fold. That acreage represented an impressive 25% of total land under agricultural cultivation in the world, suggesting GMO crops were well on the way to fully dominating world crop production, at least in basic crops, within a decade or even less. Over two-thirds of that acreage, or 106 million acres, was planted by the world's leading GMO advocate, the United States. That fact, its proponents argued, proved there was a high degree of confidence on the part of the US Government and consumers, as well as farmers, that GMO crops offered substantial benefits over conventional crops.

In 1995, there were next to none GMO crops. Around 2006, the top GMO-plantations were:²⁰ The United States were the first by far, with 54.6 million hectares of GMO. Second was Argentina, with 18 mln hectares. Then Brazil, with 11.5 mln hectares. Then British/US-dominated Canada, with

²⁰http://www.gmo-compass.org/eng/agri_biotechnology/gmo_planting/142.countries_growing_gmos.html, references an ISAAA article; accessed Jan 12, 2012.

6.1 mln hectares. And then China, with 3.5 mln hectares. India was penetrated shortly after the turn of the century, and is experiencing exponential GMO growth. The rest of the world has been cautious. Not everyone has fallen for the GMO bait.

Fortunately, the main GMO crops early on were cash-crops: soybean, corn, cotton, and canola. North Americans are well-advised to stay away from *anything* containing either soybean or corn. The problem is that the factory-farms feed soy to their animals, meaning that we get the GMO soy via the meat.

With Argentina, what happened was that the government was swindled (or bribed, or intimidated) into producing soybean cash crops to pay off its foreign debt.

(p. 186) By 2004, 48% of all agricultural land in the country was dedicated to soybean crops, and between 90% and 97% of these were Monsanto GMO Roundup Ready soybeans. Argentina had become the world's largest uncontrolled experimental laboratory for GMO.

Between 1988 and 2003, Argentine dairy farms had been reduced by half. For the first time, milk had to be imported from Uruguay at costs far higher than domestic prices. As mechanized soybean mono culture forced hundreds of thousands of workers off the land, poverty and malnutrition soared.

In the more tranquil era of the 1970's, before the New York banks stepped in, Argentina enjoyed one of the highest living standards in Latin America. The percentage of its population officially below the poverty line was 5% in 1970. By 1998, that figure had escalated to 30% of the total population. And by 2002, to 51%. By 2003, malnutrition rose to levels estimated at between 11% and 17% of the total population of 37 million.

The other aspect of the problem is as follows:

(p. 188) Collection of such a royalty or "technology license fee" was at the heart of the Monsanto marketing scheme. Farmers in the USA and elsewhere had to sign a binding contract with Monsanto agreeing to not re-use saved seeds and to pay new royalties to Monsanto each year—a system which can be seen as a new form of serfdom.

Collecting such fees in Argentina was illegal. So Big Agra bode its time for a while, allowing the crops to spread far and wide. And then, in 1999, wham! - Big Agra demanded its money, playing the victim. The Argentinian Menem government stood quiet. The leverage Big Agra had was its dominance at the points of entry of the Argentinian exports. Pay, the money-junkies said, or we will simply exact the money at the docks of the United States and Europe. In 2004, the Argentinian government passed a law forcing its people to pay for what they had before had for free.

The ruined Argentinians got hungry, and the government decided to feed them with what there was - namely soybeans unfit even for the cattle.

Chapter 10 deals with the GMOization of American Iraq. The cradle of civilization turned into the island of Dr Moreau(n) (the book was written, of course, by none other than H.G. Wells).

Chapter 11, titled *Planting the "Garden of Earthly Delights,"* examines the worldwide GMO push. Under the umbrella of the GATT and the WTO, the American-dominated Agribusiness is taking over the planet - or at least attempting to do so. GATT and its fellow hellspawn "treaties" provided the dual benefit of patent recognition and "free-market" annihilation of tariffs, quotas, and bans.

Fortunately for humanity, the EU with its powerful agricultural industry slapped a moratorium on GMOs in 1997. The Europeans are heroically resisting the GMO onslaught, and, in light of the experience of the GMO-infested nations in the last 15 years, the Oligarchical cabal will have a tough time penetrating Europe.

A recent *Time* article highlights the situation:

Is Europe Finally Ready for Genetically Modified Foods?²¹

Time; By Leo Cendrowicz / Brussels; Tuesday, Mar. 09, 2010

It's hard to work up an appetite when other diners brand what you're about to eat "Frankenstein food." For many Europeans, that evocative label has told them all they need to know about genetically modified organisms (GMOs). Opponents of GM foods have managed to paint them as the freakish products of a dangerous technology created by hubristic scientists.

But the European Union may have reached a tipping point in its awkward relationship with GMOs. This week, it quietly gave the green light to farmers to grow fields of genetically modified potatoes. It marks the first time that Brussels has approved any GMO cultivation since a moratorium 12 years ago.

In short, the Oligarch-controlled EU is pushing from above, while the people and certain national interests are resisting from below. Europe must hold on, lest the world enters a truly horrendous situation. Russia is also against the GMOs.

The propaganda machine extols the joys of GMO. In reality, apart from being poisonous and conductive to neo-feudalism, the GMO crops are *less* productive than ordinary crops, and require *more* fertilizers and pesticides. The last statement will of course be contradicted by a myriad of pseudo-scientific bought-and-paid-for "peer-reviewed" hack papers. Anyone with a grain of self-respect should *a priori* reject *all* papers affiliated in any way - including via the foundations - with the Oligarchical machine in general and Agribusiness in particular.

Here is the reality:

(p. 245) From Russian science came another test, the results of which were attacked and belittled by the marvellous propaganda machine of the GMO agribusiness lobby.

In January 2006, a respected London newspaper, *The Independent* carried a story titled, "Unborn Babies Could be Harmed by GMOS." The article reported on research results from scientist Dr. Irina Ermakova of the Institute of Higher Nervous Activity and Neurophysiology of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Her study found that more than half of the offspring of rats fed on genetically modified soybean diet died in the first three weeks of life-six times as many as those born to mothers with normal diets.

...

Tony Coombes, director of corporate affairs for Monsanto UK, told the press, "The overwhelming weight of evidence from published, peer-reviewed, independently conducted scientific studies demonstrates that Roundup Ready soy can be safely consumed by rats, as well as all other animal species studied."

Whom are we going to believe? The Russian Academy of Sciences or Monsanto?

There are other GMO debacles one can cite, but I feel the point has been made.

Part V of Engdahl's expose deals with the Malthusian angle.

We have already mentioned the wonderful "terminator" seeds, which produce a crop, which can not be replanted. The implications are obvious: pay or starve. Everybody could see that, and so:

(Ch. 12, p. 262) In September 1999, Gordon Conway, the Rockefeller Foundation President, took the highly unusual step of asking to personally address the Board of Directors of Monsanto. He made clear to them that what was at stake was to demand Monsanto not to persist in developing and commercializing Terminator seed technologies.

²¹<http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,1970471,00.html>, accessed Jan 12, 2012.

Monsanto listened carefully to Conway. On October 4, 1999, Monsanto CEO, Robert B. Shapiro, held a press conference where he announced that the company had decided to stop the process of commercializing the Terminator technology.

I.e., "Let us keep our trump cards hidden, boys!"

But there is more.

(pp. 270-271) In San Diego, a small, privately-owned biotech company, Epicyte, held a press conference in September 2001 to make an announcement about its work. Epicyte reported that they had successfully created the ultimate GMO crop-contraceptive corn. They had taken antibodies from women with a rare condition known as immune infertility, isolated the genes that regulated the manufacture of those infertility antibodies, and, using genetic engineering techniques, had inserted the genes into ordinary corn seeds used to produce corn plants. "We have a hothouse filled with corn plants that make anti-sperm antibodies;" boasted Epicyte President, Mitch Hein.

At the time of this dramatic announcement, which went largely uncommented by the world's major media, Epicyte had concluded a strategic joint research and licensing agreement with Dow Chemical Company through Dow AgroSciences, one of the three agribusiness genetic seed giants in the US. The purpose of that joint venture, they announced at the time, was to combine Epicyte's technological breakthroughs with Dow AgroSciences' "strength in the genetic engineering of crops."

This is another *ipso facto* criminal endeavour. Why on Earth would anyone try to develop a spermicidal seed except to cull proportions of the world's population?

Considering that: 1) We have a very rich and instructive history of Malthusianism and eugenics; 2) We have the explicit Club of Rome and NSM200 documents, as well as the recent Billionaires population-control meeting; 3) We have the GMO-push; we can only make one conclusion - that there are plans for the genocidal sterilization of a great deal of the world's population. Moreover, they can unleash this hell on Earth very easily, by innocently mixing the sterilizing agents with "ordinary" GMO corn. By such a gambit, however, they would risk exposing their whole campaign - and so they are waiting for the right time.

Moreover, if 1) the Oligarchs have spermicidal food; 2) they have repeatedly threatened to poison food supplies; 3) the sperm quality in the west is decreasing; then we must make the conclusion that *people are already being quietly poisoned in some way*. The process has to be slow, because any sudden outbreak in infertility would blow up the whole scam. In the long run, the Oligarchs will find some "scientists" to claim that the mass infertility is a Gaian-pseudo-evolutionary revenge, or something along those lines, and that anyway the planet was "overpopulated" and that "science" will save the day with designer babies.

The reader should watch the rather disgusting, but technically and thematically remarkable movie *Children of Men* (2006).

Engdahl gives an example of a sterilizing vaccine; we will look at the vaccines problem shortly.

Chapter 13 looks at the prospects of GMO chickens. First plants, then birds, then perhaps cows (Engdahl's Ch. 14 reports of patents on pigs) - and the ultimate goal remains GMO humans - the greatest travesty imaginable.

Before concluding, let us take a look at two notable GMO scandals - one in Canada, and one in India.

It has been said that the murder of one man is a tragedy, while the murder of a million is a statistic. Let us begin with the tragedy.

Percy Schmeiser (1931-), a small Saskatchewan farmer, found Monsanto canola on his property in 1997. Somehow or other, he used the seeds for his 1998 crop. Monsanto slapped him with a lawsuit, demanding their patent royalties. Schmeiser refused to pay. Their argument was that he was using their "intellectual property," and his argument was that it was not his fault that the wind had blown franken-canola on his property, and that he was free to do whatever he wished with his own property.

The Canadian Supreme Court ruled 5-4 that Monsanto's patent was valid. They also ruled 9-0 in absolving Schmeiser from paying damages, since he had not gained anything by using the frankenseeds - his profits would have been the same either way.

Schmeiser's adventures attracted much publicity, and the man became a symbol of the anti-GMO movement. In particular, the episode highlighted the GMO cabal's vulnerability to adverse publicity. Their case is barely tenable as it is, and would be impossible without their stranglehold on the media and the U.S. federal government.

The attack on the Canadian farmers continues and must be withstood.

The second, far more tragic story is that of the Indian farmers.

KILLER SEEDS: The Devastating Impacts of Monsanto's Genetically Modified Seeds in India²² by Iqbal Ahmed; *Global Research*, January 12, 2012

In a country of more than 550 million farmers who are largely poor and uneducated and the agriculture market rife with inefficient business practices, the Indian government sought to reform the market by eliminating subsidies and loans to the farmers.

The government reform did not help the farmers. With pressure from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Indian government has "forced market liberalization on India which means the elimination of government subsidies and government-backed loans to farmers."

Enter Monsanto with its "magic" GM seeds to transform the lives of the poor Indian farmers.

The U.S. agri-business giant took full advantage of its entry into the Indian market. It entered into an agreement with state governments including Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh to introduce a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that dictated the terms of disseminating the GM technology in Indian market.

For Monsanto, it is one thing to convince farmers to use artificial seeds for the purposes of enriching their lives, it is quite another to manipulate nature and technology to profit from them.

Killer Seeds

The irony is GM seeds have not been effective in India and the consequences are not as rosy as what Monsanto had promised to deliver. Scathing reports of mass suicides of the Indian farmers broke out as recently as three years ago when scores of farmers took their own lives in order to escape the burden of high price and failure of Monsanto's GM seeds. Monsanto offered its GM seeds to the farmers of India with hopes of reaping plentiful crops. Plain and mostly uneducated farmers thought Monsanto has come to provide a "magic" formula that would transform their lives. They had no idea what was coming. Monsanto's seeds in India did not produce what the company had promised and farmers hoped. The expensive seeds piled up debts and destroyed farming fields. In many instances, the crops simply failed to materialize. The farmers were not aware that the GM seeds required more water than the traditional seeds. And lack of rain in many parts of India exacerbated the crop failure.

With no harvest, the farmers could not pay back the lenders. Burdened with debts and humiliation, the farmers simply took their own lives, some by swallowing poisonous pesticides in front of their families. To date, an estimated 200,000 farmers have committed

²²<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=28629>, accessed Jan 13, 2012.

suicide all over India.

To add to the misery, wives inherited the debts along with the fear of losing their homes and lands. With no money coming in, they also had to pull their kids from the schools. The mass suicide among the Indian farmers is known as the "GM genocide."

Market Power

Using its colossal market power, Monsanto craftily penetrated into the Indian markets. Monsanto convinced the Indian government that its GM seeds would produce better crops. According to a report by Farm Wars, one former Managing Director of Monsanto claimed that Monsanto manipulated research data "to get commercial approvals for its products in India."

Indian regulatory agencies, instead of verifying the data, simply remained compliant with the findings of what Monsanto presented. "They did not even have a test tube to validate the data and, at times, the data itself was faked," the Farm Wars report says.

Government regulations worked in favor of Monsanto to monopolize the Indian seed market. For example, "Prime Ministers Office" in India pressured various state governments to sign MOUs with Monsanto to privatize the seed market.

Through these "vested interests" with the Indian government, Monsanto eventually has monopolized the GM seed market for more than a decade.

Unable to purchase traditional seeds, the farmers had to pay a hefty price for the expensive GM seeds. Many farmers had to borrow money from the local lenders to buy Monsanto's seeds. To cite an example of how expensive the GM seeds are, 100 grams of GM cost \$15 to the farmers compared with \$15 for 1000 grams of traditional seeds.

Vandana Shiva, a renowned scientist and activist in India, wrote that Monsanto had also planned to control water in India. Its aim was to control water supply through privatization. In other words, Monsanto sought to profit from water, a lifeline of Indian livelihood. By seeking control of water, Monsanto also seized the opportunity to benefit from the scarce water supply that plagues communities throughout India.

...

Facing pressure from the anti-GM seed activists, NGOs, and local communities, the Indian government gave in. In 2010, Indian Environment Minister issued a temporary "moratorium" on Monsanto to introduce genetically engineered egg plant seeds in India. Only time will tell how long this policy effects will last.

In a country where money, politics, and business often go hand in hand, the farmers are at the mercy of their own fate.

The world must learn from the suffering of the Indians, or suffer in turn.

In summary, 1) the Oligarchs are trying to take over the world's food supply; 2) the usual suspects are driving the whole process; 3) the explicit purpose of GMOs is a) to provide the corporate powers and their owners with a neo-feudal control mechanism, and b) to open-up new frontiers of Malthusianism; 4) the GMO crops exploded exponentially between the time of their introduction in 1996, and today; 5) the GMO expansion has reached powerful bastions - Europe, Russia, and, by-and-large, China; 6) the issue is, literally, one of life and death.

What can we expect?

First, should the GMO project succeed, we can expect a Malthusian/ neo-feudal assault on humanity. That is beyond doubt.

Will it succeed? That is debatable. My view is that the gradualist strategy has poor chances of success in regard to the GMOs. The problem with the GMOs is that they are too obviously poisonous and detrimental to society. Any half-conscious person can look at what the GMOs did for Argentina and for the farmers in Argentina, Canada, and India. Thus, the Oligarchs may have missed their window of opportunity. In the near future, we are most likely to see a retrenchment of the anti-GMO

resistance. Elements in Canada and the United States may and should organize their own anti-GMO lobbies. There is reason for optimism. At the same time, the Oligarchical machine is a powerful one, and may come up with all sorts of tricks.

In contrast to such subtler ideologies as Darwinism and Global Warming, the GMO craze is an *immediate and recognizable* threat. Thus, while people fail to see the lack of logic behind the former scams, they readily perceive the problems with GMO "food." Russia, China, and the stronger European governments have the moral obligation to strongly condemn the GMO cult. At the time of this writing in early 2012, all three great powers are under Anglo-American attack (China via the threat on its oil supply; Russia via a color revolution; Europe via economic warfare - S&P just slashed the credit ratings of all of Europe on Jan 13 2012). The Sino-Russo-Europeans are in a war, and should forego diplomatic niceties, and defend themselves. Moreover, the enemy are not the people of America or England, but the camarilla operating from Wall Street and the City. Should a powerful enough player raise the banner against the Oligarchical despotism, the populations of North America and Britain, which are growing increasingly discontent, may be won over.

10.3 The Food Crisis

If you were a Malthusian Oligarch and wanted to kill five billion people, what would you do? Wars, even modern industrial wars, do not kill nearly enough humans. Moreover, after every war, people develop a brief immunity to warmongering, and live in peace for a while. Moreover, the nukes have made warfare unreliable. One wrong move, and the entire planet goes. You don't want to destroy that which you want to inherit.

Plague is a good killer, but modern society has become far too healthy and hygienic to succumb to a good plague. An induced plague would be risky. It remains an option.

But the safest way to provoke megadeath is to cause a famine. The old Malthusian way - safe and reliable. And the beauty of it is - nobody can blame you! All you have to do is turn around and say, "See? Malthus was right, after all!"

And so, having worked diligently for a century to acquire control of the world's food supplies. They control the trade, they have swindled nations into producing coffee and chocolate and cotton rather than grain and corn via the Ricardian fraud of "relative efficiency," they have exhausted the world's grain reserves - and now they are deliberately destroying perfectly good crops in one of the vilest, most transparent, and potentially most genocidal lunacies in history.

Getting used to Life without Food

Wall Street, BP, bio-ethanol and the death of millions

by F. William Engdahl²³

Eliminating emergency reserves

The ability to manipulate the price of essential foods worldwide at will - almost irrespective of today's physical supply and demand for grains - is quite recent. It is also scarcely understood.

Up until the grain crisis of the mid-1970s there was no single "world price" for grain, the benchmark for the price of all foods and food products. Grain prices were determined locally in thousands of market places where buyer and seller met. The onset of economic globalization was to change that radically to the worse as the tiny percent of grains traded internationally were able to set the global price for the bulk of grains grown.

From the time of the earliest traces left by Sumerian civilization some two thousand years before Christ, in the region between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers in today's Iraq, almost every culture had the practice of storing a reserve stock of a grain harvest right up to the most recent times. Wars, droughts and famines were the reason. When properly

²³<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=25483>, accessed Jan 18, 2012.

stored, grain can be safely stored over a period of about seven years, enabling reserve stocks in case of an emergency.

After the Second World War, Washington created a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to serve as a wedge to push free trade among major industrial nations, especially the European Community. During initial negotiations, agriculture was deliberately kept off the table at the insistence of the Europeans, especially the French, who regarded political defense of Europe's Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) and European agriculture protections as non-negotiable.

Beginning in the 1980s with the political crusades of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, the extremist free market views of Chicago's Milton Friedman became increasingly accepted by leading European power circles. Step-by-step the resistance to the Washington agriculture free trade agenda dissolved.

After more than seven years of intense horse-trading, lobbying and pressure, the European Union finally agreed in 1993 to the GATT Uruguay Round, requiring a major reduction of national agriculture protection. Central to the Uruguay Round deal was agreement on one major change: national grain reserves as a government responsibility were to be ended.

Under the new 1993 GATT agreement, formalized with the creation of a World Trade Organization to police the agreements with enforceable sanctions against violators, 'free trade' in agriculture products was for the first time an agreed priority of the world's major trading nations, a fateful decision to put it mildly.

Henceforth, grain reserves were to be managed by the 'free market,' by private companies, greatest among them the US Grain Cartel giants, the behemoths of American agribusiness. The grain companies argued that they would be able to fill any emergency gaps more efficiently and save governments the cost. That ill-advised decision would open the floodgates to unprecedented grain market shenanigans and manipulations.

ADM (Archer Daniels Midland), Continental Grain, Bunge and the primus inter pares, Cargill - the largest privately-held grain and agribusiness trading company in the world - emerged the great winners of the WTO process.

The outcome of the GATT agriculture talks was very much to the liking of the people at Cargill. That was no surprise to insiders. Former Cargill executive Dan Amstutz played the key role in drafting the agriculture trade section of the GATT Uruguay Round. In 1985 D. Gale Johnson of the University of Chicago, a colleague of Milton Friedman, co-authored a seminal report for David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission that was the blueprint for what they called "market-oriented" agricultural reform. It provided the framework for the US position in the coming GATT Uruguay Round negotiations. The Rockefeller group and its think tanks were the architects of 'agricultural reform,' as with so much in our post-1945 world.

The process of eliminating government grain reserves in major producing countries took time, but with the passage of the 1996 Farm Bill, the US had virtually eliminated its grain reserves. The EU followed soon after. Today, among major agriculture producing countries, only China and India still hold to a strategic security policy of nationally held grain reserves.

Wall Street smells blood

The elimination of national grain reserves in the USA and EU and other major OECD industrial countries set the stage for the next step in the process - elimination of agricultural commodity derivatives regulation, allowing unbridled unchecked speculative manipulations.

As we discussed in Chapter 2 of the current work, the 2000 Financial "Modernization" Act unleashed unbridled speculation, epitomized, as Taibbi recorded, by the vampire squid of Goldman Sachs. Whether Goldman was the worst offender is debatable. Perhaps they were the most brazen criminals,

but surely, the rest of Wall Street and the City, also took its tithe.

For some two billion people in the world who spend more than half of their income on food, the effects have been horrifying. During the speculation-driven grain price explosion in 2008, more than a quarter billion people became what the UN terms "food insecure," or a total of one billion human beings, a new record.

That need never have occurred had it not been for the diabolical consequences of the US Government deregulating grain speculation, with support from the US Congress over the past decade or more. By early 2008, upwards of 35% of all US arable land was being planted with corn to be burned as biofuel under the new Bush Administration incentives. In 2011 the total is more than 40%. Thus, the stage was set for the slightest minor market shock to detonate a massive speculative bubble in grain markets, as was then being done by the use of the same GSCI index games as are played with oil.

The last point bears repeating.

America, the grainbasket of the planet, has turned its agricultural might to producing "biofuels." Biofuels are genocide. The Global Warming scam is the barely palatable excuse for biofuels. Some scientists have perceived the reality of the farce:²⁴

Converting corn to ethanol in Iowa not only leads to clearing more of the Amazonian rainforest, researchers report in a pair of new studies in *Science*, but also would do little to slow global warming - and often make it worse.

"Prior analyses made an accounting error," says one study's lead author, Tim Searchinger, an agricultural expert at Princeton University. "There is a huge imbalance between the carbon lost by plowing up a hectare [2.47 acres] of forest or grassland from the benefit you get from biofuels."

Growing plants store carbon in their roots, shoots and leaves. As a result, the world's plants and the soil in which they grow contain nearly three times as much carbon as the entire atmosphere. "I know when I look at a tree that half the dry weight of it is carbon," says ecologist David Tilman of the University of Minnesota, coauthor of the other study which examined the "carbon debt" embedded in any biofuel. "That's going to end up as carbon dioxide in the atmosphere when you cut it down."

The problem with scientists and politicians and people in general is that they think that somebody out there surely knows what he is doing. Biofuels may be insane, but hey, the guys at the top know their business.

Of course they do! That is why we had the war in Iraq and the 2008 economic meltdown.

Continuing with Engdahl's article:

The Killer PunchBP, Bioethanol and Genocide

In 2007, just as the US real estate crisis was causing the first tsunami shock waves through Wall Street, the Bush Administration made a major public relations push to convince the world that the US had turned into a "better steward of the environment." Too many fell for the hype.

The center of the Bush program, announced in his January 2007 State of the Union Address, was something called '20 in 10' - cutting US gasoline use 20% by 2010. The official reason given to the public was to "reduce dependency on imported oil," as well as cutting unwanted "greenhouse gas" emissions. That wasn't the case, of course, but it made good PR. Repeat it often enough and maybe most people will believe it. Maybe they won't realize that their taxpayer subsidies are being used to grow ethanol corn

²⁴ *Scientific American*, February 2008: *Biofuels Are Bad for Feeding People and Combating Climate Change*; <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=biofuels-bad-for-people-and-climate>, Jan 18, 2012.

instead of feed corn and are also driving the price of their daily bread through the roof. The heart of the Bush plan was a huge taxpayer-subsidized expansion of the use of bio-ethanol for transport fuel. President Bush's first plan required production of 35 billion gallons (about 133 billion liters) of ethanol a year by 2017. Congress had already mandated, via the Energy Policy Act of 2005, that corn ethanol for fuel must rise from 4 billion gallons in 2006 to 7.5 billion gallons in 2012.

To make certain it would happen, farmers and big agribusiness giants like ADM were given generous taxpayer subsidies to grow corn for fuel instead of for food. David Rockefeller's corporate farms were one of the largest recipients of US Government agriculture subsidies. Currently ethanol producers in the US get a subsidy of 51 cents per gallon of ethanol. The subsidy is paid to the blender, usually an oil company, that blends it with gasoline for sale. In the 2011 harvest year, an estimated 40% of all corn acreage in the United States is expected to be grown for biofuel.

As a result of these generous US Government subsidies to produce bio-ethanol fuels, and the new legislative mandate, the US refinery industry has been investing big time in building special new ethanol distilleries, similar to oil refineries, except they produce ethanol fuel. The number currently under construction exceeds the total number of oil refineries built in the US over the past 25 years. When finished in the next 2-3 years, the demand for corn and other grain to make ethanol for car fuel will double from present levels.

Not wanting to be left behind, the EU bureaucrats in Brussels - no doubt generously encouraged by the likes of BP, Cargill, ADM and the major biofuel lobby - came up with its own scheme for "10 in 20" or a mandate that 10% of all road fuel in the EU by 2020 be from biofuel. Shockingly, they did so despite the existence of a report by the same EU Commission on the damaging impact of such a massive turn to subsidized biofuels.

And so on. LaRouche (with whom Engdahl is acquainted) has also spoken on the food crisis. The other vocal group alert to the debacle is the Peak Oil eschatological cult. Unfortunately, the Peak Oilers arrive from the Malthusian perspective. The problem is not Malthusian. It is economico-political.

"Biofuel," by the way, means alcohol. Biofuel is ethanol. Booze. What you do is, you pour a vast amount of petroleum over a batch of land, and you get grain. Then you refine that into booze. Then you drive your car with that. Of course, you could have used the petroleum to fuel the car to begin with. But then you would not have a genocide.

Meanwhile, something like one out of seven Americans are on food stamps. Already malnourished by the disgusting sugar-laden dishes stuffed down their throats, the Americans now can not even those!

Mass famine must be prevented. The biofuels, the GMOs, and the Ricardian "relative efficiencies" must be phased out as quickly as possible.

10.4 Vaccines

Note: in the context of this section, we regard vaccination and inoculation as synonymous. In principle, broadly, *vaccination* involves the introduction of dead foreign organisms into the body, and *inoculation* involves the introduction of live foreign organisms into the body. The goal in both cases is to provoke an immunization response in the body.

The incidence rates of autism in the United States have been rising since at least 1980. (Figures from Wikipedia's Autism page) In particular, the incidence went from about 0.6-0.7 per 1,000 in 1996 to about 2.0 per 1,000 in 2001 to about 5.2 per 1,000 in 2007. They are saying now that something like

1 in 100 children has autism. The situation is similar, though not as egregious, in the other Western countries. South Korea is the worst hit, with autism rates among children approaching 3%. Unfortunately, the available worldwide data on the incidence of autism is rather poor. Nevertheless, the prevailing opinion is that: 1) autism is on the rise, exponentially so; and 2) nobody knows why, though it is becoming undeniable that the causes are environmental.

Now, from what I gather, the official line is that the methods for catching the autistics have improved, and that many autistics who slipped between the cracks in the old days, to live lives of terrible misery, are now caught by the good psychiatrists and treated humanely with toxic expensive pharmaceutical drugs.

We have to take exception to this view. America was not some barbaric zoo back in the 1950s and 1960s. It was the most developed nation on the planet. It had its faults, but it was, nevertheless, something special. And we are to believe that the Americans failed to notice that many of their "autistic" kids went undiagnosed?

The psychiatrist kooks, of whom we talk in the next section, have indeed embarked on a frenzy of over-diagnosis of all sorts of imaginary illnesses, but that can not, by itself, account for the autism explosion. Moreover, autism is not as imaginary as other illnesses, though we can be sure that the psychiatrists are trigger-happy.

So, for some reason, the incidence of autism is rising.

What could be the cause for this debacle? Obviously, the cause has to be some external factor connected with either the food or the medicine children ingest. The "gene pool" has not miraculously metamorphosed over a night.

We have seen that GMO foods, which were introduced around 1996, may be one cause for the rise of autism. The psycho-pharmaceutical offensive, which began in the late 1980s, and which we examine in the next section, undoubtedly contributes to the autism epidemic. The sugar poisoning of the modern (post-1982) American diet is another culprit.

But we also have to ask: could vaccination also provide answers? Beyond a doubt, vaccination is one potential cause that must be looked at.

Whatever the case, in light of the repeated Malthusian promises for sterilization via vaccination, we have to look at the existing problems of modern inoculation.

Now, there exists an anti-vaccine movement *within the medical community*. As pointed out before, nobody denies gravity and electricity, and therefore we have to examine the heretical minority views held by academics, particularly in regard to those issues even remotely connected to the pernicious dogma of eugenics. And it is obvious that vaccination poses significant "eugenical" connotations. Moreover, whereas the argument can be made that the anti-Darwinists arrive from a hard ideological religious perspective, vaccines are, more or less, ideology free - and hence, the views of the anti-vaccines crowd must be examined circumspectly.

A good list of anti-vaccine literature can be found on the following webpage: <http://www.whale.to/vaccines/books.html>²⁵

The authors of the webpage recommend the following titles: *Vaccination is Not Immunization* (2011) by Tim O'Shea, DC; *Vaccine Safety Manual for Concerned Families and Health Practitioners: Guide to Immunization Risks and Protection* (2008) by Neil Z. Miller; *Silenced Witnesses Volume II: The Parents' Story* (2010); *Vitamin C, Infectious Diseases, and Toxins: Curing the Incurable* (2002) by Thomas E. Levy, M.D., J.D.; *What the Pharmaceutical companies don't want you to know about Vaccines* (2008) by Dr Todd M. Elsner, D.C.

The site lists an additional fifty-odd titles. Most of the works are recent (post-1985). The contro-

²⁵ Accessed on Jan 14, 2012.

versy, however, is more than a century old. One classic anti-vaccine expose is Chas M. Higgins's (1854-1929, prominent American ink manufacturer) *Horrors of Vaccination Exposed and Illustrated* (1920), which deals with the Spanish influenza epidemic, which claimed the lives of more US troops during and shortly after WWI, than did the Germans.

Another notable book on vaccination is Graham Wilson's *The Hazards of Immunization* (1967). (Sir) Wilson (1895-1987) was a Fellow of the Royal Society, and a pro-vaccinationist.

Robert S. Mendelsohn's *Confessions of a Medical Heretic* (1980) is a popular classic.

A reference that I can explicitly recommend is *Fowl! Bird Flu: It's Not What You Think* (2006) by Dr. Sherri J. Tenpenny.

Another highly recommended work is *Murder by Injection* (1988) by the inimitable Eustace Mullins.²⁶ *Murder* provides copious amounts of evidence of the terrific and terrible Rockefeller influence over the American (and hence world) medical establishment.

A priori, I see the following reasons to doubt the usefulness of vaccination: 1) the Malthusian-eugenecist problem; 2) the incidence of mass delusion in the medical profession - the historical bleeding of patients, the psychiatric torture chambers of the 20th century, the "racial hygiene" craze, and the Darwinist surgical removal of "redundant organs" mania are cases in point; 3) the incidence of mass delusions in the academic community in general - AGW, Darwinism, free-marketeering, psychopharmacology, etc; 4) the fact that the periods of introduction of vaccines coincided with the periods of the improvement of sanitary conditions in various places; 5) the fact that vaccine-caused deaths can be confused with "natural" child deaths via a mistaken pre-supposition (namely, that vaccines work); 6) the fact that compulsory vaccination makes it impossible to compare the rates of incidence of certain illnesses *manifested in the long-term* with the corresponding rates in a control group; 7) the disproportionate power of small cliques in the worldwide medical establishment, notably that of the head honchos of the AMA and the WHO; 8) the diabolical "free-market" connotations of compulsory vaccination - since the *public* pays *private* manufacturers for the making of vaccines, the latter have the incentive to invent more and more vaccines; 9) the strange logic of vaccination - how can one prevent an illness by inflicting it?; 10) the bizarre manufacturing processes of the vaccines - who wants monkey tissue and mercury in his body?

The first two issues can not be stressed enough. Of Malthusianism, we can hardly say more. Of medical barbarism, we must stress that for centuries upon centuries, up to the end of the 19th, the good doctors *bled people to "cure" them*. Now, the exorcisms of evil spirits I can accept. At worst, an exorcism (assuming it does not involve damaging the body in any way and is purely "spiritual") can not harm the patient, and it probably provides a useful placebo effect. But bloodletting is pure lunacy.

Hence, I can not accept the claim of infallibility of the medical establishment. I am tired of the "we were wrong once, but now we have the right answer!" Panglossian arrogant mentality. The medical profession has committed grave blunders, and will submit to judgement from outside its brainwashed priesthood.

Another gruesome example of medical insanity is the "vestigial organs" scam. In the aftermath of the introduction of the Darwinian lunacy, it was decided that many of the organs of the human body were evolutionary dead-ends, and therefore useless. The medical butchers went on a surgery frenzy - after all, the surgical removal of an organ is both enjoyable and profitable! Of course, the "useless organs" were merely organs whose use had not yet been understood. Thus, recent research shows that "vestigial organs" like the appendix and the spleen have their purposes.²⁷ That the human body can live sans organs is obvious - but would you cut off your legs just because you can live without them? The imbecile Darwinists have now decided that much of DNA is "junk." I say, line

²⁶A half-hour Mullins interview on the subject can be found online: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IWkqSncY3fg>, Jan 14, 2012.

²⁷For example, see this: <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2009/07/090730-spleen-vestigial-organs.html>, accessed Jan 14, 2012.

up all Darwinists and cut off all of their vestigial organs. They don't need them anyway! Improve their fitness, ease their burdens, let them prove their theory in practice!

More examples of medical folly can be provided. The (Rockefeller-dominated) mainstream "study" of cancer consists of almost nothing but butchery. See Ch.3 of Mullins's *Murder*. In particular, irradiation treatment is nothing more than the bloodletting of old, metamorphosed.

So, no, people should not "trust" the doctors. They should study issues for themselves.

10.4.1 Fun Facts About Vaccines

First, we have to define the thesis of the pro-vaccines crowd. That can be summarized as follows: 1) vaccination "works," in the sense that it is *the* driving force in reducing the prevalence of certain illnesses; 2) vaccination is relatively harmless, in the sense that the damage it causes is inferior to the benefit it produces; 3) vaccination has been "proved" to work historically. Points one and three overlap, but let us separate them for convenience.

Observe that one incontrovertible counter-example is sufficient to disprove each of the three hypotheses. This is the logical principle of contradiction, of which many people seem to be unaware. Hence, if even one example of a disease disappearing sans vaccination can be provided, the thesis that vaccination is the sole panacea falls apart.

Furthermore, if one can come up with an example of a vaccinated population succumbing to disease, the thesis of the infallibility of vaccination collapses. To the argument that maybe some vaccines are more effective than others, one has to reply that maybe the assumptions belying the theory of vaccination are faulty.

Another important logical principle is the following one: *correlation does not necessarily imply causation*. Thus, the British enacted vaccine laws in 1853 and 1867. But they also established a Public Health Act in 1875. By 1900, say, smallpox, had been nearly eliminated. We have a double correlation, but which was the major causal factor?

To see the point from another angle, consider the following: it is easy to provide an example of more people dying from vaccines in a certain population, than from the disease the vaccine was supposed to destroy. The pro-vaccination crowd will claim that this is so only because the vaccine prevented further deaths from the disease. But that is circular logic - they assume what they have to prove, namely that the vaccine works. The question arises: have they compared the relevant death rates of the vaccinated population to the death rates in an equivalent unvaccinated population? In light of the compulsory vaccination laws in the developed West, the question is a crucial one.

The other major conundrum with vaccination concerns the continued vaccination of a population following the annihilation of a disease. Namely - why vaccinate, if the disease is gone? Why not treat the occasional outbreaks, in any occur at all, via quarantine? The pharmaceutical industry and the medical establishment have obvious reasons - profits and prestige - to promote endless vaccination. In view of that conflict of interest, the issue, I suspect, has not been subjected to a thorough enough analysis.

Let us begin with two points that should be obvious.

First, medical doctors in the West are 1) arrogant;²⁸ 2) trained to memorize rather than to think; and 3) trained to suppress symptoms rather than identify and remove causes.²⁹ The first point is

²⁸From the New York Times:

A survey of health care workers at 102 nonprofit hospitals from 2004 to 2007 found that 67 percent of respondents said they thought there was a link between disruptive behavior and medical mistakes, and 18 percent said they knew of a mistake that occurred because of an obnoxious doctor. (The author was Dr. Alan Rosenstein, medical director for the West Coast region of VHA Inc., an alliance of nonprofit hospitals.)

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/02/health/02rage.html?pagewanted=all>, accessed Jan 16, 2012.

²⁹See Mendelsohn's writings.

self-evident - doctors think of themselves as the elite of the elite, the best of all academics, mostly because their wages are so high, and Western society determines one's value by the amount of money one makes. For the second point, observe that medical training entails the memorization of endless facts, factoids, and theories. To pass their exams, doctors have to learn to regurgitate memorized information, rather than to think constructively. Finally, modern medicine does not fix causes, it just treats symptoms. You are given a magic pill that is known to diminish your symptoms (and cause side effects, necessitating further profitable medical "care"), and you are sent on your way. I encourage those who doubt the above three-pronged thesis to consult the minions of the doctors - namely the nurses, the hospital staffs, and the frequent patients. Between their arrogance and their training, doctors should be expected to be susceptible to mass delusion.

Next, vaccination is profitable. A century ago, there were barely any vaccines, and today the average American child is stuffed like a turkey, with something like 30+ vaccines. The pharmaceutical companies make those vaccines, and the public pays either directly or via taxes. We are talking serious profits here.

The next question is: are vaccines safe? The answer is - no. For a technical overview of the subject, look up Graham Wilson's *The Hazards of Immunization*. In summary,

(Wilson, *Hazards* (1967), Ch.1) The risks attendant on the use of vaccines and sera are not as well recognized as they should be. Indeed our knowledge of them is still too small, and the incomplete knowledge we have is not widely disseminated. This was forcibly brought home to me when I read a statement by a university lecturer in bacteriology at a symposium in 1965 on immunization, that the first recorded disaster associated with a vaccine was that known as the Lubeck disaster. The failure of a health officer to appreciate the risks of immunization is regrettable enough, but that a medical bacteriologist should be wholly ignorant of the long series of accidents that occurred during the forty years before 1930 struck me as being almost incredible, till I reflected that his ignorance must be due to the almost complete absence of information on the subject in current textbooks of bacteriology. The lesson to be learnt is the importance of approaching any subject from a historical angle, for unless we know and can benefit from the mistakes of our predecessors we are liable to make even greater mistakes ourselves.

...

During the course of my reading I have come to the conclusion that no vaccine or anti-serum can be regarded as completely safe. Some are very much safer than others, but no vaccine or antiserum that has yet been used has been free from complications or accidents of one sort or another.

Wilson proceeds to warn that his list is incomplete, and then fills two hundred pages with instances of vaccine-related damage. One doubts that, despite Wilson's worthy effort, the medical profession has become any more aware of the dangers of vaccination. Note that Wilson was pro-vaccination. He stated that, as far as he was concerned, the benefits of vaccination out-weighted the costs. Well, as Wilson himself said, the research into subject was woeful. Perhaps the benefits were as overstated as he found the costs to have been understated.

In short, 1) vaccines are always dangerous, and 2) the medical profession is not well-aware of the dangers.

To provide an example of the points stressed so far:

Europe to Investigate WHO 'False Pandemic' Scandal³⁰
 Alex Newman for *The New American*, Jan 05, 2010.

³⁰<http://www.thenewamerican.com/world-mainmenu-26/europe-mainmenu-35/2697-eu-to-investigate-who-false-pandemic>
 Jan 14, 2012.

The Council of Europe is set to investigate the World Health Organization's swine flu campaign this month over allegations of improper influence from pharmaceutical companies in declaring the H1N1 "pandemic" and the promotion of "inefficient" and potentially dangerous vaccination strategies.

The resolution to launch the emergency inquiry was approved by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) and passed through the health committee unanimously. It states in part that "in order to promote their patented drugs and vaccines against flu, pharmaceutical companies influenced scientists and official agencies responsible for public health standards to alarm governments worldwide and make them squander tight health resources for inefficient vaccine strategies, and needlessly expose millions of healthy people to the risk of an unknown amount of side-effects of insufficiently tested vaccines."

"The 'birds-flu'-campaign (2005/06) combined with the 'swine-flu'-campaign seem to have caused a great deal of damage not only to some vaccinated patients and to public health-budgets, but to the credibility and accountability of important international health-agencies," noted the resolution. "The Council of Europe and its member-states should ask for immediate investigations and consequences on their national levels as well as on the international level. The definition of an alarming pandemic must not be under the influence of drug-sellers."

Leading the charge for the probe is German epidemiologist Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg, the chairman of the PACE health committee and a medical doctor specializing in lung disease. "The victims among millions of needlessly vaccinated people must be protected by their states and independent scientific clarification should provide evidence and transparency for national and - if necessary - European courts," Wodarg said in a statement.

Wodarg called the "false pandemic" one of the greatest medical scandals of the last century and said that pharmaceutical companies influenced the whole process and needed to be held accountable. They were willing to "inflict bodily harm in their pursuit of profits," he said. Articles in the European press, starting in Denmark and spreading, have repeatedly called into question the myriad ties between vaccine manufacturers and decision makers in the United Nations' global health body.

Earlier this year the WHO redefined the term pandemic, lowering the threshold for an emergency declaration by removing the requirement of an "enormous" number of deaths. The WHO estimated that by the end of 2009, around 10,000 people had died from swine flu-linked complications. Seasonal influenza kills between 250,000 and 500,000 per year on average, according to the organization.

News reports earlier this year, citing the UN, warned of millions of deaths around the world unless nations promptly proceeded with the controversial vaccination schemes being promoted by the WHO along with forking over billions of dollars. Since then, the disease has proved relatively mild despite the wild fearmongering campaigns waged by governments, such as the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology that warned that 90,000 Americans could die from the H1N1 virus.

Now, The Council of Europe is an extremely prestigious body. And here we have them blame the pharmaceuticals for inventing epidemics.

The President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology is led, as we know, by John Holdren, who is in favor of surreptitiously sterilizing the population. Now, John Holdren wants to sterilize the population (he has denied that since, but no sane person could possibly believe him). He also wants compulsory vaccination (which obviously is what the fearmongering aimed at).

The reader can add two and two.

Furthermore, (*italics in the original*)

WHO 'Swine Flu Pope' under investigation for gross conflict of interest³¹

By F. William Engdahl, 8 December 2009

The man with the nickname "Dr Flu", Professor Albert Osterhaus, of the Erasmus University in Rotterdam Holland has been named by Dutch media researchers as the person at the center of the worldwide Swine Flu H1N1 Influenza A 2009 pandemic hysteria. Not only is Osterhaus the connecting person in an international network that has been described as the Pharma Mafia, he is THE key advisor to WHO on influenza and is intimately positioned to personally profit from the billions of euros in vaccines allegedly aimed at H1N1.

Earlier this year the Second Chamber of the Netherlands Parliament undertook an investigation into alleged conflicts of interest and financial improprieties of the well-known Dr. Osterhaus. Outside of Holland and the Dutch media, the only note of the sensational investigation into Osterhaus' business affairs came in a tiny note in the respected British magazine, *Science*.

The article accused Osterhaus of a severe conflict of interest. The man owned a large share in at least one pharmaceuticals manufacturer (ViroClinics B.V). He claimed to have done nothing wrong. The Dutch health minister, Klink, reportedly a friend of Osterhaus's, said that he knew about the conflict of interest and it was not a problem. The affair was snuffed.

More careful investigation into the Osterhaus Affair suggests that the world-renowned Dutch Virologist may be at the very center of a multi-billion Euro pandemic fraud which has used human beings in effect as human guinea pigs with untested vaccines and in cases now emerging, resulting in deaths or severe bodily paralysis or injury.

... Albert Osterhaus is no small fish. He stands at the global nexus of every major virus panic of the past decade from the mysterious SARS deaths in HongKong, where current WHO Director Margaret Chan got her start in her career as a local health official.

In 2003, at the height of the SARS panic, Osterhaus went and supposedly figured out the source of the "pandemic." How much he really figured out is questionable in light of his next performance, in regard to the Avian Flu. Claiming to be the first "scientist" to show that the bird flu can go from birds to humans, Osterhaus sounded the alarm already in 1997. By 2005, he was prophesying a pandemic. Writes Engdahl, "He claimed that at certain times of the year up to 30% of all European birds acted as carriers of the deadly avian virus, H5N1. He also claimed that farmers working with hens and chickens were then exposed." And so Osterhaus began to collect bird feces. He acquired 100,000 samples. Then he had the stuff analysed. No pandemic virus was found. Meanwhile, in 2003, the Dutch government had massacred a few million birds at the behest of Osterhaus, who had attributed a person's death to the bird flu. Nobody else died of the "H5N1." Predictably, Osterhaus explained that the success was due to his preventive measures. By that logic, the best way of protecting one from knee pain is the amputation of one's foot. Osterhaus furthermore claimed that the bird feces were the cause of the imaginary infection. It was later determined that the feces were, shall we say, clean. Meanwhile,

When no mass wave of human deaths from Avian Flu materialized and after Roche, maker of Tamiflu and GlaxoSmithKline had banked billions of dollars in profits from worldwide government stockpiling of their dangerous and reportedly ineffective antiviral drugs, Tamiflu by Roche, and Relenza by GlaxoSmithKline, Osterhaus and other WHO advisers turned to other greener pastures.

By April 2009 their search seemed rewarded as La Gloria, a small Mexican village in Veracruz, reported a case of a small child ill with what had been diagnosed as Swine Flu or H1N1. With indecent haste the propaganda apparatus of the World Health Organization in Geneva went into gear with statements from the director-general Dr Margaret Chan,

³¹http://www.engdahl.oilgeopolitics.net/Swine_Flu/Flu_Pope/flu_pope.html, Jan 14, 2012.

about a possible danger of a global pandemic.

Chan made such irresponsible statements as declaring "a public health emergency of international concern."

...

Notably those were symptoms which would make sense in terms of the proximity of one of the world's largest pig industrial feeding concentrations at La Gloria owned by Smithfield Farms of the USA. Residents had picketed the Smithfield Farms site in Mexico for months complaining of severe respiratory problems from the fecal waste lagoons.

...

On June 11, 2009 Margaret Chan of WHO made the declaration of a Phase 6 "Pandemic Emergency" regarding the spread of H1N1 Influenza. Curiously in announcing it, she noted, "On present evidence, the overwhelming majority of patients experience mild symptoms and make a rapid and full recovery, often in the absence of any form of medical treatment. She then added, "Worldwide, the number of deaths is small... we do not expect to see a sudden and dramatic jump in the number of severe or fatal infections." It later was learned that Chan acted, following heated debates inside WHO, on the advice of the scientific advisory group of WHO, or SAGE, the Strategic Advisory Group of Experts. One of the members of SAGE at the time and today was Dr. Albert "Mr Flu" Osterhaus.

Not only was Osterhaus in a key position to advocate the panic-inducing WHO "Pandemic emergency" declaration. He was also chairman of the leading private European Scientific Working group on Influenza (ESWI), which describes itself as a "multidisciplinary group of key opinion leaders in influenza [that] aims to combat the impact of epidemic and pandemic influenza." Osterhaus' ESWI is the vital link as they themselves describe it, "between the World Health Organization (WHO) in Geneva, the Robert Koch Institute in Berlin and the University of Connecticut, USA."

What is more significant about the ESWI is that its work is entirely financed by the same pharma mafia companies that make billions on the pandemic emergency as governments around the world are compelled to buy and stockpile vaccines on declaration of a WHO Pandemic. The funders of ESWI include H1N1 vaccine maker Novartis, Tamiflu distributor, Hofmann-La Roche, Baxter Vaccines, MedImmune, GlaxoSmithKline, Sanofi Pasteur and others.

...

The Wall Street bank, JP Morgan, estimated that in large part as a result of the WHO pandemic decision, the giant pharma firms that also finance Osterhaus' ESWI work, stand to reap some 7.5 to 10 billion [pounds] in profits.

A fellow member of WHO's SAGE is Dr Frederick Hayden, of Britain's Wellcome Trust and reportedly a close friend of Osterhaus. Hayden also receives money for "advisory" services from Roche and GlaxoSmithKline among other pharma giants involved in producing products related to the H1N1 panic.

Chairman of WHO's SAGE is another British scientist, Prof. David Salisbury of the UK Department of Health. He also heads the WHO H1N1 Advisory Group. Salisbury is a robust defender of the pharma industry. He has been accused by UK health citizen health group One Click of covering up the proven links between vaccines and an explosive rise in infant autism as well as links between the vaccine Gardasil and palsy and even death.

A few more examples of corruption follow. Then:

In the past decade the WHO, in order to boost funds at its disposal entered into what it calls "public private partnerships." Instead of receiving its funds solely from member United Nations governments as its original purpose had been, WHO today receives almost double its normal UN budget in the form of grants and financial support from private industry. The industry? The very drug and vaccine makers who benefit from decisions

like the June 2009 H1N1 Pandemic emergency declaration. As the main financiers of the WHO bureaucracy, naturally the Pharma Mafia and their friends receive what has been called "open door red carpet treatment" in Geneva.

In short, 1) small cliques do exert great influence in the vaccine world; 2) there are egregious examples of corruption; 3) the pharmaceuticals are reaping great profits.

But to get back to the point: do vaccines work? First, are they the major destroyer of diseases, and second, do diseases occur in vaccinated populations?

In regard to the first question, we turn to *HealthSentinel's* Roman Bystryanyk's *Vaccines and Disease - An investigative Report* (2001-2002).³²

One of the chief concepts that vaccine proponents tell us, and that we generally believe in modern society, is that the use of vaccines is responsible for the virtual elimination of many childhood scourges that used to ravage the world. We are told, and assume, that in the 1800s and early in the 1900s many diseases killed a large number of people, and that vaccines were invented and stopped these diseases from being a threat. But is this in fact the case? [The author provides an example of a CDC booklet making that exact claim.]

On the face of it, we cannot help but assume that vaccines have played a key role in improving all of our lives. But looking carefully at the evidence over a longer period of time reveals a different picture of disease evolution and the role vaccines have played. One Swiss scientist that analyzed data over a longer period of time came to a different conclusion of what occurred in Switzerland:

"An analysis has been made of the evolution in Switzerland of mortality due to the main infectious diseases ever since the causes of death began to be registered. Mortality due to tuberculosis, diphtheria, scarlet fever, whooping cough, measles, typhoid, puerperal fever and infant gastro-enteritis started to fall long before the introduction of immunization and/or antibiotics. The decline was probably due to a great extent to various factors linked to the steady rise in the standard of living: qualitative and quantitative improvements in nutrition; better public and personal hygiene; better housing and working conditions and improvements in education."

In that research paper, several graphs of death rates in Switzerland show massive drops in deaths from disease long before vaccinations are introduced. One graph shows diphtheria death rates for children from 0 to 14 years of age peaking at over 200 deaths per 100,000 in the late 1800s. This is followed by death rates decreasing to less than 10 deaths per 100,000 near the time of the introduction of the vaccine in the mid 1930s. There was an apparent 95 percent decrease in diphtheria death rates before introduction of the vaccine. Another graph within the same study shows scarlet fever decreasing from 200 deaths per 100,000 in the late 1800s to virtually zero by the 1930s before drug treatments were introduced. Yet another graph in the study shows typhoid also decreasing from 50 deaths per 100,000 in 1876 to virtually zero by the 1940s when drug treatments were introduced.

The author continues in the same spirit for a few paragraphs, providing mainstream claims of vaccine effectiveness, followed by statistical data showing a sanitation-caused reduction in disease-related fatalities. Let us go directly to the numbers.

To understand the role of vaccines, we must use the raw information and analyze it over a long period of time. *The Vital Statistics of the United States* provides the most accurate

³²Available here: <http://www.whale.to/a/bystryanyk3.html>, accessed on Jan 14, 2012.

information of death rates from various causes starting early in the 1900s. Figure 1 is a graph of the death rates from measles, typhoid, scarlet fever, whooping cough (pertussis), and diphtheria. Both the pertussis and diphtheria vaccines were made widely available in 1949 and the measles vaccine was introduced in 1963.

The *VSUS* reports are available online.³³

Bystrianyky's graphs are well worth seeing - refer to the original source. For the numbers:

This graph shows that large drops in disease death rates occurred long before vaccines were introduced. From 1900 to 1963, when the measles vaccine was introduced, death rates from measles had declined from 13.3 per 100,000 to 0.2 per 100,000 a 98% decrease. From 1900 to 1949, death rates from whooping cough declined from 12.2 per 100,000 to 0.5 per 100,000 a 96% decrease. From 1900 to 1949, death rates from diphtheria declined from 40.3 per 100,000 to 0.4 per 100,000 a 99% decrease. These are clear and major changes in the severity of diseases well before any vaccines were introduced. Close up views (figures 2-4) of the diphtheria, pertussis, and measles death rates show this dramatic drop well before vaccination programs began.

...

Similarly, in England and Wales we find the same decline in disease mortality. The data for the disease mortality was recorded 50 years earlier than in the United States, beginning in 1850.

From 1850 to 1968, when the measles vaccine was introduced, death rates from measles had declined from a range of 52.11 to 26.6 per 100,000 to 0.11 per 100,000 a range of 99.8% to 99.6% decrease. From 1860 to 1955, death rates from whooping cough declined from a range of 43.73 to 60.86 per 100,000 to 0.2 per 100,000 a 99.5% to 99.7% decrease. From 1859 to 1940, death rates from diphtheria declined from a range of 49.2 to 22.7 per 100,000 to 6.77 to 1.83 per 100,000 a 96.2% to 70.2% decrease. The exact decrease in mortality is difficult to obtain because the mortality from these diseases fluctuated from year to year, and the exact introduction of a vaccination and number of people vaccinated each year is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. However, it is clear that death rates in England did to a large extent decline before vaccinations were widespread.

Now, the data is high-quality government data, and it shows, conclusively and undeniably, that the annihilation of the various diseases was accomplished *without* the vaccines. This is absolutely critical, and, in light of the hard facts, indisputable.

Hence, one must ask - what conceivable excuse could there be for using vaccines, *which are known to be dangerous*, to combat a problem, *which can be defeated by safe means*?

The reality is that hygiene, sanitation, nutrition, and civilized living conditions - all four factors stemming from industrial development, widespread education, and a reasonably fair distribution of wealth - is, apart from such techniques as the imposition of quarantines, the driving force of disease control.

Hence, Bill Gates and his cronies can vaccinate as many African children as they want to, and it will not make too great a difference. Africa needs industrial development, not vaccines. The known dangers of vaccines, the known power of hygiene and development, and Mr Gates's Malthusian associations, paint a grim picture.

Again, the available high-quality government statistics indicate beyond a reasonable doubt that vaccines are *neither the only nor the best tool* for combating disease.

Given that, do vaccines at least protect a vaccinated population? Continuing with Bystrianyky's article.

³³<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/vsus.htm>, Jan 14, 2012.

In 1798, Jenner reported his work in the book, "An Inquiry into the Causes and Effects of the Variolae Vaccinae." This book prompted the medical professionals of the time to adopt the practice of vaccination. The vaccine was introduced in England in 1798. It was later made compulsory in 1853 through the Compulsory Vaccination Act, and then in 1867, an even more stringent law was passed to enforce vaccination.

Looking at the raw data from England during that era, as shown in Figure 6, we see that despite enforced vaccinations against smallpox there was no significant decrease in deaths from smallpox. In fact, three major epidemics during 1857-1859, 1863-1865, and 1871-1872 occurred, even though there was a high vaccination rate. The last major epidemic in 1871-1872 had death rates of 101.2 and 82.1 per 100,000 people respectively, occurring just four years after a newer and more strict vaccination law was enacted in 1867.

Another interesting point is that the smallpox disease cycle of decreased deaths and epidemics appears closely tied to the scarlet fever disease cycle. Just as there was a large decrease in scarlet fever deaths after 1885, there was simultaneously a decrease in smallpox deaths. It is important to remember that death from scarlet fever, which was the worst of infectious diseases in that era, was eliminated without any vaccination program. Figure 7 shows that vaccination coverage had no apparent affect on smallpox deaths. As coverage fell to from a high of 86% in 1879 to 61% in 1898 there was no resurgence of smallpox deaths. There was a small increase in smallpox deaths to 7.5 per 100,000 people as vaccine coverage rates again increased to 71.8% in 1902, but there after, as vaccine rates fell to below 40%, there was no increase in smallpox deaths. In fact, after 1905, deaths from smallpox almost completely vanished.

We must also remember that deaths were directly attributable to the smallpox vaccine. Figure 8 shows the deaths per 100,000 that were caused by the smallpox vaccine. Although the number of people that died from the vaccine is small compared to the number of people that were killed directly by smallpox, after 1888 there were years that the deaths from the vaccine was close to or exceeded that from the disease itself (e.g. 1889 smallpox: 23, vaccine: 58; 1890 smallpox: 16, vaccine: 43; 1891 smallpox: 49, vaccine: 43). After 1905, as can be seen in Figure 9, the number of deaths from smallpox and vaccination were very close to one another. In point of fact, after 1905, a person was almost as likely to die from the vaccine for smallpox as from the disease itself.

Another interesting point of note is that certain diseases that also once killed many people declined and vanished without any assistance from mass vaccination programs. Typhoid death rates of 10s per 100,000 each year was not uncommon. Scarlet fever once killed large numbers of people at a death rate of 100 or more per 100,000 each year. While quite deadly during their prime, these two "killers" were in effect eradicated due in large part to advances in hygiene and a better understanding of germ activity. The Canadian Medical Journal contains the following statements in an advisory statement:

"Typhoid fever is caused by *Salmonella typhi*, which affects only humans, often causing serious systemic illness. The organism is generally transmitted by the feces or urine of the people with the disease or those who are the *S. typhi* carriers. The death rate is approximately 16% for untreated cases and 1% for those given appropriate antibiotic therapy. ... The incidence of typhoid fever is very low in all of the industrialized countries. Approximately 70 cases are reported in Canada and 190 in the United States annually. The low incidence of typhoid fever in these countries is attributable to improved living conditions, better drinking-water quality and the treatment of sewage. The vaccine does not seem to play an important role in maintaining this lower incidence. Most infections occurring in the industrialized countries are acquired elsewhere. ... It is certain that vaccination does not afford adequate protection when heavily contaminated foods are ingested. ... There cannot be too much emphasis

placed on hygiene and food precautions; these measures appear to be the most effective protection against the disease.

The question to ask is, when did the British pass their Hygiene Act? From Wikipedia's page:

The Public Health Act 1875 was established in the United Kingdom to combat filthy urban living conditions, which caused various public health threats, including the spread of many diseases such as cholera and typhus. Reformers wanted to resolve sanitary problems, because sewage was flowing down the street daily, including the presence of sewage in living quarters. The act required all new residential construction to include running water and an internal drainage system. This act also led to the government prohibiting the construction of shoddy housing by building contractors.

Many factors delayed reform, however, such as the fact that to perform a clean up, the government would need money, and this would have to come from factory owners, who were not keen to pay, and this further delayed reform. But reformers eventually helped to counteract the government's laissez-faire attitude, and a public health act was introduced in 1875.

Now, if one looks at the graph of smallpox deaths, the curve between 1850 and 1875 is fluctuating, but essentially constant in average. After 1875, there is a spectacular drop in the smallpox death rates. In particular, there was a horrible epidemic immediately after the 1867 compulsory vaccination act; while the post-1875 drop is almost smooth.

What kills the argument that the vaccinations did much good is the parallel fall in scarlet fever deaths. Before 1875, the scarlet fever mortality rates were fluctuating, but constant on average, at a high level. After 1875 they dropped dramatically.

Thus: Efforts were made to combat smallpox via vaccination and hygienic reform. (Possibly indirect) Efforts were made to combat scarlet fever only via sanitation reform. The smallpox mortality rates did not decrease appreciably before the public health reform of 1875. Both smallpox and scarlet fever death rates fell after the 1875 public health act.

Therefore, vaccination did not kill the diseases. At best, it did very little; at worst, it killed many people. Public health, stemming from government efforts (rather than the "free-market") equivalent to a drive for the more equitable distribution of industrial wealth, destroyed the evils of infectious diseases.

Not that the second point is any news. From Ben Gurion University's Velvl W. Greene's (PhD, MPH) paper *Personal hygiene and life expectancy improvements since 1850: Historic and epidemiologic associations*, published in the *American Journal of Infection Control* (2001;29:203-6).³⁴

The documented history of Western civilization describes an endless and unromantic struggle with sickness and death, tragically high infant mortality rates, and the premature death of young adults. Deathdealing epidemics attacked helpless communities nearly as often as summer and winter came to pass, and were followed every few years by major catastrophes.

Even during the "good" years when no serious epidemics occurred, the baseline mortality rate was often 4 times higher than what we experience today. In Victorian [Malthusian] England, the average age of death among the urban poor was 15 to 16 years.

This dismal situation started to improve dramatically about 150 years ago. Mortality records from different communities in Western Europe and America indicate a veritable "health revolution" by the middle of the 19th century - a significant increase in life expectancy and a marked decline in crude mortality rates, followed a few decades later by a gratifying drop in the infant mortality rates. Moreover, each decade since then,

³⁴I got the reference from Bystryanyk's page.

a lower mortality rate has been recorded than in the decade immediately preceding it. Although the greatest relative improvements were seen in infant and child mortality rates, the life expectancy of every age group improved: young adults, the middle-aged, the old, and the very old.

How did this revolution commence, and what contributed to its amazing success?

...the following 3 general innovations are generally accepted:

1. improved housing and consequent reduction of overcrowding;
2. improved nutrition resulting from innovations in agriculture and technology; and
3. improved hygiene, including environmental sanitation and personal cleanliness.

Determining which of these 3 innovations was the most important is not relevant. Each innovation meets the aforementioned criteria and undoubtedly played a significant role in reducing mortality rates. More importantly, all 3 innovations were essential components of the war against infectious disease in the 19th century.

And specifically:

The conquest of infectious disease and the health revolution it initiated is arguably one of the greatest achievements of Western civilization. Yet the phenomenon is largely unknown and rarely taught, even in history courses. Conventional wisdom usually assumes that the conquest of infectious disease can be credited to well-known lifesaving innovations in medicine such as vaccines, antibiotics, and surgical asepsis. These icons are truly essential ingredients of modern medicine, and their contribution to human life and health in this century can never be minimized. However, except for the smallpox vaccination, which was introduced in 1798 and made compulsory in England in 1853, the overall contribution of medical innovations to the health revolution of the 1800s is difficult to validate. Diphtheria, tetanus, and pertussis vaccine arrived on the scene only after disease mortality rates already had been reduced significantly; measles, rubella, and polio vaccines did not become available until the middle of the 20th century, when most infant deaths were the result of other causes. The same holds true for the sulfa drugs and antibiotics. Their contribution is unequivocal, but they did not affect mortality rates until the 1940s. Antiseptics and disinfectants were used successfully as early as the 1840s, and by 1900 the autoclave and sterile gloves had been invented. Lister and Semmelweis and their contemporaries certainly deserve credit for their vision and lifesaving innovations, but many decades passed before their recommendations became widely accepted, and the actual number of lives they influenced was probably too small to have a significant impact on national mortality rates. The modern hospital is largely a phenomenon of the 20th century. Before then, there were relatively few surgical patients and hospital deliveries - the population groups that would most benefit from hospital infection control practices.

Thus, no, vaccines did not contribute appreciably to the spectacular improvements to public health; and in particular - and this is the crucial point, since the major contribution of the vaccines is the supposed suppression of certain illnesses - the vaccines were not what destroyed the diseases.

Moreover, this is not some half-baked immunization theory that is next to impossible to seriously test. This is the historical method, based on the historical record. The fact is: improved hygiene and general prosperity killed the diseases. The effect of the vaccines is, at best, ambiguous and insignificant. At best!

Furthermore - assuming that vaccines are useful - in light of the practically uninterrupted downward trend in disease mortality, the assumption must be made that, perhaps, a *one time* vaccination is the most a population should be subjected to. The claim that the disease may come back is absurd in the light of the fact that it was going away before the vaccine was introduced. Thus, those children born in a disease-free environment should not be vaccinated excessively, particularly in the light of

the known dangers of vaccination.

So far we have given conclusive answers to the first and third problems that we formulated. Vaccines are, demonstrably and clearly, not the driving force in the annihilation of diseases.

We have also shed some light on the second point: vaccines are indeed dangerous. Let us try to get an idea of how dangerous they are.

To begin with, let us go back to the male fertility problem. The quality of male sperm in the West has been decreasing since the 1950s. In the previous section, we showed that the changes in the American diet since the 1980s are poisoning the population. In the next section, we will see that the introduction and the mass-marketing of "mental illness" pills in the late 1980s has also poisoned the American people. Observe that both issues apply to the "globalized" world at large.

However, both debacles only commenced in the 1980s - while the fertility decline started in the 1950s. The cause for the decreased fertility has to be the introduction of some external agent into the mass population. If the food and the psycho-pharmaceutical pills only arrived in the last three decades, then we must look for another cause in the preceding period.

The fluoridation of the water is a suspect.

And so are the vaccines.

As pointed out above, correlation does not imply causation. However! When there is reason to think that there is a link between correlation and causation, the author of the counter-thesis must provide a reasonable substitute cause. I did that above, in showing that hygiene and prosperity rather than vaccination accounted for the disappearance of the infectious diseases. Hence, anyone who argues that the vaccines could not be the cause of the fertility decline, must explain what the real cause is.

In short, new vaccines have been continually introduced since the 1950s. The frequency of introduction of new vaccines has been rising dramatically.³⁵ Hence the vaccines offer one plausible cause for the decline in fertility.

We should ask, of course, is there any indication that vaccines cause infertility? The question is trivially answered. Many vaccines contain mercury, which is deadly to human beings, and which, in particular, decreases fertility.

Academic research showing links between certain vaccines and infertility does exist. I will provide one standard example.³⁶

The 1993 Slovakian paper by Gajdová M, Jakubovsky J, Války J., entitled *Delayed effects of neonatal exposure to Tween 80 on female reproductive organs in rats* explains that this "Tween 80" causes serious damage to the fertility of the rats.

Next, "Tween 80" is also known as Polysorbate 80. It is used as an "expedient" in various influenza vaccines. In particular, it was used in the GlaxoSmithKline "Fluarix" swine flu "pandemic" vaccine. The cited reference mentions that:

GlaxoSmithKline specifically mentions that they cannot guarantee that their flu vaccine will not damage your fertility: "FLUARIX has not been evaluated for carcinogenic or mutagenic potential, or for impairment of fertility."

The stuff is in other vaccines as well. Thus, we have 1) the (at least) two-century old ongoing Malthusian campaign; 2) the rise in infertility; 3) the strong links between vaccines and infertility; 4) John Holdren's alarmism; 5) the WHO/UN pandemic mania, the goal of which is compulsory worldwide vaccination.

The conclusions are obvious.

If the reader still harbors any doubts of the Malthusian plan, he should consult the following UN paper cited in the reference used above: *UN Population Division Policy Brief No.2009/1 March*

³⁵See, for example, this: <http://www.health.vic.gov.au/immunisation/resources/history.htm>, Jan 14, 2012.

³⁶Which I found here: <http://organichealthadviser.com/archives/polysorbate-80-in-swine-flu-vaccines-infertility-i> accessed Jan 15, 2012.

2009: *What would it take to accelerate fertility decline in the least developed countries?* The title speaks for itself.

Now, what is the additional damage of vaccination? First, does the illusion of protection by vaccination sometimes lead to laxity in hygienic arrangements? In particular, is vaccination a surefire defence? No.

The problem is that the lovers of vaccines can always claim that for some reason this or that vaccines failed to work, but vaccines work in principle. Thus, one must ideally go through all the various vaccines, and there are too many of them. So let us focus on a few examples. First, did the poster child of vaccination - Jenner's "smallpox" vaccine - provide invulnerability to smallpox? No.

The Case Against Vaccination³⁷

Verbatim Report of an Address by Walter Hadwen

J.P., M.D., L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., L.S.A., Etc

(Gold Medalist in Medicine and in Surgery)

At Goddard's Assembly Rooms, Gloucester, Saturday, January 25th, 1896

(During the Gloucester Smallpox Epidemic)

...

They say, "Look at Prussia, and the way vaccination has stamped out small-pox there." Very well, we will look at Prussia, which, I may say, has kept better vaccination records than any other country in Europe, except, perhaps, Sweden. In 1834, which is twenty years before England adopted the Compulsory Vaccination Act, so severe was the Act in Prussia that, in addition to primary vaccination, every child had to be vaccinated over again when he started upon his school life; he had to be re-vaccinated on going from college to college; and re-vaccinated over again when he entered the Army, which meant every healthy male out of the whole of Prussia. And so severe was the Act that if any man refused to be vaccinated he was ordered to be held down and vaccinated by force; and so thoroughly was it done that he was vaccinated in ten places on each arm. That was stiff enough for anybody, I should think. (Laughter.) In 1871-2 - thirty-five years after this Compulsory Vaccination Act - came the terrible epidemic which swept all over Europe. It came to Prussia, and what was the result? In that year small-pox carried off no less than 124,978 of her vaccinated and re-vaccinated citizens after thirty-five years of compulsory vaccination of the description which I have referred to! This roused Prussia, and she began to look about her; she saw the cause, and she was determined to remedy it. She brought good water into her cities, purified her river Spree, introduced a complete drainage system throughout the country - (loud cheers) - she got rid of her "rookeries," and ordered model barracks to be built for the soldiers; and away fled the small-pox, like the Philistines before the Children of Israel. Sanitation did for Prussia what 35 years of compulsory vaccination was unable to accomplish. At the present time in Prussia small-pox is almost extinct. (Cheers.) It is not that people are being vaccinated more; they are vaccinated less. (Hear, hear.) They hate it in Germany as we English people do; and you can now get out of vaccination there by the payment of a shilling fine. Even the very children in Germany know well enough how it is hated, and in proof of this I may relate to you an amusing incident. A school inspector went to one of the schools the other day and asked the question of the class, "Why was Moses hidden by his mother in the bullrushes?" Very soon a little fellow put up his hand and replied, "Please sir, she did not want him to be vaccinated." (Loud laughter.)

The eminence of the author is notable, but we should focus on the facts. And they are plain: Germany vaccinated itself with German efficiency, and nevertheless experienced an outbreak of smallpox, which could be directly traced to unsanitary conditions. Hence: vaccinations does not really work.

³⁷<http://www.soilandhealth.org/02/0201hyglibcat/020119hadwin/020119hadwenrallytalk.html>, accessed Jan 14, 2012.

Sanitation does. In particular, vaccination is no sure defence against contracting the respective illness.

Hadwen's speech contains a few more similar examples. The reader can browse through those at leisure.

It is also worth pointing out that Hadwen rejected the germ theory of infection. This does not mean that his views on vaccination were faulty; moreover, Hadwen was well aware of the benefits of sanitation.

From the same Hadwen speech:

There is one thing about this Vaccination Act which I don't like: it's an unequal law - it presses hardly upon the poor. The rich man can pay his sovereign fine and feel none the worse for it; but the poor man has to either submit or have his goods seized, or go to the prison cell in default of paying his fine. I say that the poor woman's child is as dear to her as the child of a prince is to its parents, and that she has no right to be put in a harder position for its protection than those who are wealthy. (Cheers.)

Which raises the question: Do the rich vaccinate? I found no satisfactory answer, but only the following:³⁸

Using data from the National Immunization Survey for the period from 1995 through 2001, Smith et al. compared the characteristics of children between the ages of 19 and 35 months who did not receive any vaccine (unvaccinated) with the characteristics of those who were partially vaccinated (undervaccinated). As compared with the undervaccinated children, the unvaccinated children were more likely to be male, to be white, to belong to households with higher income, to have a married mother with a college education, and to live with four or more children. Other studies have shown that children who are unvaccinated are likely to belong to families that intentionally refuse vaccines, whereas children who are undervaccinated are likely to have missed some vaccinations because of factors related to the health care system or sociodemographic characteristics.

...

Moreover, parents of exempt children were more likely than parents of vaccinated children both to have providers who offered complementary or alternative health care and to obtain information from the Internet and groups opposed to aspects of immunization. The most frequent reason for nonvaccination, stated by 69% of the parents, was concern that the vaccine might cause harm.

In other words, the rich and the informed are the most likely to refuse vaccination.

The paper makes alarmist reports of outbreaks of disease. Could the cause of the outbreaks be the exacerbating deterioration of living conditions in America?

The figures at the end of Hadwen's report (presented by a Lord E Percy to Parliament) showed that the decreases in the vaccinated proportion of the population did not lead to increases in the mortality rates from smallpox.

Another interesting case is that of the BCG tuberculosis vaccine. The BCG, it appears, varies in effectiveness across geographical regions. It was found to be useless in India and Puerto Rico (*BCG: Bad News from India, The Lancet*, Jan 1980, pp. 73-74) In India, the article tells, the vaccinated people experienced more cases of TB than those on placebos. The BCG was the cause of a notorious incident in Lubeck in Germany in 1930.

The reasons for the failure of the BCG remain unclear. The Americans decided not to enforce the

³⁸ *Vaccine Refusal, Mandatory Immunization, and the Risks of Vaccine-Preventable Diseases*; Saad B. Omer, M.B., B.S., Ph.D., M.P.H., Daniel A. Salmon, Ph.D., M.P.H., Walter A. Orenstein, M.D., M. Patricia deHart, Sc.D., and Neal Halsey, M.D.; *N Engl J Med* 2009; 360:1981-1988 May 7, 2009.

Available here: <http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMs0806477#t=article>, Jan 14, 2012.

vaccine. The British mandated the BCG for their own population (the test results in Britain had been, while not great, generally positive). They stopped vaccinating in 2005, since TB was no longer a real problem. The vaccine's use is, generally, widespread.

The polio vaccine is also interesting. Its inventor was Dr Jonas Salk (1914-1995). Vaccination against Polio with the Salk vaccine began in 1955. Look up Salk's March 4, 1977 article for *Science, Control of Influenza and Poliomyelitis with Killed Virus Vaccines*. On page 4 there is a picture of the polio cases per 100,000 people. In 1942, polio was at a low ebb, with 3-4 cases (per 100 thousand people). It spiked up to about 20 cases in 1946, before sinking to about 9 cases in 1947. For some reason, there was another explosion in polio, with the figures reaching above 35 in 1952. Followed a steady decline. At the time of the introduction of the vaccine, in 1955, there were about 20 cases, and the trend was sharply downward. By 1957, the incidence of polio fell below 5. It rose slightly toward the end of the 1950s, fell sharply afterward, and was all but gone by 1970.

Polk had this to say in the conclusions of his article: (emphasis mine)

Contrary to previously held beliefs about poliovirus vaccines, evidence now exists that (i) the live virus vaccine cannot be administered without risk of inducing paralysis, (ii) the killed virus vaccine does suppress virus spread and can eradicate poliovirus from a population, (iii) booster doses of killed poliovirus vaccine are no more necessary than booster doses of live poliovirus vaccine, and (iv) an orally administered live polio-virus vaccine is not necessarily more effective or more acceptable for poliomyelitis immunization than a killed poliovirus vaccine administered by injection.

A killed poliovirus vaccine is safe and effective under all circumstances when properly prepared. The live poliovirus vaccine carries a small, inherent risk of inducing paralytic poliomyelitis in vaccinated individuals or their contacts. Where paralytic poliomyelitis is prevalent, this risk is relatively less than that of the natural disease; but where naturally occurring poliomyelitis has been suppressed or eradicated, the risk from live poliovirus vaccine is greater than that from the natural disease. This is similar to the present situation with smallpox vaccine.

The live poliovirus vaccine has been the predominant cause of domestically arising cases of paralytic poliomyelitis in the United States since 1972.

So, accepting that vaccines can help in specific cases, certain vaccines are dangerous in populations where a disease has been eradicated.

The live polio vaccine was dropped in the United States in 2000 and in the UK in 2004. It is still used across the world, despite the fact that there were less than 500 reported cases of polio in 2001. The figure went back up to about 1,000 cases per year, and went above 1,500 cases in 2009, probably because of the economic crisis. In light of Salk's statement, it may be that a significant proportion of still occurring polio cases are vaccine induced. The WHO, with its connections to Big Pharma, is for continued polio vaccination.

There have been polio outbreaks in various vaccinated countries since 1955.

At the same time, it is conceivable that Salk's vaccine did contribute to the eradication of polio. Vaccines may have their place in medicine, but they should not be considered a panacea, and their dangers should be far better appreciated.

Also of interest in regard to polio is the question, what caused the fluctuations in the incidence of polio prior to the introduction of the vaccine? It turns out that Benjamin P. Sandler, M.D., published a book on the subject in 1951: *Diet Prevents Polio*.³⁹ In effect, Sandler claimed that too much sugar (starch) in one's diet causes low blood sugar, which causes polio (in the sense that it makes one vulnerable to the polio virus). This fits with Robert H. Lustig's *Sugar: Bitter Truth* thesis. Interestingly, Sandler managed to test his conjecture. There was much more polio in the United

³⁹The work can be found here: <http://www.whale.to/v/sandler.html>, accessed Jan 14, 2012.

States in 1949 than there had been in 1948 - but with some exceptions. The state of North Carolina experienced a drastic reduction in reported polio cases (214 compared to 2402, when the corresponding figures for the entire nation were 38,153 vs 23,418). What was different in North Carolina? It turned out that the people there had followed Sandler's dietary advice, which had been carried by certain newspapers the previous year. Sandler explicitly visited the city of Asheville, which had seen its polio cases descend from 76 to 5. The people of Asheville attributed the fall to their adoption of Sandler's diet. There had been a sharp decrease in the sales of "soft" drinks and ice cream in the state.

The good doctor opens his book with the words:

Medical science has been able to prevent diphtheria, smallpox, and typhoid fever by vaccination. We have been able to reduce the mortality from tuberculosis by pasteurization of milk and improved general hygiene. Typhoid fever and cholera have been prevented by chlorination of water and proper sewage disposal. Humans have been protected against these diseases because they have been artificially immunized and because their environment has been controlled to some extent, and not because the body's inherent ability to prevent infection has been built up.

It is far more important to enable the human to maintain his natural powers against infection than it is to keep bacteria and viruses away from his door, especially since we do not have vaccines available for many common infections. I do not believe that Nature over intended that man should suffer sickness, crippling, and death through infections. From my observations and studies in human nutrition I have become convinced that Nature originally did endow us with natural powers of protection and that we have lost these powers through errors in diet. A polio vaccine may some day be a reality. Until then, it is necessary that we fortify ourselves with good food.

Furthermore:

That there is a direct relationship between nutritional standards and susceptibility to infection is shown by the great increase in the incidence of tuberculosis in countries that experience a reduction in nutritional standards during war time. Knud Faber, a Danish physician, in an analysis of factors responsible for the increase in tuberculosis mortality in Denmark, Sweden, and England during World War I, concluded that the reduced consumption of meat and fish was the most important nutritional factor. Dr. Faber began his study without any preconceived ideas as to what were the responsible factors for this increased tuberculosis mortality. He writes:

"In Denmark the increase in tuberculosis mortality took place in 1916-1917 simultaneously with a greatly reduced consumption of meat and fish, and the decrease of the mortality coincided with a greatly increased consumption of these foods. If we take beef, veal, and fish alone, the fall in consumption was extraordinary during 1915-1916. The total calories consumed was not diminished because there was sufficient bread and flour." He continues:

"We see the same thing in Sweden, though to a less marked degree. The rise in tuberculosis mortality was recorded in 1914-1916, and in those years the consumption of bread and flour rose, whereas that of meat decreased. After 1916 we see a steady and continuous fall in tuberculosis mortality, and at the same time flour foods fell off while the consumption of meat and fish rose rapidly. It may be added too, that in England, a rise in tuberculosis mortality coincided with a lower consumption of meat and butter and an increased consumption of flour foods."

I.e., instead of hunting for magic bullets, people should try to build a better educated, better fed, wiser society. The last statement is a truism, but unfortunately modern society seems to ignore it.

Many more examples of problems caused by vaccines can be provided.⁴⁰ Let us, however, turn to the *cause célèbre* of recent memory: the Andrew Wakefield scandal and the MMR vaccine.

Wakefield (1957-) was born to a pair of doctors. He followed in his parents' footsteps and studied medicine at St Mary's. He became a Royal College of Surgeons fellow in 1985. In 1995, at the request of a worried parent, Wakefield began to look for a possible connection between the MMR (measles, mumps, and rubella) vaccine and the spectacular rise in the incidence of autism, which we mentioned at the beginning of this section.

The MMR had been invented in Germany in the late 1960s. It was introduced in the United States in 1971. The autism epidemic took off at around that time. A second dose of MMR was introduced in 1989. Autism rates exploded in the 1990s, in part, also, because of developments in the field of psycho-pharmacology, and perhaps due to the changes in the American diet which took place during the same era.

MMR has been introduced in 60 countries across the world. A recent report in South Korea estimated that 1 in 38 of the population has autism.⁴¹

It is known that MMR has a number of side effects, considered minor.

If we are to believe the official graphs (it is hard to check everything), the vaccine did its job in combating measles. Fair enough! But was the cure worse than the disease?

In February 1998, *The Lancet* (the most prestigious medical journal in the world) published a Wakefield paper, which, in effect, said that, perhaps, the MMR vaccines are causing autism. The paper was publicised and caused a furor. Predictably, Wakefield was subjected to a vociferous attack from high quarters. He stood his ground. In 2001, Wakefield was forced to resign from his job at the Royal Free Hospital.

Wakefield joined the anti-vaccine movement and continued his research. Meanwhile, a smear campaign was organized against him. In 2004, it emerged that some of the parents, with whose children Wakefield had conducted the study, had been offered significant sums by lawyers who aimed to sue the large pharmaceuticals who made MMR. Wakefield was charged with "professional misconduct" and "dishonesty." He was accused of personally pocketing almost a half million pounds, without issuing a disclosure. *The Lancet* described Wakefield's paper as "fatally flawed." Ten of his twelve co-authors made retractions.

Wakefield's nemesis was a journalist by the name of Brian Deer. In December 2004, Deer publicly accused Wakefield of having patented a new measles vaccine prior to releasing his paper. Wakefield responded with libel suits against Deer and *The Sunday Times*. In December 2006, Deer reported that Wakefield had taken money to build a case against the MMR vaccine. Wakefield cut his losses, curtailed the lawsuits, and paid the legal costs.

In 2010, the General Medical Council blasted Wakefield, and the *Lancet* fully retracted the original paper. A swath of papers stated that MMR does not cause autism. The Japanese switched to single vaccines in the stead of the triple barrage, but their autism epidemic continued to develop.

That is what one gather from the politically correct Wikipedia. Fair enough! But let us dig deeper.

First, the autism epidemic is not going away, and its causes must be determined. Second, Wakefield threw away a solid career to defend his convictions. The accusations of dishonesty thrown against him sound hollow. He may have made a mistake, but he does not appear to be of the mercenary type. It is conceivable that he reached the conclusions that vaccines cause autism, and decided to go after some vaccine, and settled on the MMR.

He had the following to say for himself (from Wikipedia):

I want to make one thing crystal clear for the record my research and the serious medical problems found in those children were not a hoax and there was no fraud whatsoever. Nor

⁴⁰For example, see this list, which is floating all over the Internet: http://www.naturalnews.com/027203_Chi_vaccination_vaccine.html, accessed Jan 15, 2012.

⁴¹*The Autism 'Epidemic' Marches On*, by Allen Frances, M.D. <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/dsm5-in-distress/201105/the-autism-epidemic-marches>, Jan 15, 2012.

did I seek to profit from our findings. ... despite media reports to the contrary, the results of my research have been duplicated in five other countries ... I continue to fully support more independent research to determine if environmental triggers, including vaccines, are causing autism and other developmental problems. ... Since the Lancet paper, I have lost my job, my career and my country. To claim that my motivation was profit is patently untrue. I will not be deterred - this issue is far too important.

Wakefield's interviews available on YouTube are worth watching. The man continues to argue his case and has a fair degree of popular support.

Deer was given a prestigious journalistic award in 2011. For a good deal of dirt on Deer, look up J.B. Handley's article *Keeping Anderson Cooper Honest: Is Brian Deer The Fraud?*⁴² That the pharmaceuticals and the British Medical Association, who indirectly hired the hitman Deer, had much to gain from smashing Wakefield, is clear.

Dan Olmsted has brought attention to the fact that the Amish have low rates of vaccination and low rates of autism. Unfortunately, the Amish population is too small to provide a decent idea of what is going on.

Generation Rescue, Inc. (an anti-vaccine front) have published a paper entitled *Autism and Vaccines Around the World*, which says that the US mandates the most vaccines in the developed world (36, versus an average of 18), has the highest rates of autism, and has the highest rates of child mortality. Back in 1983, only 10 vaccines were mandated. The figures are indisputable, and the correlation is there. Does it imply causality? Debatable, but likely.

Bill Gates the Malthusian vaccine-enthusiast has spoken against Wakefield's research.

Various papers have confirmed some of Wakefield's claims.

There is much more to be said on the subject, but we lack the space. Let the reader conduct his own research. For my part, I suspect that Wakefield is on the right track, and he strikes me as genuine.

10.4.2 Dr Tenpenny's *Fowl!*

Follow some notable pieces of information from Dr. Sherri Tenpenny's *Fowl! Bird Flu: It's Not What You Think*.

The choice of reference is somewhat arbitrary; nevertheless, Tenpenny is among the foremost anti-vaccinists, and she claims to have dedicated more than 10,000 hours to studying the subject of vaccines since about the year 2000. Ten thousand hours is three years at ten hours per day. I see no reason to doubt the woman's word. Between 1987 and 1995 she was in charge of an ER. She knows what she is talking about.

Chapter 1 covers the media brainwashing campaign, which urges people to get seasonal flu shots. Nowadays, the propaganda machine comes up with another pandemic every few years, and yet the apocalypse never arrives. The hoax is transparent, the profits are great, and Tenpenny has the numbers.

Next, (Ch. 2) the flu is relatively harmless and healthy people have no reason to worry about it. (Ch. 3) Bird flus have hit birds on occasions in the past half-century, probably because of the conditions in the bird concentration camp factory farms - but the bird flus have never seriously affected the

⁴²<http://www.ageofautism.com/2011/01/keeping-anderson-cooper-honest-is-brian-deer-the-fraud.html>, Jan 15, 2012.

humans.

(Ch. 4) There were three major flu pandemics in the 20th century: the awful Spanish Flu of the late Great War (victim estimates vary - let us take the 20 million figure); the 1957-1958 Asian Flu, which killed up to a million people; and the 1968-1969 Hong Kong flu, which was mild. In general, it looks like humanity has defeated the worse forms of the flu, and it is conceivable that, barring the type of mass idiocy humanity is engaging in today, no more flu pandemics will occur. Two of the epidemics went along with wars. The Hong Kong flu was attributed to US troops returning home.

(Ch. 5) Since 1969, two scares have flopped - a swine flu in 1976, and a smallpox alarm in 2002. The wonderful aspect of the pandemic alarms is that when they fail to occur, the top honchos claim they managed to prevent them. Heads we win, tails you lose.

(Ch. 6) The CDC has developed a plan for indoctrinating the population into taking its vaccines. The plan is called the *Seven Step Recipe for Generating Interest in, and Demand for, Flu (or any other) Vaccination*. And every flu season they go through the seven steps and brainwash people.

(Ch. 7) During the initial period of production and use, vaccines were largely confined to industrialized countries. For instance, the original smallpox vaccine was offered to all age groups, but only those at risk, mostly healthcare workers and travelers were aggressively targeted. As a result, coverage was actually patchy. For example, despite the accolades given to its role in eradicating smallpox, it has been estimated that only about 10 percent of the world's population ever received the vaccine. As stated previously, Dr. Tom Mack's opinion was that "even without mass vaccination, smallpox would have died out anyway. It was already on its way out. It just would have taken longer."

Smallpox is the vaccine-crowd's favorite, the first major disease to be banished from planet Earth. With the increasing global population and the increasing disposable income people had, the vaccine business boomed after WWII. Tenpenny points out that from 26 vaccine producers in 1967, the US went to six by late 2004. The consolidation of everything continues. Humanity has not quite reached the one-world Global Corp. stage, but it is getting there. To be fair, the futurists predict the emergence of an oligopoly of 5-10 supercorporations rather than a full blown one megacorporation. After all, there has to be some illusion of competition.

Meanwhile, Big Pharma is ready to stick people with as many syringes as they will take. They call it their "charity," since the psychotropic drugs deliver far greater profits than do the vaccines.

And now for some real fun: what is in the flu shots? What are vaccines made of?

(Ch. 8) The reader may be interested to learn that (many) flu shots are fertilized in eggs. The vaccine is good and cooked at about the time the egg turns into a chicken. So they wash out the blood and pack the goo as best as they can. The entire process takes about six months. Next, they separate the stuff with an industrial strength chemical. Then they mix it up with sucrose. There is more cooking, and polysorbate 80 (which causes infertility) joins the fray.

By the time the fly shot is ready for packaging, the solution contains the following: various egg proteins, Triton-X100, formaldehyde [used for preserving corpses, toxic to humans], resin, gelatin, tri-butylphosphate, polysorbate 80, and in some instances gentamicin [has grave side effects]. To preserve this chemical brew, in doses of up to 25 micrograms thimerosal (a mercury derivative [poisonous]) is still added to many of the shots. After detailing this vivid description of the manufacture of the influenza vaccine, the thought of injecting this into your body - or the body of your baby - should be repugnant.

Tri-butylphosphate is used for making nukes. But hey, if the maddocs say it's good, what could possibly be wrong with it? Furthermore,

For those not repulsed by the idea of injecting the above solution into your body, perhaps knowing that the vaccine won't prevent you from getting the flu will add to your perspective. A report released by the *Cochrane Collaboration* in January 2006 concluded that

there was no evidence that injecting children six to 23 months of age with the influenza vaccine was any more effective than a placebo. After a review of 51 studies involving more than 260,000 children, including 17 papers translated from Russian, the co-author of the study and coordinator of the Rome-based Cochrane Vaccine Project, Dr. Thomas Jefferson, concluded that mandates to vaccinate babies is based on very little evidence.

They also found no evidence of vaccines preventing death or complications in the same age group. Strangely, it was also discovered that practically nobody had bothered to conduct safety studies.

What else do the eggs contain? To provide the illusion of safety, there exists a list of pathogens and bacteria, which must not be on the eggs. So the eggs are screened for those bugs... But the other 25 to 37 egg viruses, nobody appears to care about. Thus, the vaccine eggs are free of some pathogens, but full of others. The "others" have caused debacles before.

Some (academic researchers) speculate that the contents of the egg vaccines (which include types other than the flu shots) cause cancer and even DNA damage.

(Still Ch. 8) Some other vaccines contain cow juices. What could possibly go wrong with injecting those into the human body? Low fertility? Obesity epidemic? Autism? Evidence exists the bovine fluids cause "human breast cancer."

Speaking of which, since the "War Against Cancer" was launched in 1971, cancer rates in America have been rising.

But, here as well as everywhere else we look, there is more. (Ch. 9) The vaccine-mad drug-pushers are heading toward vaccinating people against the common cold. They are pushing vaccines for illnesses too weak to threaten or even significantly bother the healthy human being. And to elicit a response effect, they are upping the doses. Double the juice! What could go wrong?

To produce that much goo, they have to use more than eggs. The eggs are too puny, they do not produce enough slop. So the maddocs have a new technology: "cell-based influenza vaccines."

The technology is only new for the flu shots. It has been used for other vaccines since the 1950s. What they do is, they grow the goo in "large steel vats filled with living cells." The viruses replicate in the cells over a matter of days. Vast new super-expensive facilities have been built, and they are now ready to pump out flu shots all the time. All that is left is to make the people buy the shots - or better yet, to get the government to buy the shots in the name of the people.

And where do the cells come from? Some come from aborted fetal tissue.

Injecting people with vaccines made from aborted fetal tissue is *cannibalism*.

Now, to get the cells to replicate, the pharmaceutical Dr Frankensteins exposed them to a virus - Adenovirus 5. The adenoviruses are toxic and can damage humans in cases of infection. They cause cancer.

There exists a patent for the production of a vaccine using *insect cells*. Another one uses canine kidney cells. The cocker-spaniel vaccines have been approved in the Netherlands.

The FDA knows these production processes manufacture concoctions that are potentially deadly. In Tenpenny's opinion, the FDA seems to be ignoring the problem.

In the event of a "pandemic," the vaccine-nuts will have to quickly produce enough shots to shoot the entire population. This is to be done with the "adjuvant" substance, which produces a strong antibody response with only a little bit of viral solution. These adjuvants have been associated with all sorts of adverse reactions, including cancer.

Legalizing adjuvants is tough, because adjuvants tend to be toxic. One new adjuvant, MF-59, has been approved in Europe relatively recently. It is based on squalene, which has been connected with

the Gulf War Syndrome (which has knocked out thousands of Gulf War I veterans).

Vaccine clinical trials, explains Tenpenny, (still Ch. 9) focus on two things: the assessment of the short-term reactions to the vaccine, and the "adequate antibody response." If the reactions are not that bad, and the antibody response is "good" enough, the vaccine passes. Long-term effects? Who cares! Moreover, when an adverse reaction occurs in the long term, the scientists refuse to associate it with their holy cow the vaccine. It is also notable that, as Tenpenny puts it, quoting an official vaccine paper, "It is known that, in many instances, antigen-specific antibody titers do not correlate with protection." I.e., you can get antibodies, you can get develop an adverse reaction to the vaccine, and on top of that, your immune system having been compromised, you can catch the disease. And then die. This is known, and the pro-vaccine argument goes along Benthamite lines - in the aggregate, by some calculation to which we are not privy, the vaccines are assumed to deliver a net benefit.

Now, imagine this scenario: A practitioner of alternative medicine proclaims he has found a cure for infectious diseases. He has created a suspension containing multiple viruses combined with a variety of potentially cancer causing cells that originated from monkey and dog kidneys, caterpillar eggs, and retina cells from aborted human fetuses. Into the mix he has added formaldehyde, aluminum, mercury, a variety of other toxic chemicals called "preservatives" and an adjuvant made from shark oil - known to cause autoimmune diseases - called squalene. Proclaiming this potion to be a "wonder drug," the new injectable drug is marketed for use by everyone in the world. Most importantly, the slurry is targeted for use in babies with injections to start at two months of age. What would Quackwatch [a Big Pharma/ medical establishment front] - or State Medical Boards, the FDA, and the U.S. government - do to this "alternative" practitioner? He would be declared a heretic (maybe a lunatic). He would be dragged into court, be prosecuted, and have his license to practice medicine revoked. Depending on what had happened to the innocents who believed his rhetoric, he may be tried for malpractice, or worse, charged with murder.

Observe, reader, that the vaccines branch of the medical establishment is firmly entrenched in the alchemist ideology of the middle ages. They seek not to understand and cure, but to turn lead into gold, to turn dogflesh into the potion of eternal youth, to synthesize a secret panacea from raw poison. Those are the true believers. The free-market yuppies and the Malthusians have their own agendas.

(Ch. 10) Could they manage to enforce mandatory vaccination at some point in time?

From the remote perspective, if they managed to get society to accept abortion, mass homosexualization, violent pornography, "murder simulator" video games, and wars so absurd it baffles the mind (few people have the faintest idea as to why the US Army still occupies Afghanistan) - if they managed to do all that, then we should beware.

Until recently, explains Tenpenny, mandatory mass vaccination was a remote possibility. That was because the states were in charge of the vaccination laws. The *status quo* changed on January 23, 2003, when the energetic wrecker of America George II announced it was decided that there should be a Project BioShield - an effort to develop vaccines to "protect" America against biological and chemical weapons. Among the project's goals was the establishment of a fast track for the swift release of new vaccines "in the event of an emergency." After 2003, various related bills were pushed through the House. In effect, the pharmaceutical industry was given the privilege of, shall we say, immunity. What Senator Frist (whose medical credentials Tenpenny reports with gentlewomanly and collegial contempt) rammed through the Senate gave Big Pharma the following: First, Big Pharma got "immunity from liability for all drugs, vaccines or biological products deemed

as a "covered countermeasure" in the event of an outbreak of any kind." I.e. if they say there is a pandemic, stuff you with poison, and you die, and there is no pandemic - that is too bad.

Second, they got "immunity for any product used for any public health emergency declared by the Secretary of HHS." This secretary is appointed rather than elected. The current HHS boss is Kathleen Sebelius, the former governor of Kansas. In 2010, *Forbes* deemed Sebelius the 23rd most powerful woman in the world. She is "staunchly" pro-abortion (infanticide). Planned Parenthood backs her. The Catholic Church, to which the woman ostensibly belongs, has all but excommunicated her. Sebelius is an AGW enthusiast. And this woman can declare an emergency and stuff you (if you are in America at the time) full of needles.

Third, Big Pharma got immunity from liability. Even it is proved that they released a contaminated batch of vaccines, they are untouchable. The government (i.e. the taxpayers) takes the punch. People are legally prohibited from suing drug companies. The way this is done is, the plaintiffs have the ostensible privilege to sue - provided they prove "willful misconduct." I.e. you have to show that Big Pharma actually wanted to kill you. This is impossible. They will always say that they goofed. And even if one proves such willful misconduct, only the U.S. Attorney General can initiate action against the offender company.

Bush explicitly stated that Big Pharma should be relieved of "the growing burden of litigation." In recent years, on account of the toxicity of vaccines, the few remaining manufacturers have been, in Bush's words, "flooded with lawsuits."

(Still Ch. 10) Every year, 11 to 12 thousand reports of "vaccine reaction" are filed with VAERS (Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System). Of those, 15 percent are "serious." Of course, these figures are the tip of an iceberg of human suffering.

As Tenpenny puts it, "the groundwork has been laid for mandatory vaccination." They can go for a mass vaccination at any time. All they need is a good propaganda campaign, and off they go. Fortunately, they have problems, too. The Wakefield controversy and the work of people like Tenpenny has alerted the population to the realities of the vaccine situation. The recent pandemic scares have created a cry-wolf syndrome. The next pandemic propaganda will encounter vicious resistance from below. They will only be able to inoculate the population at gunpoint - and, barring truly egregious circumstances - such forced inoculation would be impossible.

Above the compulsory vaccination dream floats the WHO, with its Malthusian population control branch. The WHO, Big Pharma's best friend. The vaccine-loving WHO.

Chapter 11 of Tenpenny's book deals with Tamiflu (*The Scam of Tamiflu*). The agent who rammed Tamiflu through was Rumsfeld, the same droll fellow who gave America sweet Aspartame.

Tenpenny also makes a clear connection between the bird-flu scares and the Agrabusines takeover of the planet. The panics caused governments to massacre poultry. Such poultryicides smash the small poultry farmers, and allows the big players to swoop in. For examples of the scam, read Ch. 13 of Tenpenny's work.

As for the causes of the outbreaks of diseases among poultry and cattle - they are obvious. Factory farming is putrid. And we know, humanity knows, that squalor and horror provoke disease. Throw the GMOs into the cauldron, and you get an unholy witch's brew.

And that is where things stand.

Conclusions

There is more, but we have to proceed. The reader is encouraged to conduct additional research.

In summary: 1) smallpox vaccination did not work in the 19th century - sanitation rather than vaccination killed disease; 2) despite the maddoc/Pharma propaganda, vaccines are dangerous, have always been dangerous, and have always been known to be dangerous; 3) even assuming that vaccines provide some net benefit, that benefit disappears along with the disease - hence, there is no excuse for continual compulsory vaccination, particularly with live-vaccines; 4) the WHO, with its Malthusian agenda, promotes vaccination; 5) Big Pharma promotes vaccines to make profits; 6) the autism and infertility epidemics demand explanation - and vaccines have been connected to both; 7) at the current stage, compulsory mass vaccination in the event of an induced panic is a real danger.

What is to be done? To recommend that people do not vaccinate themselves and their children is beyond me. But I feel that people ought to research the subject on their own before injecting known poisons and the flesh of chickens, dogs, or humans, into their bodies.

Moreover, in light of the inherent dangers of vaccination, the documented Malthusian infatuation of the United Nations, the callous disregard for human life exhibited by Big Pharma, and the recent pandemic hoaxes, the drive toward the legalization of arbitrary mass vaccination must be halted.

Now, doctors tend to go through an arduous process of brainwashing, and, by the time they graduate, they tend to groan under the weight of massive debts. Medical school is expensive. So do not expect doctors to rock the boat. They are most of them naive and afraid.

Nevertheless: Dear doctors,

You are doctors, only as long as you adhere to the ancient Oath of Hippocrates. Forswear the Oath, in action or in spirit, and you become butchers and hypocrites.

I will neither give a deadly drug to anybody if asked for it, nor will I make a suggestion to this effect. In purity and holiness I will guard my life and my art.

...

If I fulfill this oath and do not violate it, may it be granted to me to enjoy life and art, being honoured with fame among all men for all time to come; if I transgress it and swear falsely, may the opposite of all this be my lot.

Live you by this creed?

Jane M. Orient, M.D. for the AASP (Association of American Physicians and Surgeons):

Roll Over Hippocrates⁴³

Jun 27, 2011

Everybody seems to think that doctors swear to the Oath of Hippocrates, and follow a long ethical tradition dating back to the 5th century before Christ.

Not anymore. The new doctors seem to be making it up as they go along. The tradition is not being set by a white beard who sat at many a patient's bedside, taught a generation or more of disciples, earned the respect of his contemporary colleagues, and wrote a corpus of observations and reflections still esteemed millennia after his death.

For example, the oath taken by the first graduating class of the Phoenix branch of the University of Arizona College of Medicine was written by the students themselves. They were charged with the task as they entered, and had all of 4 years to think about it.

The graduates don't use the word "swear." That's a verb that implies an object (to whom?), and a concept that assumes the existence of a higher authority, such as the Greek gods to whom the original Oath is addressed, or the Creator referred to in the Bible. The new graduates "promise" or "pledge"-perhaps to themselves.

The graduates "appreciate," are "grateful and humbled," and they "aspire" and "strive." They "commit to lives of practice and learning, to living artfully and with passion."

⁴³http://www.aaponline.org/index.php/site/article/roll_over_hippocrates/, Jan 16, 2012.

Among the hopes: "Let us always remember the excitement and awe that we feel at this moment."

But passing from feelings to action, the actual promises - of things "we will" do - are few. First, "we will respect and honor all who are involved in the healing arts." Those who taught them the art are evidently no more worthy than anybody else who is somehow "involved" in one of the allied professions. Standing on the shoulders of those who came before, "we will support those who follow." As to dedication, "we will balance our commitment to medicine and our relationships with loved ones." Finally, "we will stay true to our profession, our values, our morality and our personal ethics."

Patients, in other words, do not come first: their needs must be balanced against other priorities. This is perhaps a natural consequence of restrictions on working hours. These days, there is no time to dawdle over teaching points; the law requires the young physicians to leave after a certain number of hours, and to "hand off" the patients, however desperately ill, to the incoming shift workers.

The values, the morality, and the ethics are "ours." There is apparently no universal law, just as there is no higher Lawgiver. Gone are the "thou shalt nots" of the Oath of Hippocrates: abortion, euthanasia, seduction of patients or anyone in their household, and the violation of confidences. Even the injunction to "never do harm to anyone" has vanished, along with the positive injunction to "prescribe regimen for the good of my patients according to my ability and my judgment." Being true to the profession, after all, might mean subordinating my judgment and my patients to the goals of the accountable care organization, as well as reporting on anything the payers might want to know.

...

When the classical foundations are torn down, what will replace them? We've gone from Beethoven, to the Beatles, to gangster rap. Patients need to ask: after Hippocrates, what?

After Hippocrates, the New World Order of the hypocrites. We wish that most doctors are no party to that Order.

10.5 Psycho-pharma-genocide

Here we examine the terrible havoc wrought upon the human mind and upon the modern human society by the virulently insane, greedy, unthinking, and violent practitioners of so-called "psychiatry" over the last century to century and a half. It is unfortunate, but psychiatry as a discipline in itself has been tainted by an epoch of horror and unreason; there are, indeed, good, thinking psychiatrists out there - and there is some good to be found in psychiatry - but as a field, in the cumulative, psychiatry has failed.

The problem lies with those psychiatrists, who, for reasons of greed, ignorance, or malevolence, prescribe toxic pharmaceutical drugs. The effectiveness of the other, "counselor" type of psychiatrists can be debated, but there are wonderful counselor-type psychiatrists, who do good, necessary work.

Before we examine the current psycho-pharmacological induced epidemic, let us first look at: 1) mental illness; and 2) the history of psychiatry.

10.5.1 Depression and its fellow horsemen

To begin with, the human being consists of: 1) a body, and 2) at least one additional component - a mind, a soul, a spirit - it is perhaps unclear what - but it is there. The triune definition (body, mind (or soul), spirit) is probably more accurate than the dual one, but let us, for simplicity, conflate the

abstract manifestations of humanity in one for the length of this section.

That life is more than brute matter was recognized for millennia before the primitive doctrine of Benthamite-Malthusian Darwinism hit the scene in the nineteenth century. Subsequently, the reductionists, the materialists, the Darwinists, and the behaviorists *refused to acknowledge anything* beyond the brute matter of the human body.

That a blow to the head may damage the workings of one's brain is a truism. Yes, the brain performs certain functions for the body; yes, damaging the brain can cause strange behavior in the victim; but no, that is not the whole story.

To make a parallel, modern cars have computers. Depending on the degree of computerization of the machine, you could disturb the car's performance by tinkering with the computer. But would that mean that the computer drives the car? No - to function, the car needs a human driver, who endows it with his consciousness. Likewise, the human body acts and looks like a machine, and the brain is the computer of that machine - but there exists something beyond the brain - namely, the consciousness. Without the brain, the machine can not work; but that does not mean that the consciousness does not exist.

The last point is fundamental, because psychiatry has, in some of its crucial manifestations, denied the existence of consciousness for more than a century, with tragic results.

When discussing mental illness, one must begin by asking, what does mental illness stem from? The current materialistic, biochemical view is that mental illness just happens - for some reason, the brain stops producing the right stuff and the person goes nuts. This is an absurd view, inasmuch as it offers no real explanation, and also because it has not been proved, but rather the contrary.

Then there is the genetic view - some people are more naturally prone to mental illness, etc. I see some problems with the genetically deterministic outlook: 1) children may inherit psychological traits by imitation (i.e. nurture) rather than genetically; 2) a mentally unstable parent may abuse the infant (though unwittingly), causing psychological damage; and 3) the problem remains unanswered - even supposing that some people are genetically predisposed toward depression, what triggers the illness?

Finally, there is the nurture/Freudian view - some people suffer abuse in their childhood, and develop pathologies, and so on and so forth. The problem is that there are cases of people who had wonderful childhoods, and developed mental illnesses anyway.

My view of the problem is broader if somewhat necessarily vague. I feel that there is no escape from vagueness in discussing the topic, since both "mental illness" and the mind are abstract concepts.

What I do see is that: 1) man is more than a machine, and possesses the capacity to appreciate beauty and to develop morality; 2) the world is generally good and beautiful, but can be cruel, painful, dark, and menacing; and 3) day follows night, spring comes after winter, people grow old and new children are born, and in short, life revolves in circles.

Now, defining mental illness is not easy, because of the issues of subjectivity and the problem of defining normality. For example, defining mental illness as a "behavior substantially different from that of one's fellows" is futile, since different cultures have different norms. What is normal in one culture may be aberrant in another culture. Moreover, there are such things as mass insanity - for example, it can be argued that Germany went mad between 1939 and 1945. Who was normal in Nazi Germany - the person who went to the gallows for condemning Hitler when the war was already lost, or the person who followed orders and committed terrible atrocities in order to avoid the labels of "traitor" and "deserter"? This is a very difficult question, and it underlines the ambiguous influence on the prevalent notions of morality on what can be termed normative behavior.

In light of the last statement, it is imperative that psychiatrists show extreme care in defining "sanity." They have never been particularly careful, and nowadays they are outright sloppy. This is

a fundamental existential problem for the field of psychiatry. Let me illustrate the point by referring to the notorious 1973 Rosenhan experiment, described in the paper *On being sane in insane places*. Rosenhan, who has been a Columbia, Oxford, and Stanford cadre, took eight sane people and told them to pretend to be crazy in front of psychiatrists. Not one to be left behind, Rosenhan joined the fun. And so the actors went to psychiatrists, and explained that they were hearing voices. The gender of the voices was unknown, but the patients could discern the words "empty", "hollow", and "thud." They claimed to suffer from no other ailments. Neither did they claim to have a history of mental illness. Everything was fine except for the voices.

All actors were admitted into mental hospitals, which ranged from decrepit madhouses to expensive private sanatoriums. The one at the private hospital was diagnosed with "manic-depression," and the others were deemed schizophrenics. Once inside the loony bins, the researchers began to act normal. They stayed for periods of 7 to 52 days, with an average of 19 days, and were diagnosed with "schizophrenia in remission" upon release, i.e. it was decided that they were damaged for life. Though the actors behaved perfectly normally and demonstrably took notes of what they saw, no staff members identified them as sane. One nurse decided that the note taking was pathological. On the other hand, a third of the patients quickly saw through the sham.

Worse, the good doctors would not release the pseudopatients until the latter agreed to admit that they were ill, and to take anti-psychotics, which they subsequently wisely discarded.

From Wikipedia's article on the experiment: "Rosenhan and the other pseudopatients reported an overwhelming sense of dehumanization, severe invasion of privacy, and boredom while hospitalized." The staff tended to mean well, but regarded the patients as *objects* rather than *people*. The pseudopatients met doctors for an average of 6.8 minutes per day.

As Rosenhal later related, the situation was a classic Catch 22 - he could only get out by admitting that he was insane.

But it gets better! To add insult to injury, Rosenhal agreed to send another unspecified impostor to a certain hospital at a random time. Naturally, Rosenhal sent no one. Instead, he waited for three months, and then checked to see how many "impostors" had been caught. 41 out of 193 patients - more than a fifth - had been misidentified as impostors.

Similar experiments have been carried out, with similar results. Follows the description of a notable one, from the same Wikipedia page:

Maurice K. Temerlin split 25 psychiatrists into two groups and had them listen to an actor portraying a character of normal mental health. One group was told that the actor "was a very interesting man because he looked neurotic, but actually was quite psychotic" while the other was told nothing. Sixty percent of the former group diagnosed psychoses, most often schizophrenia, while none of the control group did so.

In another experiment, psychiatrists were given a list of symptoms. Half of them were told that the subject was black, the other half that he was white. The researchers "concluded of the results that "Clinicians appear to ascribe violence, suspiciousness, and dangerousness to black clients even though the case studies are the same as the case studies for the white clients"."

What conclusions can we draw? The inescapable conclusion is that psychiatry in general, as a "science," is a fraud. Either that, or most of its practitioners are incompetents. The fundamental question is - can they tell "sane" from "insane"? And they can not, or they often do not take the time to carefully study the patients. The ability to tell one from the other is indispensable for people who have the power to imprison others.

Psychiatrists like to think of themselves as "doctors." They are cranks, not doctors! For an elementary analogy, suppose you go to a doctor and tell him you have a broken foot, when in reality your foot is fine. Will the doctor diagnose you with a broken foot? He might diagnose you with insanity, but he certainly won't try to mend your broken bone! Nor would the doctor determine how broken your foot is on the basis on your socio-economic condition or your ethnicity.

Which raises another point - obviously, the psychiatrists in the above studies were biased by the pre-

vailing social mores. For example, "bi-polar" disorder can mean "flamboyancy." After all, Churchill and Hemingway exhibited symptoms of "bipolarity." "Schizophrenia," on the other hand, means crazy. Thus, the rich person is eccentric whereas the poor person is mad and eugenically disposable. That is psychiatry for you! Black people are psychotic, while white people are just angry. This is *not* science and psychiatrists are *not* doctors and they can *not* be given the right to imprison others.

Two caveats must be inserted:

First, there is a distinction between the institution of psychiatry and the ideal of psychiatry. The former is clearly corrupt. The latter, as we will see shortly, has suffered from grievous errors in its doctrine.

Second, there are, I presume, psychiatrists, who do a decent job in diagnosing people. Their skill stems not so much from their training, as from their diligence and their practice. Any person who spends a great deal of his time in deliberate and careful analysis of the mental states of people, will acquire the experience necessary for identifying the manifestations of true mental illness. Learning to read people is a skill, like learning to read body language. Unfortunately, there obviously are many psychiatrists out there, who merely look at the *DSM*, make a prescription, and forget about the whole affair. Considering the trust put in such people, their behavior is unacceptable.

What is psychiatry, really, and whence did it arrive? In the old days, those who went insane were cared for by their families, and exorcised by the priests. By the middle ages, asylums started to appear here and there, but those were nothing more than holding places for those too far gone. Around the time of the French revolution (and the proto-industrial age), "retreats" began appearing. In those, the patients were, from what I gather, allowed to rest and treated "humanely."

Things changed dramatically in the 19th century. Though at the start there had been practically no asylums in the United States and Great Britain, by the end of the century, hundreds of asylums existed, and the total population of those diagnosed as "mad" had hit the hundreds of thousands. One has to ask why this happened, and the answer can only be urbanization and industrial torture.⁴⁴ The madhouses of the 19th and pre-WWII 20th century were true hellholes, the stuff of legends. Let us here make the distinction between the madhouse and the sanatorium - the poor go in the former, and the rich in the latter. The madhouse is a place of confinement, and the sanatorium a place of rest. The logic of the madhouses was a classic Malthusian, free-market British, *Catch 22* one: the inmate was a lazy bum who was maligning from work, and the best way to cure him was to scare him out of the loony bin. Hence the infernal conditions. If one got well at the madhouse, it was in spite, rather than because of, the conditions around him. Thus, the madhouses aimed to show the desperate victims of gonzo industrialism that there are worse things than working 16 hours per day - and those who refused to repent could very well rot and die a Malthusian death.

That is what psychiatry was and is. The upper classes have always known that people have tough times, and when those come, the best cure is peace, quiet, and rest. That is why Julian Huxley the eugenicist went to a sanatorium ("nursing home") when his fuse blew. They know!

At the same time, I get the impressions that many oligarchical-types may have fallen for their own traps, and succumbed to the monsters of their own creation.

But for the herd, there are the madhouses and the psychiatrists. In the old days, the goal was to either get the aberrant creature back to work, or to lock him up and let him rot. Today, the situation is slightly more complex. Today, the goal is to do all of those things if necessary, and in addition to get as much money as possible out of the victim. Observe that the public pays for the madhouses (as opposed to the private sanatoriums). Observe that the goal is not to cure the causes of, say, depression, but to remove the symptoms, so that the person can "feel good." Observe that the pills they give people are addictive and expensive. Observe that these days people are told that *mental illness is forever*, i.e. you will have to keep buying the pills until you die.

This is obvious from the Rosenham experiment, in which the madhouse staff kept one eminently

⁴⁴Research confirms the hypothesis; for example, see this: <http://labspace.open.ac.uk/mod/resource/view.php?id=341613>, accessed Jan 13, 2012.

sane person locked up for two months! Their purpose was *not* to cure him, but to hold him, at the taxpayers' expense.

That is what psychiatry *is*; but what *should* it be? Consider the following: What is mental illness, but an illness of the mind? And what is the mind, but a manifestation of the one's consciousness, of what others call the "soul"? The true psychiatrist must be the caretaker of the mind - and in this way, in his useful form, the psychiatrist is nothing more than a secular version of the priest. The psychiatrists have taken over the duties, but not the moral doctrines, of the priests.

Thus, the position taken here is not one of "anti-psychiatry." The psychiatrists can play the role of materialistic priests. But the historical psychiatry, including the current psycho-pharmacological psychiatry, is a decades-long crime against humanity perpetrated by sadists, maniacs, and oh-so-many well-meaning dupes.

But let us go back to mental illness and to the issues of subjectivity and objectivity.

Now, as we said before, a blow to the head can cause aberrant behavior. However - if you see a car moving haphazardly, do you suppose that the car is broken, or do guess that the driver is drunk or otherwise incapacitated? The latter is the natural assumption, and so it is with mental illness - absent obvious physiological problems, it should be assumed that the subject suffers from an illness of the mind - not the material brain, but the abstract "soul."

What could cause such an illness? Let us begin with what we know: what causes illness to the body? The answers are: 1) a weak constitution; 2) poor hygiene and dirty environments; and 3) factors, which we can describe as "stress" - for example, having to walk in the mud for hours and hours while wet. Even absent any of those factors, nagging minor problems like the common cold can appear from time to time; and then there is old age and death.

Let us apply the same principles to the concept of mental illness: 1) a person who is psychologically weak - i.e. (perhaps?) nervous, uncertain, prone to self-doubt, manipulable, impulsive - will be prone to mental illness; 2) "mental hygiene" is a dangerous and vague concept, but let us say that a person who has not learned to think straight, to understand his problems and to work toward their solutions, will be prone to mental illness, as would be a person put in a psychologically poisonous place - such as, say, the madhouse; 3) psychological "stress" undoubtedly causes mental illness. Examples of such stress are: contradictory messages, sensory overload, forced confinement, incessant emotional duress, dissatisfaction with one's job, abuse in the hands of a bully, etc.

The three causes are obviously related. In general, to become psychologically stable and content, one should be given the chances and the know-how to realize the best human qualities in oneself. Moreover, a stable person will be able to withstand a fair amount of shock - but prolonged, severe shock will destroy anyone. This is well-known - during World War II, those who stayed at the front for too long became listless, apathetic, etc - obviously depressed.

In regard to the concept of "mental hygiene," examples of sloppy thinking can be the following: blaming oneself for events beyond one's control; blaming others for one's own failures; and persisting in a behavior subjectively known to be damaging. Depressives in particular are prone to falling in a vicious circle of self-hatred and self-destruction.

In regard to poor mental constitution: if a girl is persistently told that she is ugly and scum, she will develop poor self-esteem, self-hatred, et cetera. At the same time, if she is consistently told that she is great, she may develop an egotistic strand, and may break down when the realities of life hit her with full force. The given line of reasoning suggests that mental illness can become epidemic in a rotten society, with pathological behavior causing more pathological behavior.

Finally, mental illness will exist even in the "best of all possible worlds." Death is a reality of existence and of life. The fear of one's personal death can be overcome - but the terror at the prospect of the death of one's loved ones is, I feel, unbearable. It is possible to come to terms with death of old age, but accidents are devastating. And accidents will always exist. Thus, even a strong person can succumb to depression at the random loss of a close relative or friend, or at witnessing a terrible accident.

Hence, it is critical to realize that depression in particular is a *natural* reaction to the ugliness in life and to tragic events. But more on that later.

This is what mental illness is really about. It must be stressed that the condition is, generally, psychological rather than physiological. This is a crucial distinction in the light of the currently prevailing biochemical model of mental illness. The biochemical model is obviously wrong. Follows a *reductio ad absurdum*. It is well-understood that bereavement (and throw divorce/ separation in this category) is a frequent cause for the emergence of depression. But bereavement *does not affect one physically*. Thus it is the height of absurdity to treat mental illness chemically - it is simply insane in the literal, doing-something-absurd, sense of the word. Why would anyone treat a non-physical problem physically? Would a doctor try to wish a broken bone away? Then why do the converse to the psychologically sick?

Hence, *the entire foundational assumption of modern psycho-pharmacology*, which is the broadest branch of modern psychiatry, *is fundamentally false*. Psychiatry in its current form is not a "science." It is half-torture half-vooodoo.

Nor was the psychiatry of the first two-thirds of the 20th century any better. Follow some examples.

First, we have lobotomy. The lunatic who invented this perversity was one Egas Moniz (1874-1955), a Portugese "neurologist." He drilled holes in people's skulls and destroyed their frontal lobes with alcohol. Later, he would go inside and just cut with a knife. He was given the 1949 Nobel for his great achievement. 40,000 people were lobotomized in the States, 17,000 in England, and 9,000 in Scandinavia. The 1970 Psychiatric Dictionary, cited in Wikipedia's lobotomy article, explains that "Good results are obtained in about 40 percent of cases, fair results in some 35 percent and poor results in 25 percent are thereabouts. The mortality rate probably does not exceed 3 percent."

Do you scramble a person's brains at such odds?

Moreover, the premise of lobotomy is absurd, since it supposes that physical damage to the brain can fix a psychiatric problem. First: why would damaging the brain help? Second, how can a **physical** operation cure a **mental** illness?

Lobotomy simply turned people into zombies. That is all it did. To continue with our series of analogies, curing mental illness via lobotomy was like setting a broken bone via amputation. The case can be made that some egregious breakages require amputation - but can we be expected to think that the lobotomists only cut the basket cases? We know they cut Jack Kennedy's sister, and that she was fine - and that is enough.

Then there is ECT - Electro-Convulsive Treatment. The name says it all! From the Wikipedia article of the subject: "Originally discovered by accident in 1938 by Dr. Ugo Cerletti he soon realized it was ideal to subdue pigs to be slaughtered. ... Deciding to try it on his patients Dr Cerletti found such electric shocks caused his obsessive and difficult mental patients to become meek and manageable."

As with lobotomy, the purpose of the treatment was not to cure, but to zombify.

Further down below, we learn that "The aim of ECT is to induce a therapeutic clonic seizure (a seizure where the person loses consciousness and has convulsions) lasting for at least 15 seconds."

The behaviorist animal-torturers have produced "a vast literature on the effects of Electroconvulsive Shock (ECS) in animals."

ECT was widespread in the 1950s, and is still in use today. Sylvia Plath, in her *The Bell Jar* (1963), explicitly compared ECT to the electric-chair frying of the purported communist spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.

I leave it to the reader to figure out how a procedure designed to "subdue pigs to be slaughtered" by frying their brains can cure mental illness. And I ask: if the psychiatrists committed an atrocity of such magnitude once, why would anyone think that they are doing anything else but torture today?

Plath's book also describes her adventures with ICT - insulin coma therapy. Wikipedia tells us that ICT "was a form of psychiatric treatment in which patients were repeatedly injected with large doses of insulin in order to produce daily comas over several weeks." How wonderful!

The inventor of ICT was Manfred Sakel (1900-1957), an Austrian butcher (that is, "psychiatrist") who plied his trade in America. He "discovered" ICT in 1927. Sakel informed his colleagues of his new method of torture, and they responded with great enthusiasm. By the late 1940s, most American psycho-torture-chambers practised ICT.

The "coma" therapy was often coupled with convulsion therapy. Thus one could writhe in awful pain for a few seconds, before passing out for a good day or two. Such pain is surely an efficacious cure for depression. What could go wrong with convincing the patient that life truly is hell? The victims of ICT usually gained significant amounts of weight. Wikipedia reports that "Mortality (death) risk estimates varied from about one percent to 4.9 percent."

But hey, that was in the long ago! The psychiatrists will get it right the next time.

Another illustrative case can be found in the maddoc Henry Cotton (1876-1933), the "medical director" of New Jersey State Hospital at Trenton. Cotton was of the opinion that insanity was caused by (presumably invisible?) bodily infections. And so he cut off body parts from his patients. The droll fellow who wrote the Wikipedia article on Cotton tells us that:

He reported wonderful success with his procedures, with cure rates of 85%; this, in conjunction with the feeling at the time that investigating such biological causes was the state of the art of medicine, brought him a great deal of attention, and worldwide praise. He was honored at medical institutions and associations in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Europe and asked to make presentations about his work and to share information with the others who practiced the same or similar methods. Patients, or their families, begged to be treated at Trenton, and those who could not, demanded that their own doctors treat them with these new wonder cures. The state acknowledged the savings in expenses to taxpayers from the new treatments and cures.

...

Unfortunately, in an era before antibiotics surgery resulted in a very high rate of postoperative morbidity and mortality, largely from postoperative infection. Among his patients at this time was Margaret Fisher, daughter of wealthy and famed Yale economist Irving Fisher, who believed in the hygienic [eugenics] movement of the period. Diagnosed by physicians in Bloomingdale Asylum as schizophrenic, which was untreatable until the modern development of some pharmaceutical agents, Fisher had his daughter transferred to Trenton, however, because Cotton attributed her condition to a "marked retention of fecal matter in the cecal colon with marked enlargement of the colon in this area" for which she was subjected to a series of colonic surgeries before dying of a streptococcal infection in 1919.

"Falling ill during the public hearing, some assert that Cotton suffered a nervous breakdown, diagnosed himself as suffering from several infected teeth, which he promptly had removed, pronounced himself cured, and returned to work." This obviously insane specimen retired in 1930. His hospital continued to chop off body parts until the 1950s.

If you go and cut somebody's testicles off, you will go to jail for a long time. If you harm a defenceless person, the sentence will perhaps be longer. Yet the mad doctor butchered away until retirement, and nobody did a thing.

Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? People should seriously consider the possibility that psychiatrists undergo a brainwashing program, which renders many of them insane, if we consider sadism to be a subnormal behavior.

Lest I am accused of blanket statements, let me stress that, say, insulin shock therapy was a widespread procedure! Highly popular! Up to 5% (1 in 20 patients) death rate.

The case was made in our discussion of psychopathy that pathological situations lead to pathological behavior. Zimbardo's Stanford prison experiment showed this point fairly conclusively. Thus, I feel that it is fair to argue that psychiatry in its current form is inherently pathological. That, and the Zimbardo-effect, is why the staff in the Rosenhal experiment treated the patients like objects. Psychiatry, in its current reductionist, pseudo-biochemical form, is psychopathic.

More egregious examples of the reality of psychiatry can be provided. Take the film *The Snake Pit* (1948). It showed what the loony bins looked like at the time - and they were nightmarish. Many states reformed their mental institutions in the aftermath of the release of the film. It should be obvious that keeping people in dungeons will not make them get better - but the psychiatrists never seemed to make the connection. Would a medical doctor keep his patients in a dirty hole to heal them?

But let us switch gears and look at the diagnosis of mental illness.

There are two ways of diagnosing mental illness - self-diagnosis, and diagnosis by someone else. Apart from cases of fraud, self-diagnosis is fairly reliable - after all, a person in possession of her reasoning abilities should be able to tell something is wrong. And though extreme cases of mental illness demolish the whole ego, problems such as persistent depression and anxiety are self-diagnosable.

Then there is the case of diagnosis by a second-party. Here, in principle, reasonable diagnoses can only be expected from stable, perceptive people who are intimately acquainted with the patient. Thus, the diagnosis of someone who is in conflict with the patient should not be accepted readily; and the diagnosis of a thick-skinned person - say, that of an overbearing relative - should be considered with caution.

Furthermore, the diagnoses of "psychiatric professionals" should be regarded with extreme suspicion. The Rosenhan experiment shows that psychiatric diagnoses are practically worthless. A hundred percent success rate in diagnosing false positives, followed by a series of additional false positives, culminating with a final false positive as a condition of release, is a dreadful performance.

Psychiatrists diagnose as follows: they open their "bible," the *DSMIV* (*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*), then they lick their lips, then they take a good look at the patient, ask a few questions, have a shot of whisky, lick their lips again, and make a pronouncement.

Those who make the effort to really study their patients over a period of time - a difficult and draining endeavour - deserve great praise and respect. Psychiatrists should be barred from making prescriptions at a glance.

The *DSMIV* has about 300 "disorders." Thus the *DSM* is perfect for a drinking game - get together with a half-dozen friends and a case of beer, and try to identify each other's "disorders." Assign points. By the end of the game, everyone will have been diagnosed with 4-5 "disorders," and moreover, the diagnoses will be more accurate than the ones a psychiatrists would assign each of you, because you actually know each other.

Thus, for example, anxiety and nervousness, two perfectly normal and natural reactions to the chaos of modern urban life, are today "disorders," to be treated with highly toxic and expensive pills. Follow the symptoms:

(DSMIV-TR) **Diagnostic criteria for 300.02 Generalized Anxiety Disorder**

A. Excessive anxiety and worry (apprehensive expectation), occurring more days than not for at least 6 months, about a number of events or activities (such as work or school performance).

B. The person finds it difficult to control the worry.

C. The anxiety and worry are associated with three (or more) of the following six symptoms (with at least some symptoms present for more days than not for the past 6 months),
Note: Only one item is required in children.

(1) restlessness or feeling keyed up or on edge; (2) being easily fatigued; (3) difficulty concentrating or mind going blank; (4) irritability; (5) muscle tension; (6) sleep distur-

bance (difficulty falling or staying asleep, or restless unsatisfying sleep)

D. [immaterial]

E. The anxiety, worry, or physical symptoms cause clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning.

F. [not on drugs]

So let us take a child who is being bullied at school and who is bored in class. And let us suppose that the child is bored in class, because he learned to read at the age of four, and is being taught to read again. The other children resent him and bully him. Now, many children will not complain about the abuse, but will become morose, and will look at school with terror. And so we have: extensive uncontrollable worry, and difficulty concentrating or sleep disturbance or restlessness - any one will do! - but let us take restlessness. The child is bored at school and is restless at home, because it has energy and curiosity and at home there are no bullies. The anxiety is interfering with school, because the child does not want to go to school to be bullied and bored.

What will happen to our hero? What may happen is that his teachers may bring him to the psychiatrist, who will diagnose the child with an Anxiety Disorder or something worse, and put him on a *toxic addictive drug*. This kind of stuff not only happens, but is becoming prevalent.

So, no, psychiatric diagnoses in general are not worth the paper they are written on, and, no, psychiatry today is neither science nor medicine.

Nevertheless, psychiatry could become a noble vocation in the aftermath of a putative reform. There should be no harmful drugs (except in certain extreme circumstances), no torture, but only counselling and serious, thought-out, realistic diagnoses.

What mental illnesses are there anyway? There is depression. It is very easy to self-diagnose and can be detected by anyone close to the sufferer. Then there is schizophrenia, which is horrible and blatant. Then there is mania, which is harder to catch, and not necessarily a mental illness - what is the difference between an influential person in the prime of his life working 16 hours per day and constantly making important, impulsive decisions; and the victim of a manic episode? The latter is not rich and can not pay for his follies when his plans collapse, that is the difference.

ADHD and "anxiety" are frauds. So are many other supposed "disorders."

The two main mental illnesses are depression and schizophrenia. What does each entail, and what causes either illness?

Depression is, in metaphorical terms, a descent into the inferno. The best literary description of depression that I know of can be found in Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar*. The illness involves insomnia, self-hatred, pervasive boredom, the inability to concentrate on anything, a nagging sense of futility, an overwhelming sense of non-physical pain, a relentless pessimism, a propensity for abusing substances which can act as painkillers, a desire to self-harm, suicidal ideation, and hopelessness. It is like drowning all the time but never dying, it is the compulsive seeing of all the ugliness in everything, it is disgust with existence, it is hell.

The causes of depression are all the wars in the world, all the injustice, all the petty greed and envy, all the useless hatred, all the ingratitude and egotism, all the pain. A world in which one spends one's childhood in a brainwashing institution, has to work boring, tiring jobs to make ends meet, is removed from nature and planted in a concrete jungle, can not form a decent relationship on account of the objectification of sex, loses one's close ones by having to move about to find work, and has to witness or even participate in war, will cause depression. Even in "the best of all possible worlds," there will be pain, and there will be depression.

Moreover, in effect, depression is, in some ways, like a passing physiological sickness. The cure for depression is a combination of rest, a temporary reduction in one's responsibilities, and care in the hands of caring persons. Given those, an episode of depression will pass, to a sufficient degree, in

about six months (the figure has been backed by studies). The problem becomes more serious when there is an underlying cause for the depression - a poor relationship, a thoroughly dissatisfying job, a physiological illness (say, cancer), or an addiction to some destructive behavior (though such addictions are often chick-and-egg problems). Even if the irritating agent remains in place, the sufferer will, most likely, emerge from the depression in the long term - but there will be the possibility of relapse. This is akin to saying that if one were to sleep in a dirty, drafty, damp room, one would be prone to falling physiologically sick.

What can pills do to alleviate depression? This is a complicated problem, since depression is a *mental* rather than a *physiological* condition. In general, I view the notion of trying to cure depression by tinkering with the brain as dangerous and unfounded. Suppose we have a soldier who reflexively aims and shoots to the left of the target. To make him hit the bull's eye, do you teach him how to shoot properly, or do you rotate the crosshairs to make-up for his drag?

There is the issue, however, of painkillers. Depression is raw pain, which is why many depressives reach for the liquor bottle, prescription painkillers and sleeping pills, or even illegal painkillers like heroin. Their action is natural and is a way of seeking to alleviate the pain.

Now, morphine is what you give wounded soldiers in a war. Its purpose is to pacify them until the doctor can operate on their injuries. Morphine is useful as a method of overcoming sudden shock; but it can not be applied to a prolonged sickness, except to ease one's passage to the other world in terminal cases, which we are not considering here. Morphine and heroin are also extremely addictive. They are no good for depressives.

Prescription painkillers tend to contain morphine and present the same problem. Prescription sleeping pills can conceivably help, except that depressives very quickly develop immunities to such pills. Then we get to alcohol. It is interesting that almost the entire American literary tradition consisted of depressives who drank. Hemingway, Scott Fitzgerald, E.A. Poe, Raymond Chandler, H.S. Thompson, Charles Bukowski, John O'Hara, William Faulkner, David Foster Wallace, etc - all drunks and depressives. Hemingway, Thompson, and Wallace ended up as suicides, and the case can be made that Fitzgerald and Faulkner also killed themselves, though via the death of a thousand cups. But the question does arise, can alcohol alleviate or at least make more bearable a depression?

What exactly does alcohol do? It provides a short-term improvement of one's mood, followed perhaps by sleep of a questionable quality, and then by a hangover. In the best-case for the depressive, the sleep is long and the hangover is a stupor rather than a shearing pain. The worst case is a brief sleep followed by a splitting headache. The stupor makes one forget the depression, while the headache keeps reminding him of it, and of how stupid it is to drink, etc, a vicious circle of self-abuse.

In the larger sense, the depressives use alcohol as a painkiller, since it is legal, cheap, and effective. One does not have to go to any shrink - one can simply go to the liquor store or to the bar, and depart on a journey of the spirits. Now, psychiatrists will tell you that alcohol is a depressant. That is true, but it is also a painkiller. Thus it poses a complex problem - can a depressive person exact benefit from alcohol, and how can one tell if a person has benefited from alcohol? My own impression is that it takes a strong, determined person to control alcohol, and it is necessary to control it, since it is poisonous and physically addictive. It may have worked for Hemingway, Churchill, and Bukowski, but it will not work for everyone. I ought not to give any advise here, but I would point out that in principle, one should beware alcohol; and *a priori*, it is better to avoid alcohol when depressed.

One must also understand that alcohol abuse tends to be the *consequence* of depressive tendencies rather than the cause.

Which brings us to the next point - is there a substance that is relatively harmless, and yet effective at curbing pain? Perhaps marijuana is such a substance. It does bring one into a stupor, it is not physically addictive (though it can be psychologically addictive), it diminishes pain, it is cheap, and it has no particularly malicious side effects. (The one notable problematic side effect of marijuana that I know of is impaired memory.) Thus, treating depressives with medical marijuana is probably a good idea, and I am fairly certain that objective academic studies will discover that marijuana outperforms the various pharmaceutical anti-depressants by a very great degree.

That is because the point of an anti-depressive drug, from my perspective, should not be to try to remove the symptoms, but rather, to try to lessen the pain, thus giving the subject the opportunity to gradually recover.

The argument can be made that it may be a good idea for the depressives to just clench their jaws, and roll with the punches; but the proponents of that argument tend to be people who have not gone through the hell of depression. Depression is pain incarnate. It is only bearable in the sense that it does not literally kill the sufferer, i.e. the depression will not directly kill its victim, despite the victim's wishes.

Some extreme members of the anti-psychiatry movement deny the existence of mental illness *per se* with the argument that mental illness, defined as an aberration from normative behavior, is culture-specific, and therefore nonsensical. This argument only invalidates the given definition. Depression *is* a definable and existing, though abstract, condition. It does occur, and it does, in a sense, constitute an illness of the "mind" (or the "soul"). Likewise schizophrenia.

Most of the *DSM* "diseases," however, are indeed contrived. The difference between depression and the *DSM* baloney is that with the former, the sufferer professes a subjective but real feeling of monumental unrest (as opposed to, say, grave distress), while with the latter, all too often, a gaggle of witch-doctors decide what is normal and what is sick.

One unfortunate outcome of the extreme anti-psychiatry movement is the argument for the "right" to suicide. Barring pathological cases, there can be no such thing as a "right" to suicide. Everyone can commit suicide, it is absurd to speak of "rights." Though it is remarkable that in the old days, failed suicides were executed. The logic baffles. As far the depressives are concerned, however, they need relief from pain, not the "right" to tie a hangman's noose. Suicide is and should be regarded as undesirable. This is not to condemn those with suicidal ideation, but to describe their conundrum. The real issue, of course, is whether professed suicidal ideation should be used as a justification for involuntary confinement. This is a tough issue, which lies beyond the current discussion. In principle, the duty of preventing one from suicide should be relegated to one's friends and family.

It should also be observed that people confuse depression and sadness. The difference is in that depression is incapacitating, while sadness is not.

Next, there is such a thing as the placebo effect (which in itself demolishes the biochemical view of the mind). If brief, if you give a depressed person a tic-tac, and tell him that the tic-tac is a magical alchemical concoction of great power, capable of curing depression, the person will (on average) report feeling better after consuming the pill. If you give him an ordinary tic-tac and tell him it has only two calories, the person will not report feeling better upon consuming the sweet. And if you give the person a pill, which causes a mild physical effect, the person will exhibit a particularly strong placebo effect.

The placebo effect is real and measurable, and suggests that thought processes and convictions are the true driving force behind "mental illness." Questions arise: how often do the pharmaceutical-bought psychiatrists conduct real placebo trials with active placebos? How often do they fudge their figures? Do the anti-depressants contribute anything more than a placebo effect?

Which brings us to the next question: what exactly do the psycho-pharmacological drugs do? It is easy to check what they do, and I have discussed the topic with depressives. And they say that the drugs turn them into zombies. The pharmacological anti-depressants chemically change the way the brain functions and turn people into zombies. Thus, any ostensible positive effect that they have is purely a painkiller or placebo effect, which can and should be achieved without altering the workings of the brain.

Consider the following:

The symptoms are depression, as listed in the *DSMIV-TR*, are: persistent depressed mood, diminished interest or pleasure in everyday activities, weight loss or weight gain, insomnia or hypersomnia (statistically, 80% of sufferers experience the former, 15% the latter), chronic feeling of fatigue, self-

hatred, inability to concentrate, suicidal ideation.

Now consider the side effects of Prozac, the flagship "anti-depressant": (from Wikipedia) sexual dysfunction is a common side effect; then we have nausea, insomnia, somnolence, anorexia, anxiety, nervousness, asthenia, and tremor. Rashes or "urticaria" sometimes occur. Akathisia, which is an inability to stay still, is a "common side effect" of Prozac. The drug also sometimes causes suicidal ideation, as Dr David Healy has been arguing for years.

Now, dear reader, the presence of four-five of the symptoms of depression leads to the diagnosis of depression. Compare the symptoms of depression with the side effects of the drug. They are similar, except that the drug *tends to cause physiological problems where there were none*. How mad does one have to be to try to treat a sickness with a medicine that causes symptoms worse than those of the sickness itself? Do you cure alcoholism with the hair of the dog that bit you? No! That is how you "cure" a hangover - but you always have to pay in the long term for the short term ostensible gain. Hair of the dog that bit you, and worse, is exactly what the psychiatrists are doing, as we will shortly see.

The psychiatrists will also tell you that: 1) the drug may take *a few months* to work; and 2) if a drug does not work for you, try another. Some people end up on whole cocktails of highly toxic, addictive drugs.

Well, unfortunately for the psychiatrists: 1) depression tends to go away on its own (i.e. the mind cures itself via its immune system or whatever it has) after, say, six months; and 2) the psychiatrists have created a heads-we-win, tails-you-lose scam with their vile pills. Because the way they have set up things, they can (and do) say the following: if the depressed person gets better after a few months on the pill, the pill gets the credit, even though depression naturally goes away in a few months anyway; but if the depressed person gets worse, they blame not the side effects of the pill, but the depressive illness itself. The notion that anti-depressants "work" is a transparent fraud, but it has superficial plausibility, the prestige of a few kooks in white coats calling themselves doctors behind it, and a pseudo-scientific biochemical "theory" to hang the white coats on.

And we have the evidence to show that the last statement is true!

But before we look at that, consider the following self-evident argument. The Western world is one of the "free-market," i.e. of the "greed-is-good" credo. The pharmaceutical companies are massive corporations, whose *raison d'être* is to make profits. They have to make profits! Now, what is the best way to make profits with pills? The best way is, find a vaguely defined "illness," declare it a public danger, offer the magical cure for it, and make sure your pill is a) addictive, b) expensive, c) hard to withdraw from. And to make sure the profit stream never goes dry, make the pill cause the symptoms of the illness it is supposed to treat. In this way, a pharmaceutical company can get perfectly healthy people hooked on an addictive poisonous drug, and make wonderful, beautiful, healthy, magnificent, unholy profits forever.

This type of behavior is *ingrained* into the so-called free-market system. Observe that like the GMO companies, the pharmaceuticals are, to a degree, on the honor system. The FDA does not really do much of its own research - it trusts the corporate research and just rubber stamps it unless the results are too obviously egregious.

Then there is the problem with the free-market psychiatrists. Everybody knows that doctors in North America make good money, and indeed, many bright students go into medicine out of pure greed. Medicine is one of the places where the real money is. And by pretending to be medicine, psychiatry is getting a cut of the loot. I know that there are psychiatrists who genuinely care about people, etc, but it would be disingenuous to claim that greed and money play no role in psychiatry. The contrary is true - for the past quarter of the century, psychiatry has aligned itself with the pharmacological business, and if the latter prospers, so does the former. The psychiatrists benefit monetarily when the pharmaceuticals sell drugs. This is elementary. The reader can unearth mountains of evidence if he makes the effort to look.

A few words on schizophrenia. That particular condition seems to be something like a disintegration of the mind, or the self, or the ego, depending on how one looks at the subject. The obscene mainstream psychiatrist view is that schizophrenia is forever, i.e. if you catch it once, you are done for, and you should take your pills forever like a good little child. In reality, there are plenty of cases of schizophrenics recovering and living normal lives.

Schizophrenia should be treated very cautiously. The patient should be allowed to rest and recover. Stuffing the patient with toxic chemicals, or locking the patient in a psycho-prison, is torture - and worse, the torture of a defenceless person.

What causes schizophrenia? The composition of modern society certainly does not contribute toward a peace of mind. (Though, to be fair, many of the basic comforts of modern life, like plumbing, are wonderful.) People live surrounded by conflicting messages. Everybody knows pedophilia is wrong, but at the same time people see a 16 year old Britney saying, effectively, "have sex with me." People are admonished to be altruistic, but at the same time they have to worship the free-market. The discrepancy is most prominent in the brainwashing of corporate workers - they are supposed to selflessly labor for the benefit of the "team" and the "corporate family" and the mother corporation, when the corporation's goal is to make profits. I.e. one is supposed to work selflessly for selfish goals. Absurd! One is supposed to support the troops abroad, but live a peaceful life at home. And so on and on - modern society is inherently schizophrenic. It is replete with double-thinking and cognitive dissonance.

Erich Fromm wrote a decent analysis on the above themes in his *The Sane Society* (1955).

In general, psychiatrists should be extremely cautious in diagnosing schizophrenia. Unfortunately, they are diagnosis-happy.

The psychoanalysis of the cocaine-addict Freud also looks like a swindle. I would rather not look into Freudianism in detail. In effect, Freud said that humans are inherently irrational and only think about sex and violence - an absurdity.

Moreover, I feel that private Freudian practitioners have to cope with the malign temptation to just sit and listen for an hour, and then collect a hefty hourly fee. I do not see how counselling can properly function in a for-profit context.

Furthermore, I have the impression that Freudianism assumes that there must be some underlying cause for the illness, and while that may often be the case, I suspect that it is possible that mental illness may occur in reaction to fundamental irreconcilable existential problems, in which case people should merely be provided with the opportunity to recover in tranquillity.

And then, the people who ought to help one in a time of need are one's friends and family. The idea that a stranger can help one with one's personal problems seems strange to me. The psychiatrist must become a friend and a guide to do his job, and that is a tall task.

Nevertheless, at least the Freudians tackle the problem from the correct, psychological angle.

A quick word on "cognitive therapy." In principle, that is the way to go. Depressive at once yearn to open themselves to people who care, and fear exposing their weaknesses and vulnerabilities. Grouping them together may not always be a good idea. The situation likely varies from person to person. I harbor the suspicion that explaining how things really work to depressives may be helpful. Truth, one supposes, possesses a cleansing, healing power. Pointing out obvious errors in the thinking of mentally ill people should also be beneficial, but must be done carefully.

But let us take a look at the evidence supporting my arguments.

10.5.2 The Evidence

My thesis is that in the context of the "greed-is-good," "free-market," mindset of modern society, the pharmaceutical companies and their mercenary psychiatrist allies are poisoning the population by peddling toxic, addictive pills as a treatment for the symptoms (rather than the causes) of vague, often non-existent illnesses.

Moreover, I pose that psychiatry in its current and its historical form is a fraud and an anti-science. The true psychiatrist should be the secular counterpart to the priest. His main concerns should be ethics, psychology, and to a certain extent, theology - but not exclusively biology. Some physical illnesses cause aberrant behavior, and the expert psychiatrist should be able to recognize them, but he must also know the workings of the human mind from the psychologico-theologico-historical perspective.

Let me state that I have no personal antagonism toward psychiatry. As far as I know, neither I, nor anyone close to me, has ever seen a psychiatrist. I have nothing personal against the psychiatrists. However, I find their doctrines intellectually revolting, and I find their actions morally repugnant. They are poisoning the entire population of North America, and even Europe. They are committing grave crimes. That is why I feel compelled to adopt such a harsh tone.

There has been and still is a small group of psychiatrists who espouse, more or less, one or both of my views. We have mentioned Erich Fromm (1900-1980). David Healy the Irish psychiatrist has conducted research indicating that the psycho-pills can cause suicidal ideation. A notable book of his is *The Creation of Psychopharmacology* (2002). Irving Kirsch, who has taught at Harvard, has written a book entitled *The Emperor's New Drugs Exploding the Antidepressant Myth* (2009). He argues, in effect, that the ostensible "positive" effects of anti-depressants, when they at all occur, are caused by the placebo effect. John Modrow, a recovered victim of schizophrenia, has written *How To Become a Schizophrenic The Case Against Biological Psychiatry* (2003). Mahone and Vaughan have written a criticism on the role of psychiatry in colonial contexts: *Psychiatry and Empire* (2007). Peter R. Breggin (1936-) is a notable leader of the renegade psychiatric movement. Look up his works, for example *Brain Disabling Treatments in Psychiatry* (2008), *The Heart of Being Helpful* (1997), and *Talking Back to Ritalin* (2001). Breggin has taught at Harvard. Thomas Szasz (1920-) is another important leader of the serious psychiatry movement. His *The Myth of Mental Illness* (1960) is a classic, and he has followed it up with a swath of volumes.

The wily hypocrites in charge of the PR of the psychiatric establishment have attempted to create a false dichotomy between psychiatry on the one side, and the "Church" of Scientology on the other side. For some reason, the Scientologists are vehement opponents of psychiatry. Now, Scientology was founded by a science fiction author, L. Ron Hubbard. That in itself renders any criticism of Scientology redundant.

But the fact that the Scientologists are kooks does not mean that they are wrong in all of their ideas! If the Scientologists say that violence is bad and nobody should ever commit acts of violence, do we assume that violence is good just to spite the Scientologists? No! We take a note of the background of the speaker, and then we look at what he actually has to say. Moreover, as we have seen, there are plenty of eminent psychiatrists, who criticise their own field.

So we reject the false dichotomy of Scientology versus Psychiatry, and we condemn the psychiatrist PR agents for inventing such a fraudulent indoctrination tool in the first place.

But the work we will focus on is Robert Whitaker's masterful *Anatomy of an Epidemic* (2010). Whitaker was a finalist for the Pulitzer back in 1999. He certainly deserves the Pulitzer for *Anatomy*, though he is unlikely to receive the award, for obvious reasons. However, the prestigious Investigative Reporters and Editors organization gave its 2010 prize for investigative research to Whitaker.

As I mentioned above, when I turned toward researching depression, I eventually understood that

the psycho-pharmacological pills are nothing more than poison and profit. The case was clear, but I did not have the evidence. The evidence lay in the assorted research papers on the various anti-depressants, and I had neither the time nor the resources to go through those. I kept my eyes open, however, and sure enough, I found Whitaker's work. *Anatomy* examines the published research, and reports that, yes, psychiatry and the pharmaceutical industry are intertwined; yes, the short term "positive" effect of the psycho-pills is ambiguous when compared to the placebo effect; yes, the long-term effect of psycho-pills is highly destructive; yes, the biochemical outlook of psychiatry is fraudulent; and yes, somebody is making lots of profits.

So let us go over Whitaker's *Anatomy*.

Chapter 1 starts out with a definition of the problem: America is experiencing an epidemic of diagnosed mental illness. The numbers:

(Ch. 1) In 1955, there were 566,000 people in state and county mental hospitals. However, only 355,000 had a psychiatric diagnosis, as the rest suffered from alcoholism, syphilis-related dementia, Alzheimer's, The Hospitalized Mentally Ill in 1955 and mental retardation, a population that would not show up in a count of the disabled mentally ill today.⁸ Thus, in 1955, 1 in every 468 Americans was hospitalized due to a mental illness. In 1987, there were 1.25 million people receiving an SSI or SSDI payment because they were disabled by mental illness, or 1 in every 184 Americans.

Now it may be argued that this is an apples-to-oranges comparison. In 1955, societal taboos about mental illness may have led to a reluctance to seek treatment, and thus to low hospitalization rates. It's also possible that a person had to be sicker to get hospitalized in 1955 than to receive SSI or SSDI in 1987, and that's why the 1987 disability rate is so much higher. However, arguments can be made in the other direction, too. The SSI and SSDI numbers only provide a count of the disabled mentally ill less than sixty-five years old, whereas the mental hospitals in 1955 were home to many elderly schizophrenics. There were also many more mentally ill people who were homeless and in jail in 1987 than in 1955, and that population doesn't show up in the disability numbers. The comparison is an imperfect one, but it's the best one we can make to track disability rates between 1955 and 1987. Fortunately, from 1987 forward it's an apples-to-apples comparison, involving only the SSI and SSDI numbers. The Food and Drug Administration approved Prozac in 1987, and over the next two decades the number of disabled mentally ill on the SSI and SSDI rolls soared to 3.97 million. In 2007, the disability rate was 1 in every 76 Americans. That's more than double the rate in 1987, and six times the rate in 1955. The apples-to-apples comparison proves that something is amiss.

If we drill down into the disability data a bit more, we find a second puzzle. In 1955, major depression and bipolar illness didn't disable many people. There were only 50,937 people in state and county mental hospitals with a diagnosis for one of those affective disorders. But during the 1990s, people struggling with depression and bipolar illness began showing up on the SSI and SSDI rolls in ever-increasing numbers, and today there are an estimated 1.4 million people eighteen to sixty-four years old receiving a federal payment because they are disabled by an affective disorder.¹¹ Moreover, this trend is accelerating: According to a 2008 report by the U.S. General Accountability Office, 46 percent of the young adults (ages eighteen to twenty-six) who received an SSI or SSDI payment because of a psychiatric disability in 2006 were diagnosed with an affective illness (and another 8 percent were disabled by "anxiety disorder").

Worse,

This plague of disabling mental illness has now spread to our children, too. In 1987, there were 16,200 children under eighteen years of age who received an SSI payment

because they were disabled by a serious mental illness. Such children comprised only 5.5 percent of the 293,000 children on the disability rolls - mental illness was not, at that time, a leading cause of disability among the country's children. But starting in 1990, the number of mentally ill children began to rise dramatically, and by the end of 2007, there were 561,569 such children on the SSI disability rolls. In the short span of twenty years, the number of disabled mentally ill children rose thirty-five fold. Mental illness is now the leading cause of disability in children, with the mentally ill group comprising 50 percent of the total number of children on the SSI rolls in 2007.

The baffling nature of this childhood epidemic shows up with particular clarity in the SSI data from 1996 to 2007. Whereas the number of children disabled by mental illness more than doubled during this period, the number of children on the SSI rolls for all other reasons - cancers, retardation, etc. - declined, from 728,110 to 559,448. The nation's doctors were apparently making progress in treating all of those other conditions, but when it came to mental disorders, just the opposite was true.

Now, these are hard numbers! What is going on? The conditions of life have not changed drastically since the 1980s. Perhaps a few more people are going "crazy," but it is impossible that there could be as many crazies as are being diagnosed. What changed since the mid-1980s? The major change in the world of psychiatry was the introduction and popularization of anti-depressant pills in the late 1980s. It is elementary deduction that the pills have to be the cause for the genocidal epidemic. And we know the answer, we know exactly what is going on! The psychiatrists, at the behest of the pharmaceuticals, are inventing new diseases and mis-diagnosing more people with imaginary ailments, and feeding the population with pills, which - and this is crucial! - fry people's brains and cause more mental illness. In particular, the psychiatrists have gone after the children. They feed the children with brain-altering drugs, and when the children suffer the consequences of the forced chemical abuse, they are put on more pills. More and more people end up on disability, which is a form of channelling taxpayer money to Big Pharma. That is what is going on, and any serious, non-mercenary person who has looked at the issue can tell you that is going on!

This epidemic is yet another truly colossal problem facing modern society, it is an evil of incomprehensible proportions, and it is getting exponentially worse every day. In Whitaker's words, emphasis mine:

The disability numbers only hint at the extraordinary toll that mental illness is exacting on our society. The GAO, in its June 2008 report, concluded that **one in every sixteen young adults in the United States is now "seriously mentally ill."** **There has never been a society that has seen such a plague of mental illness in its newly minted adults**, and those who go on the SSI and SSDI rolls at this young age are likely to spend the rest of their lives receiving disability payments.

And almost nobody save for a few decent and brave true psychiatrists, and some sharp journalists, is doing anything about the problem!

Observe, moreover, that even if we were to accept the mainstream psychiatrist view, the system that they have concocted does not work *even on their own terms*. If their system works, we should observe a decrease in the incidence of mental illness. Instead, we have an epidemic. Therefore, their system does not work - meaning that their assumptions are totally, criminally wrong.

Moreover, as Whitaker points out, the psychiatric propaganda campaign has poisoned the very outlook of Western society. It is now assumed that a good chunk of the population suffers from inherent mental deficiencies, which are for life, and which must be treated chemically. This is a great stigma and the realization of the eugenicist dream.

Though the psychiatrists hypocritically babble about how people should avoid stigmatizing the "mentally ill," what they really say is that some people are just inherently inferior - the old Aristotelian/

Calvinist/ Darwinian fraud in yet another guise. In reality, it is blatantly obvious that mental illness happens like the flu and should not be considered any more stigmatizing than the flu. People go through tough times, recover, and go on. A few collapse completely, and that is tragic, but such is life on planet Earth. Observe that FDR was a president though a cripple, Reagan was a president though an Alzheimer's victim, and Churchill and Lincoln were both serious depressives. The psychiatrists' madness must be curtailed, and the stigma must be annihilated. The issue is one of life and death.

The inventor of proto-pharma-psychiatry was the German Paul Ehrlich (1854-1915). (The Malthusian *Population Bomb* Ehrlich is a different specimen.) Ehrlich decided that illnesses could be treated with "magic bullets." The idea says, vaguely, that for every illness there should be a "magic" pill, which kills the illness but not the organism, and people only have to discover that "magic bullet" and everything will be great. His theory applied to physiological illnesses, but by the 1950s, the psychiatrists decided to adopt the "magic bullet" worldview within their field.

(Ch. 3) The United States geared up for this wondrous future. Prior to the war, most basic research had been privately funded, with Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller the most prominent benefactors, but once the war ended, the U.S. government established the National Science Foundation to federally fund this endeavor. There were still many diseases to conquer, and as the nation's leaders looked around for a medical field that had lagged behind, they quickly found one that seemed to stand above all the rest. Psychiatry, it seemed, was a discipline that could use a little help.

Modern psychiatry itself only came into existence around 1892.

At their 1892 meeting, the asylum superintendents vowed to leave moral therapy behind and instead utilize physical treatments. This was the dawn of a new era in psychiatry, and in very short order, they began announcing the benefits of numerous treatments of this kind. Various water therapies, including high-pressure showers and prolonged baths, were said to be helpful. An injection of extract of sheep thyroid was reported to produce a 50 percent cure rate at one asylum; other physicians announced that injections of metallic salts, horse serum, and even arsenic could restore lucidity to a mad mind. Henry Cotton, superintendent at Trenton State Hospital in New Jersey, reported in 1916 that he cured insanity by removing his patients' teeth. Fever therapies were said to be beneficial, as were deep-sleep treatments, but while the initial reports of all these somatic therapies told of great success, none of them stood the test of time.

Then came the insulin treatment, electroshock convulsion therapy, and of course lobotomy.

(Ch. 3) With such articles regularly appearing in major newspapers and magazines like *Harper's*, *Reader's Digest*, and the *Saturday Evening Post*, the public had reason to believe that psychiatry was making great strides in treating mental illness, participating in medicine's great leap forward, but then, in the wake of World War II, the public was forced to confront a very different reality, one that produced a great sense of horror and disbelief. There were 425,000 people locked up in the country's mental hospitals at that time, and first Life magazine and then journalist Albert Deutsch, in his book *The Shame of the States*, took Americans on a photographic tour of the decrepit facilities. Naked men huddled in barren rooms, wallowing in their own feces. Barefoot women clad in coarse tunics sat strapped to wooden benches. Patients slept on threadbare cots in sleeping wards so crowded that they had to climb over the foot of their beds to get out.

People correctly compared the madhouse hellholes to the Nazi concentration camps. Psychiatry's prestige sank to a nadir. The butchers in white coats, and the comen with sofas, decided that something had to be done. In particular, they decided to make psychiatry more medical-like and

more respectable, by claiming that mental illness is physical in nature (a patent contradiction in terms).

Writes Whitaker, (Ch. 4) "The psychopharmacology revolution was born from one part science and two parts wishful thinking."

The first psycho-pharmacological magic bullet was Thorazine (a.k.a. Chlorpromazine, a.k.a. Largac-til). The drug was synthesized by the French pharmaceutical company Laboratoires Rhône-Poulenc. The surgeon Henri Laborit proposed using the drug as a psychiatric treatment. Indeed, Thorazine was initially known as "Laborit's drug." Was Laborit a eugenicist? Yes.⁴⁵

There are in fact just two conceptions of medicine : the first considers human life sacred and will do anything to protect it: research, care, company, etc. We have considered it so far the intrinsic vocation of medicine.

The other approach sees the human being just a material to be managed and its main concern is profitability. Its ideal is mainly the man who evolves towards an improved race; that is what Henri Laborit explains in his book *L'homme imaginant* (10/18, 1970, p.187-188):

"[The] individual belongs to a species that is in itself the resultant of a very long evolutionary descent. (...) What is an essential characteristic of this species is the fact that it has in its cortex some particularly developed associative zones, and creative imagination relies on their functioning. Finally it seems that very few men today, after millions of years of human evolution, are capable of using these privileged cervical zones. Then we could say that they grow old even before they are born to their humanity. In other words, aren't they still at the evolutionary stage not of their grand-parents or their ancestors but of the ancestors of their race itself? Aren't those real old men? Why then prolong the existence, not of dead people in suspension but of representatives of a prehuman race, which cannot finally die out? Wouldn't some reserve be enough to keep the range of samples?"

And so the prophet of psycho-pharmacology was, judging by the above quotation, a Darwinist eugenicist who thought that the "inferior"-types should be killed.

Explicitly, Whitaker reports that in Laborit's opinion, the drug "produced a veritable medicinal lobotomy." The goal was not to *cure* anyone, but to produce eugenically safe *zombies*. The drug was a tranquillizer and a neuroleptic. This was understood.

(Ch. 4) Physicians in the United States similarly understood that this new drug was not fixing any known pathology. "We have to remember that we are not treating diseases with this drug," said psychiatrist E. H. Parsons, at a 1955 meeting in Philadelphia on chlorpromazine. "We are using a neuropharmacologic agent to produce a specific effect."

Other drugs were invented. As a counter-part to the Thorazine downer, the mad doctors invented some uppers, one of them (Marsilid) literally a variation of rocket-fuel. The rocket fuel would energize the depressives, and the tranquillizer would pacify the schizos. The introduction of these various drugs took place in the mid-1950s.

The profits were not bad at all. And the docs knew it.

The selling of drugs in the United States began to change with the passage of the 1938 Food and Drug Cosmetics Act. The law required drug firms to prove to the Food and

⁴⁵http://www.trdd.org/EUGBR_4E.HTM, Jan 14, 2012. The page is a part of a book on eugenics, entitled *The Eugenic Connection*.

Drug Administration that their products were safe (they still did not have to prove that their drugs were helpful), and in its wake, the FDA began decreeing that certain medicines could be purchased only with a doctor's prescription. In 1951, Congress passed the Durham-Humphrey Amendment to the act, which decreed that most new drugs would be available by prescription only, and that prescriptions would be needed for refills, too. Physicians now enjoyed a very privileged place in American society. They controlled the public's access to antibiotics and other new medicines. In essence, they had become the retail vendors of these products, with pharmacists simply fulfilling their orders, and as vendors, they now had financial reason to tout the wonders of their products. The better the new drugs were perceived to be, the more inclined the public would be to come to their offices to obtain a prescription. "It would appear that a physician's own market position is strongly influenced by his reputation for using the latest drug," explained *Fortune* magazine.

The financial interests of the drug industry and physicians were lined up in a way they never had been before, and the AMA quickly adapted to this new reality. In 1952, it stopped publishing its yearly book on "useful drugs." Next, it began allowing advertisements in its journals for drugs that had not been approved by its Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry. In 1955, the AMA abandoned its famed "seal of acceptance" program. By 1957, it had cut the budget for its Council on Drugs to a paltry \$75,000, which was understandable, given that the AMA was no longer in the business of assessing the merits of these products. Three years later, the AMA even lobbied against a proposal by Tennessee senator Estes Kefauver that drug companies prove to the FDA that their new drugs were effective. The AMA, in its relationship to the pharmaceutical industry, had "become what I would call sissy," confessed Harvard Medical School professor Maxwell Finland, in testimony to Congress.

...

In 1952, an industry trade publication, *FDC Reports*, noted that the pharmaceutical industry was enjoying a "sensationally favorable press," and a few years later, it commented on why this was so. "Virtually all important drugs," it wrote, receive "lavish praise by the medical profession on introduction."

This new marketplace for drugs proved profitable for all involved. Drug industry revenues topped \$1 billion in 1957, the pharmaceutical companies enjoying earnings that made them "the darlings of Wall Street," one writer observed. Now that physicians controlled access to antibiotics and all other prescription drugs, their incomes began to climb rapidly, doubling from 1950 to 1970 (after adjusting for inflation). The AMA's revenues from drug advertisements in its journals rose from \$2.5 million in 1950 to \$10 million in 1960, and not surprisingly, these advertisements painted a rosy picture. A 1959 review of drugs in six major medical journals found that 89 percent of the ads provided no information about the drugs' side effects.

Thorazine and the other new psychotropic drugs received a similar treatment in the hands of the press.

The introduction of the psychotropic drugs spelled the decline of the Freudians who dominated American psychiatry in the 1950s. To justify the use of drugs, the psychiatrists gradually developed the biochemical theory of mental illness. As Whitaker puts it, the one to plant the "seed" of the idea in 1955 was Bernard Brodie. The reader probably knows the basic idea - not enough serotonin and too much dopamine, etc, etc. Like Darwinism, the whole thing is a conjecture, but they just know that it is true and that humanity should construct its society on the basis of the conjecture.

The "chemical imbalance" theory was officially proposed in 1965 by Joseph Schildkraut (1934-2006) of the NIMH. Schildkraut opined that the theory was (still Ch. 4) "at best a reductionistic oversimplification of a very complex biological state." His was the serotonin-depression theory, and two

years later they invented the dopamine-schizophrenia theory.

At the same time, the researchers were discovering that, in Whitaker's words, the drugs "weren't normalizing brain function; they were creating a profound pathology." This problem was "reasoned" around via half-baked theories.

The propaganda succeeded in making the drugs cool, and so (Ch. 4) "In 1967, one in three American adults filled a prescription for a "psychoactive" medication, with total sales of such drugs reaching \$692 million." The sedative Valium (Diazepam) was particularly popular.

Whitaker's Chapter 5 looks behind the research on the "chemical imbalance" theory. People began to look at the hypothesis, and found no evidence to support it.

In 1969, Malcolm Bowers at Yale University became the first to report on whether depressed patients had low levels of serotonin metabolites in their cerebrospinal fluid. In a study of eight depressed patients (all of whom had been previously exposed to antidepressants), he announced that their 5-HIAA levels were lower than normal, but not "significantly" so. Two years later, investigators at McGill University said that they, too, had failed to find a "statistically significant" difference in the 5-HIAA levels of depressed patients and normal controls, and that they also had failed to find any correlation between 5-HIAA levels and the severity of depressive symptoms. In 1974, Bowers was back with a more finely tuned follow-up study: Depressed patients who had not been exposed to antidepressants had perfectly normal 5-HIAA levels.

Additional research confirmed the findings.

In 1975, however, a group of Swedish researchers led by Marie Asberg, "breathed new life" into the decrepit theory.

(Ch. 5) Twenty of the sixty-eight depressed patients they had tested suffered from low 5-HIAA levels, and these low-serotonin patients were somewhat more suicidal than the rest, with two of the twenty eventually committing suicide. This was evidence, the Swedish researchers said, that there might be a biochemical subgroup of depressive disorder characterized by a disturbance of serotonin turnover.

Soon prominent psychiatrists in the United States were writing that "nearly 30 percent" of depressed patients had been found to have low serotonin levels. The serotonin theory of depression seemed at least partly vindicated. But today, if we revisit Asberg's study and examine her data, we can see that her finding of a "biological subgroup" of depressed patients was mostly a story of wishful thinking.

In her study, Asberg reported that 25 percent of her "normal" group had cerebrospinal 5-HIAA levels below fifteen nanograms per milliliter. Fifty percent had fifteen to twenty-five nanograms of 5-HIAA per milliliter, and the remaining 25 percent had levels above twenty-five nanograms. The bell curve for her "normals" showed that 5-HIAA levels were quite variable. But what she failed to note in her discussion was that the bell curve for the sixty-eight depressed patients in her study was almost exactly the same. Twenty-nine percent (twenty of the sixty-eight) had 5-HIAA counts below fifteen nanograms, 47 percent had levels between fifteen and twenty-five nanograms, and 24 percent had levels above twenty-five nanograms. Twenty-nine percent of depressed patients may have had "low" levels of serotonin metabolites in their cerebrospinal fluid (this was her "biological subgroup"), but then so did 25 percent of "normal" people. The median level for normals was twenty nanograms, and, it so turned out, more than half of the depressed patients - thirty-seven of sixty-eight - had levels above that amount.

As any statistician will tell you, if you take a sample of something that is more-or-less continuously measurable, you will obtain a bell curve. This is called the Central Limit Theorem and is, in effect,

the core of statistics. And so, if anything, Asberg's research had conclusively *disproved* the serotonin chemical imbalance conjecture.

Hilariously, a group of Japanese researchers conjectured that since 25% of the sample exhibited high levels of serotonin, depression was caused by excess rather than insufficient serotonin.

A 1984 NIMH experiment again failed to discover any causal relationship between serotonin and depression.

The Prozac propaganda, which, Prozac being a "Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor," promoted the serotonin fraud, sparked a new wave of research.

But this second round of studies produced the same results as the first. "I spent the first several years of my career doing full-time research on brain serotonin metabolism, but I never saw any convincing evidence that any psychiatric disorder, including depression, results from a deficiency of brain serotonin," said Stanford psychiatrist David Burns in 2003. Numerous others made this same point. "There is no scientific evidence whatsoever that clinical depression is due to any kind of biological deficit state," wrote Colin Ross, an associate professor of psychiatry at Southwest Medical Center in Dallas, in his 1995 book, *Pseudoscience in Biological Psychiatry*. In 2000, the authors of *Essential Psychopharmacology* told medical students "there is no clear and convincing evidence that monoamine deficiency accounts for depression; that is, there is no 'real' monoamine deficit."

David Healy drove the point home in 2005 by observing that "The serotonin theory of depression is comparable to the masturbatory theory of insanity."

That it is.

The research on the dopamine conjecture reached similar conclusions - that the theory was wrong. I omit the details, save for noting that the scientists discovered that the drugs actually *caused* increases in dopamine.

At autopsy, the brains of twenty schizophrenics had 70 percent more D2 receptors than normal. At first glance, it seemed that the cause of schizophrenia had been found, but Seeman cautioned that all of the patients had been on neuroleptics prior to their deaths. "Although these results are apparently compatible with the dopamine hypothesis of schizophrenia in general," he wrote, the increase in D2 receptors might "have resulted from the long-term administration of neuroleptics."

A variety of studies quickly proved that the drugs were indeed the culprit. When rats were fed neuroleptics, their D2 receptors quickly increased in number.

And so, while there is no evidence that dopamine "imbalance" causes schizophrenia, the dopamine-type drugs cause significant chemical changes in the human brain.

(Ch. 5) ""The dopaminergic theory of schizophrenia retains little credibility for psychiatrists," observed Pierre Deniker in 1990."

Whitaker concludes that:

The low-serotonin hypothesis of depression and the high-dopamine hypothesis of schizophrenia had always been the twin pillars of the chemical-imbalance theory of mental disorders, and by the late 1980s, both had been found wanting. Other mental disorders have also been touted to the public as diseases caused by chemical imbalances, but there was never any evidence to support those claims. Parents were told that children diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder suffered from low dopamine levels, but the only reason they were told that was because Ritalin stirred neurons to release extra dopamine. This became the storytelling formula that was relied upon by pharmaceutical companies again and again: Researchers would identify the mechanism of action for a class of drugs,

how the drugs either lowered or raised levels of a brain neurotransmitter, and soon the public would be told that people treated with those medications suffered from the opposite problem.

And so, the research supports my thesis that the "chemical imbalance" view of mental illness is pure speculation, and the promotion of the view that the theory holds constitutes fraud. Note that this is clear from first principles - if psychological rather than physical shock can lead to "mental illness," then it is absurd to look for biochemical drivers of mental illness. What the psychotropic crowd always aimed to do was to addict people to pills and to change behavior rather than alleviate psychological suffering. Unfortunately, Whitaker was not fully aware of the eugenicist angle.⁴⁶ Had he looked at the right places, he would likely have discovered the usual things: eugenics, Aldous Huxley's *Soma*, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Nevertheless, the perceptive Whitaker did come up with many wonderful questions: (Ch. 5) "If psychiatric drugs don't fix abnormal brain chemistry, what do they do?"

We know what they do - they meddle with the functioning of the brain. (Emphasis mine.)

...the medicine clearly doesn't fix a chemical imbalance in the brain. Instead, it does precisely the opposite. Prior to being medicated, a depressed person has no known chemical imbalance. Fluoxetine then gums up the normal removal of serotonin from the synapse, and that triggers a cascade of changes, and several weeks later the serotonergic pathway is operating in a decidedly abnormal manner. The presynaptic neuron is putting out more serotonin than usual. Its serotonin reuptake channels are blocked by the drug. The system's feedback loop is partially disabled. The postsynaptic neurons are "desensitized" to serotonin. Mechanically speaking, the serotonergic system is now rather mucked up.

I.e., the drugs change the brain - and in view of their "side effects," the conclusion is inescapable that the pills *cause* mental illness - of the physiological, "faulty"-brain type, rather than the real, abstract type.

The parallel with physiological medicine would go like this: you go to the doctor to complain of a rash on your knee. "Don't worry," says he, "I will help you!" He grabs a hammer and smashes your knee. You scream. "The blow removed the rash along with the skin on top of your knee," the doc explains. "Your rash will no longer trouble you. But I see that you have a wee knee issue here; would you like to have a knee replacement? We have a special discount today..."

The pharmaceutical stooges were well-aware of this problem.

Now, in the short run, the combination of a) the pacifying (or electrifying) effect of the drug, b) the placebo effect, and c) the natural recovery of one's mental processes, may lead to an ostensible improvement in the condition of the human guinea pig. In the long run, however, between the known "side effects" of the drugs, and the brain damage that they cause, the victim will, likely, develop pathologies. This is where one arrives from first principles. Whitaker's evidence (which consists of the official "peer reviewed" research papers) proves the reasoning is correct.

Whitaker touches on the effects of eugenics on the official understanding of mental illness in Chapter 6. Briefly, the idea that schizophrenia is a manifestation of genetic inferiority, and thus a hopeless, lifelong condition, was invented by Emil Kraepelin (1856-1926), who was a disciple of Wundt the proto-behaviorist, and a eugenicist. His work was extremely influential and remains such today.⁴⁷ Between 1946 and 1954 (when Thorazine was introduced), the eugenicists were going underground like so many cockroaches in the aftermath of WWII, and there was a window of opportunity for re-evaluating certain accepted psychiatric views.

⁴⁶It is also conceivable that Whitaker knows of the Malthusian/eugenicist problems, but has decided to limit the scope of his campaign in order to achieve maximum publicity. Such a strategy would hold certain advantages.

⁴⁷The following lecture is worth hearing - The late works of *Emil Kraepelin* by Octavian Buda, 7th May 2009; Goethe Institute Riga, Latvia. <http://www.pulse-project.org/node/150>, Jan 13, 2012.

(Ch. 6) Here's the data. In a study conducted by the NIMH, 62 percent of first-episode psychotic patients admitted to Warren State Hospital in Pennsylvania from 1946 to 1950 were discharged within twelve months. At the end of three years, 73 percent were out of the hospital. A study of 216 schizophrenia patients admitted to Delaware State Hospital from 1948 to 1950 produced similar results. Eighty-five percent were discharged within five years, and on January 1, 1956 - six years or more after initial hospitalization - 70 percent were successfully living in the community.⁵ Meanwhile, Hill side Hospital in Queens, New York, tracked 87 schizophrenia patients discharged in 1950 and determined that slightly more than half never relapsed in the next four years. During this period, outcomes studies in England, where schizophrenia was more narrowly defined, painted a similarly encouraging picture: Thirty-three percent of the patients enjoyed a "complete recovery," and another 20 percent a "social recovery," which meant they could support themselves and live independently.

These studies provide a rather startling view of schizophrenia outcomes during this time. According to the conventional wisdom, it was Thorazine that made it possible for people with schizophrenia to live in the community. But what we find is that the majority of people admitted for a first episode of schizophrenia during the late 1940s and early 1950s recovered to the point that within the first twelve months, they could return to the community. By the end of three years, that was true for 75 percent of the patients. Only a small percentage - 20 percent or so - needed to be continuously hospitalized. Moreover, those returning to the community weren't living in shelters and group homes, as facilities of that sort didn't yet exist. They were not receiving federal disability payments, as the SSI and SSDI programs had yet to be established. Those discharged from hospitals were mostly returning to their families, and judging by the social recovery data, many were working. All in all, there was reason for people diagnosed with schizophrenia during that postwar period to be optimistic that they could get better and function fairly well in the community.

It is also important to note that the arrival of Thorazine did not improve discharge rates in the 1950s for people newly diagnosed with schizophrenia, nor did its arrival trigger the release of chronic patients.

In other words, people entered episodes of serious illness (like fever or the pox), had a necessary rest in institutions which may have been full of all sorts of horrors, recovered, and continued their lives. Now, since the sickness was a serious one, and, I suspect, because of the torture at the mental institutions, some of the people failed to recover. As we know, serious physiological illness can lead to death. Schizophrenia is a serious mental illness. It can lead to something akin to the death of the mind.

Thorazine did not help at all, but that did not bother the "magic-bullet" machinegunners.

In 1961, the California Department of Mental Hygiene reported on discharge rates for all 1,413 first-episode schizophrenia patients hospitalized in 1956, and it found that 88 percent of those who weren't prescribed a neuroleptic were discharged within eighteen months. Those treated with a neuroleptic - about half of the 1,413 patients - had a lower discharge rate; only 74 percent were discharged within eighteen months. This is the only large-scale study from the 1950s that compared discharge rates for first-episode patients treated with and without drugs, and the investigators concluded that "drug-treated patients tend to have longer periods of hospitalization... . The untreated patients consistently show a somewhat lower retention rate."

I.e., the only study on the subject conclusively showed that the drug was making people sick. For another wonderful fraud, consider the following:

The discharge of chronic schizophrenia patients from state mental hospitals - and thus the beginning of deinstitutionalization - got under way in 1965 with the enactment of

Medicare and Medicaid. In 1955, there were 267,000 schizophrenia patients in state and county mental hospitals, and eight years later, this number had barely budged. There were still 253,000 schizophrenics residing in the hospitals.⁹ But then the economics of caring for the mentally ill changed. The 1965 Medicare and Medicaid legislation provided federal subsidies for nursing home care but no such subsidy for care in state mental hospitals, and so the states, seeking to save money, naturally began shipping their chronic patients to nursing homes. That was when the census in state mental hospitals began to noticeably drop, rather than in 1955, when Thorazine was introduced. Unfortunately, our societal belief that it was this medication that emptied the asylums, which is so central to the "psychopharmacology revolution" narrative, is belied by the hospital census data.

In other words, the pills poisoned people, who were shipped off to the taxpayer-subsidized nursing homes. By propounding the "once-is-forever" view of schizophrenia, the psychiatrists could continue to stuff their victims with pills even in the nursing homes, at the expense of the taxpayers. I am aware that many psychiatrists mean well, etc. Most of them certainly must have double-thought their way around the moral blight of their actions. Fine. As the Christians say, there is plenty of forgiveness for the repentant.

To get official approval, the psychiatrists had to somehow test their drugs. They decided on the follow schematic: the trials would be 6-weeks long (i.e. short term), and would rely on subjective self-evaluations on the part of the patients. The problems with this are clear: first, what about the potential long-term side effects of the pills? Second, who is to say that the self-evaluations are either "objectively" accurate or if the selected categories measure all relevant aspects of the phenomenon? These problems, combined with the obvious conflict of interests between the public and the for-profit pharmaceuticals, render the drug test trials highly suspect. But it turns out, as we will see, that even on their own terms, the trials fail.

The major early neuroleptics test went as follows:

(Ch. 6) The Psychopharmacology Service Center launched its nine-hospital trial of neuroleptics in 1961, and this is the study that marks the beginning of the scientific record that serves today as the "evidence base" for these drugs. In the six-week trial, 270 patients were given Thorazine or another neuroleptic (which were also known as "phenothiazines,") while the remaining 74 were put on a placebo. The neuroleptics did help reduce some target symptoms - unrealistic thinking, anxiety, suspiciousness, auditory hallucinations, etc. - better than the placebo, and thus, according to the rating's scales cumulative score, they were effective. Furthermore, the psychiatrists in the study judged 75 percent of the drug-treated patients to be "much improved" or "very much improved," versus 23 percent of the placebo patients.

Further research of the same type reached similar conclusions. Obviously, the examined "symptoms" decreased in incidence, because the patients had turned into zombies. Thus, there is no "unrealistic thinking" where there is no thinking. Moreover, one has to ask: was the placebo an active or passive one? I.e. did it cause some discomfort to give the impression that it was doing something?

The researchers then tested to see if people should stay on the meds. "In 1995, Patricia Gilbert at the University of California at San Diego reviewed sixty-six relapse studies, involving 4,365 patients, and she found that 53 percent of the drug-withdrawn patients relapsed within ten months versus 16 percent of those maintained on the medications." In other words, withdrawal is bad. But the test is ridiculous, since it does not test those who were never on the drugs in the first place. Of course people experience withdrawal horrors - the drug is made that way, it is addictive.

Some sharper researchers were aware of the problem:

"Little can be said about the efficacy and effectiveness of conventional antipsychotics on nonclinical outcomes," confessed Lisa Dixon and other psychiatrists at the University

of Maryland School of Medicine in 1995. "Well-designed long-term studies are virtually nonexistent, so the longitudinal impact of treatment with conventional antipsychotics is unclear."

This doubt prompted an extraordinary 2002 editorial in *European Psychiatry*, penned by Emmanuel Stip, a professor of psychiatry at the Université de Montréal. "After fifty years of neuroleptics, are we able to answer the following simple question: Are neuroleptics effective in treating schizophrenia?" There was, he said, "no compelling evidence on the matter, when 'long-term' is considered."

Existing evidence supported the hypothesis that the pills were making things worse.

(Ch. 6) Although Dixon's and Stip's comments suggest that there is no long-term data to be reviewed, it is in fact possible to piece together a story of how antipsychotics alter the course of schizophrenia, and this story begins, quite appropriately, with the NIMH's follow-up study of the 344 patients in its initial nine-hospital trial. In some ways, the patients - regardless of what treatment they had received in the hospital - were not faring so badly. At the end of one year, 254 were living in the community, and 58 percent of those who - according to their age and gender - could be expected to work were in fact employed. Two-thirds of the "housewives" were functioning OK in that domestic role. Although the researchers didn't report on the medication use of patients during the one-year follow-up, they were startled to discover that "patients who received placebo treatment [in the six-week trial] were less likely to be rehospitalized than those who received any of the three active phenothiazines."

And also, "Soon, NIMH investigators were back with another surprising result. In two drug withdrawal trials, both of which included patients who weren't on any drug at the start of the study, relapse rates rose in correlation with drug dosage. Only 7 percent of those who had been on a placebo at the start of the study relapsed, compared to 65 percent of those taking more than five hundred milligrams of chlorpromazine before the drug was withdrawn." Not only that, but those who had used the drugs and then relapsed experienced atrocious new symptoms.

More and more similar evidence emerged. The picture that emerged suggested that, while "antipsychotics" were useful in pacifying the patients at the time of their psychotic episode, they had a malignant effect in the medium to long-term.

As I mentioned before, it is probably a good idea to give mild painkillers to the depressed at the times of their worst pain, and, by parallel, to give some pacifiers to the psychotics when they lose it. Fine. But the drugs should be as mild as possible, and administered for as short a time as possible.

As Whitaker relates, research showed that, yes, indeed, in the long term - and the theory said schizophrenia is forever! - the neuroleptics were not curing anyone, but creating, literally, "zombies": "Thorazine and other first-generation neuroleptics caused Parkinsonian symptoms and extraordinarily painful muscle spasms. Patients regularly complained that the drugs turned them into emotional "zombies." In 1972, researchers concluded that neuroleptics "impaired learning."

Many other studies confirmed the facts that: 1) schizophrenia is not forever, but episodic like the flu; 2) the neuroleptic drugs hurt people, particularly in the long-run; 3) the way to treat schizophrenia is to kindly help the victim get over the initial episode of psychosis, and then allow him to recover in a decent atmosphere.

For example,

In 1969, the World Health Organization launched an effort to track schizophrenia outcomes in nine countries. At the end of five years, the patients in the three "developing"

countries - India, Nigeria, and Colombia - had a "considerably better course and outcome" than patients in the United States and five other "developed countries." They were much more likely to be asymptomatic during the follow-up period, and even more important, they enjoyed "an exceptionally good social outcome."

I.e., the people living in places lacking a psychiatric establishment have no psychiatrists to torture them, get over their illness over time, and go back to life. It can not get clearer than this.

The psychiatrists protested and claimed the study had been faulty. Another study was conducted. The results were the same as in the first one. In particular, the less medication people consumed, the better they fared.

Mountains of additional research confirms the above hypothesis again and again. The details can be found in Whitaker's work. But let us look at something else.

Chapter 7 of Anatomy deals with the "anxiety" medication - the "benzoes." The same picture emerges - the "cure" is worse than the illness. In short,

Moreover, it is a story easily traced, as Dr. Stevan Gressitt, who today is the medical director for Adult Mental Health Services in Maine, can attest. In 2002, he helped form the Maine Benzo Study Group, which was comprised of physicians and other health-care professionals, and it concluded that "there is no evidence supporting the long-term use of benzodiazepines for any mental health condition." Benzodiazepines, Gressitt and his colleagues wrote, may "aggravate" both "medical and mental health problems." In an interview, I asked Dr. Gressitt whether those "problems" included increased anxiety, cognitive impairment, and functional decline. Was his understanding of the scientific literature, I wondered, the same as mine?

The reply said: "Your words I don't contradict or argue with."

Chapter 8 deals with depression. In the old days, they called it "melancholia."

For millennia, people have known that existence has its darker sides, and that, sometimes, people fall into states of - depression. In many cases, the depression would eventually (six months) go away. For the pathological cases, one has to consider the following points: 1) the victim may be incapable of leaving a psychologically poisonous environment, and 2) serious illnesses sometimes have terminal outcomes. Without undue optimism, I would focus on the former scenario, since it offers a way out. In the middle ages, mental illness was associated with demonic possession. Some hold this view to this day. Look up the works of Malachi Martin, whom we have already met. Remember the man held three doctorates and spoke 10+ languages. He was an exorcist. It is notable that: 1) he relied on the psychiatrists' expertise in diagnosing patients, to distinguish between cases of mental anguish caused by physical distress, and true more-or-less inexplicable mental affliction; and 2) Martin managed to convince at least one (non-Catholic) psychiatrist that demonic possession is a reality.⁴⁸ Let me stress that I am not saying that "demonic possession" is real, etc - I merely point out that there exist erudite people who take the demonic business seriously.

Kraepelin defined the currently prevalent paradigm: there is depression, there is mania, and there is manic-depression (with the two alternating), and there is hope for the depressives - though these days many are regarded as tainted for good and are encouraged to take their pills until they die, which, statistically, they will do at an earlier age than the non-drug-abusing population.

Whitaker observes that:

(Ch. 8) In 1955, there were only 7,250 "first admissions" for depression in state and county mental hospitals. The total number of depressed patients in the nation's mental

⁴⁸Apart from Martin's books, look up the following interview on *Coast to Coast*: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5TqTySn0AqM>, Jan 13, 2012.

hospitals that year was around 38,200, a disability rate of one in every 4,345 people. Depression, Silverman and others noted, was primarily an "ailment of middle aged and older persons." In 1956, 90 percent of the first-admissions to public and private hospitals for depression were thirty-five years and older. Depressive episodes, explained Baltimore psychiatrist Frank Ayd Jr., in his 1962 book, *Recognizing the Depressed Patient*, "occur most often after age thirty, have a peak incidence between age 40 and 60, and taper off sharply thereafter."

This is important, of course, in light of the current depression epidemic among the young. Moreover, depression tends to be a one-time affair: "Sixty percent of Kraepelin's 450 "depressed-only" patients experienced but a single episode of depression, and only 13 percent had three or more episodes. Other investigators in the first half of the twentieth century reported similar outcomes." And yet today there are hordes of chronic depressives. Furthermore, "Indeed, as Dean Schuyler, head of the depression section at the NIMH explained in a 1974 book, spontaneous recovery rates were so high, exceeding 50 percent within a few months, that it was difficult to "judge the efficacy of a drug, a treatment [electroshock] or psychotherapy in depressed patients." I.e., depression goes away on its own, and therefore most of the anti-depressant studies are flawed to so great a degree as to be effectively useless. "Most depressive episodes, Schuyler explained, "will run their course and terminate with virtually complete recovery without specific intervention."

The studies of the early (1950s) antidepressants showed disastrous to unimpressive results:

The history of trials on the short-term efficacy of antidepressants is a fascinating one, for it reveals much about the capacity of a society and a medical profession to cling to a belief in the magical merits of a pill, even though clinical trials produce, for the most part, dispiriting results. The two antidepressants developed in the 1950s, iproniazid and imipramine, gave birth to two broad types of drugs for depression, known as monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs) and tricyclics, and studies in the late 1950s and early 1960s found both kinds to be wonderfully effective. However, the studies were of dubious quality, and in 1965, the British Medical Council put both types through a more rigorous test. While the tricyclic (imipramine) was modestly superior to placebo, the MAOI (phenelzine) was not. Treatment with this drug was "singularly unsuccessful." Four years later, the NIMH conducted a review of all anti-depressant studies, and it found that the "more stringently controlled the study, the lower the improvement rate reported for a drug." In well-controlled studies, percent of the drug-treated patients improved versus 46 percent of the placebo patients, a net benefit of only 15 percent. "The differences between the effectiveness of antidepressant drugs and placebo are not impressive," it said. The NIMH then conducted its own trial of imipramine, and it was only in psychotically depressed patients that this tricyclic showed any significant benefit over a placebo. Only 40 percent of the drug-treated patients completed the seven-week study, and the reason so many dropped out was that their condition "deteriorated." For many depressed patients, the NIMH concluded in 1970, "drugs play a minor role in influencing the clinical course of their illness."

Moreover, in regard to the placebos:

The minimal efficacy of imipramine and other antidepressants led some investigators to wonder whether the placebo response was the mechanism that was helping people feel better. What the drugs did, several speculated, was amplify the placebo response, and they did so because they produced physical side effects, which helped convince patients that they were getting a "magic pill" for depression. To test this hypothesis, investigators conducted at least seven studies in which they compared a tricyclic to an "active" placebo, rather than an inert one. (An active placebo is a chemical that produces an unpleasant

side effect of some kind, like dry mouth.) In six of the seven, there was no difference in outcomes.

And there you have it, reader. Further tests were done, with the same results.

But of course, like the Darwinists, the psychiatrists love to claim that though they may have made mistakes before (chopping people's parts off, insulin coma, electroconvulsive therapy, lobotomy, etc), this time they have the real deal. Hence, let us look at the research on the modern batch of antidepressants.

(Ch. 8) Societal belief in the efficacy of antidepressants was reborn with the arrival of Prozac in 1988. Eli Lilly, it seemed, had come up with a very good pill for the blues. This selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI) was said to make people feel "better than well." Unfortunately, once researchers began poking through the clinical trial data submitted to the FDA for Prozac and the other SSRIs that were subsequently brought to market, the "wonder drug" story fell apart.

In short,

The first blow to the SSRIs' image came from Arif Khan at the Northwest Clinical Research Center in Washington. He reviewed the study data submitted to the FDA for seven SSRIs and concluded that symptoms were reduced 42 percent in patients treated with tricyclics, 41 percent in the SSRI group, and 31 percent in those given a placebo. The new drugs, it turned out, were no more effective than the old ones. Next, Erick Turner from Oregon Health and Science University, in a review of FDA data for twelve antidepressants approved between 1987 and 2004, determined that thirty-six of the seventy-four trials had failed to show any statistical benefit for the antidepressants. There were just as many trials that had produced negative or "questionable" results as positive ones. Finally, in 2008, Irving Kirsch, a psychologist at the University of Hull in the United Kingdom, found that in the trials of Prozac, Effexor, Serzone, and Paxil, symptoms in the medicated patients dropped 9.6 points on the Hamilton Rating Scale of Depression, versus 7.8 points for the placebo group. This was a difference of only 1.8 points, and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence in Britain had previously determined that a three-point drug-placebo difference was needed on the Hamilton scale to demonstrate a "clinically significant benefit." It was only in a small subgroup of patients - those most severely depressed - that the drugs had been shown to be of real use. "Given these data, there seems little evidence to support the prescription of antidepressant medication to any but the most severely depressed patients, unless alternative treatments have failed to provide benefit," Kirsch and his collaborators concluded.

One also has to wonder about: 1) corruption and conflicts of interests; and 2) the "active" placebo-effect. Then there are the atrocious physiological side effects to the drugs, which can be attributed *directly* to the drugs.

(Still Ch. 8) "All of this provoked some soul-searching by psychiatrists in their journals. Randomized clinical trials, admitted a 2009 editorial in the British Journal of Psychiatry, had generated "limited valid evidence" for use of the drugs." Etc, etc.

The situation in regard to the active placebo effect can be gleaned from the following tests:

There is one other interesting addendum to this research history. In the late 1980s, many Germans who were depressed turned to *Hypericum perforatum*, the plant known as Saint-John's-wort, for relief. German investigators began conducting double-blind trials of this herbal remedy, and in 1996, the British Medical Journal summarized the evidence: In

thirteen placebo-controlled trials, 55 percent of the patients treated with Saint-John's-wort significantly improved, compared with 22 percent of those given a placebo. The herbal remedy also bested antidepressants in head-to-head competition: In those trials, 66 percent given the herb improved compared to 55 percent of the drug-treated patients. In Germany, Saint-John's-wort was effective. But would it work similar magic in Americans? In 2001, psychiatrists at eleven medical centers in the United States reported that it wasn't effective at all. Only 15 percent of the depressed outpatients treated with the herb improved in their eight-week trial. Yet - and this was the curious part - only 5 percent of the placebo patients got better in this study, far below the usual placebo response. American psychiatrists, it seemed, were not eager to see anyone as having gotten better, lest the herb prove effective. But then the NIH funded a second trial of Saint-John's-wort that had a design that complicated matters for any researcher who wanted to play favorites. It compared Saint-John's-wort to both Zoloft and a placebo. Since the herb causes side effects, such as dry mouth, it would act at the very least as an active placebo. As such, this truly was a blinded trial, the psychiatrists unable to rely on side effects as a clue to which patients were getting what, and here were the results: Twenty-four percent of the patients treated with Saint-John's-wort had a "full response," 25 percent of the Zoloft patients, and 32 percent of the placebo group. "This study fails to support the efficacy of *H perforatum* in moderately severe depression," the investigators concluded, glossing over the fact that their drug had failed this test too.

I.e. indications exist suggesting that the active placebo effect is superior to that of the drugs. The "wort" herb also has the benefit of causing significantly milder side-effects (than the SSRIs). Observe, also, that the markedly different numbers between the German and the American tests suggest that mental preconceptions and other mental processes can have powerful effects on the depressives. I.e., the problem is more mental and abstract than physical and material.

Hence, SSRIs do not really work in the short-term. Furthermore, they cause damage over the long-term. And they are physically addictive:

(Ch. 8) Over the next twenty years, investigators reported again and again that people treated with an antidepressant were very likely to relapse once they stopped taking the drug. In 1973, investigators in Britain wrote that 50 percent of drug-withdrawn patients relapsed within six months; a few years later, investigators at the University of Pennsylvania announced that 69 percent of patients withdrawn from antidepressants relapsed within this time period. There was, they confessed, "rapid clinical deterioration in most of the patients." In 1984, Robert Prien at the NIMH reported that 71 percent of depressed patients relapsed within eighteen months of drug withdrawal. Finally, in 1990, the NIMH added to this gloomy picture when it reported the long-term results from its study that had compared imipramine to two forms of psychotherapy and to a placebo. At the end of eighteen months, the stay-well rate was best for the cognitive therapy group (30 percent) and lowest for the imipramine-exposed group (19 percent).

Everywhere, the message was the same: Depressed people who were treated with an antidepressant and then stopped taking it regularly got sick again. In 1997, Ross Baldessarini from Harvard Medical School, in a meta-analysis of the literature, quantified the relapse risk: Fifty percent of drug-withdrawn patients relapsed within fourteen months. Baldessarini also found that the longer a person was on an antidepressant, the greater the relapse rate following drug withdrawal. It was as though a person treated with the drug gradually became less and less able, in a physiological sense, to do without it. Investigators in Britain came to the same sobering realization: "After stopping an antidepressant, symptoms tend to build up gradually and become chronic."

The psychiatrist-pharmaceutical cabal spins the above findings to say that depression is forever and people have to take their drugs until they die. In reality, the drugs are addictive, like alcohol and

heroin, and have awful withdrawal effects.

It is worth pointing out here, that people who want to stop taking their psychotropic drugs *must never go cold turkey*. The withdrawal has to be gradual.

All of this stuff was known, and pointed out once in a while, but with the introduction of the new wave of anti-depressants in the late 1980s, the profits were sweet. Simply delicious.

It was now known, the APA said, that "depression is a highly recurrent and pernicious disorder."

Depression, it seemed, had never been the relatively benign illness described by Silverman and others at the NIMH in the late 1960s and early 1970s. And with depression reconceived in this way, as a chronic illness, psychiatry now had a rationale for long-term use of antidepressants. The problem wasn't that exposure to an antidepressant caused a biological change that made people more vulnerable to depression; the problem was that once the drug was withdrawn, the disease returned.

And so, they reached the conclusion that "Only 15% of people with unipolar depression experience a single bout of the illness," the APA's 1999 textbook noted, and for the remaining 85 percent, with each new episode, remissions become "less complete and new recurrences develop with less provocation." Of course, this new discovery totally contradicted the wisdom of centuries - and the only new factor was the mass drugging of the population - and anyone who paid attention could connect the dots.

Every new study kept showing the same thing - the ADs do not really work, they cause harm, etc.

For obvious reasons, the research on the long-term effect of the ADs is poor. Nevertheless,

...we can search for "naturalistic" studies that might help us answer this question.

Researchers in the UK, the Netherlands, and Canada investigated this question by looking back at case histories of depressed patients whose medication use had been tracked. In a 1997 study of outcomes at a large inner-city facility, British scientists reported that ninety-five never-medicated patients saw their symptoms decrease by 62 percent in six months, whereas the fifty-three drug-treated patients experienced only a 33 percent reduction in symptoms. The medicated patients, they concluded, "continued to have depressive symptoms throughout the six months." Dutch investigators, in a retrospective study of the ten-year outcomes of 222 people who had suffered a first episode of depression, found that 76 percent of those not treated with an antidepressant recovered and never relapsed, compared to 50 percent of those prescribed an antidepressant. Finally, Scott Patten, from the University of Calgary, plumbed a large Canadian health database to assess the five-year outcomes of 9,508 depressed patients, and he determined that the medicated patients were depressed on average nineteen weeks each year, versus eleven weeks for those not taking the drugs. These findings, Patten wrote, were consistent with Giovanni Fava's hypothesis that "anti-depressant treatment may lead to a deterioration in the long-term course of mood disorders."

WHO (World Health Organization) tests reached similar conclusions. Other research was conducted, with the same findings. (It is worth pointing out that one standard definition of "insanity" goes along the lines of "repeating the same action over and over and expecting a different outcome every time.")

Meanwhile, the plague was taking its toll.

Several countries also observed that following the arrival of the SSRIs, the number of their citizens disabled by depression dramatically increased. In Britain, the "number of days

of incapacity” due to depression and neurotic disorders jumped from 38 million in 1984 to 117 million in 1999, a threefold increase. Iceland reported that the percentage of its population disabled by depression nearly doubled from 1976 to 2000. If antidepressants were truly helpful, the Iceland investigators reasoned, then the use of these drugs ”might have been expected to have a public health impact by reducing disability, morbidity, and mortality due to depressive disorders.” In the United States, the percentage of working-age Americans who said in health surveys that they were disabled by depression tripled during the 1990s.

But, as Dr. Dunegan pointed out, ”people just do not ask the right questions... They are too trusting.” And they suffer.

(Ch. 8) We can also track the rise in the number of people disabled by depression during the antidepressant era. In 1955, there were 38,200 people in the nation’s mental hospitals due to depression, a per-capita disability rate of 1 in 4,345. Today, major depressive disorder is the leading cause of disability in the United States for people ages fifteen to forty-four. According to the NIMH, it affects 15 million American adults, and researchers at Johns Hopkins School of Public Health reported in 2008 that 58 percent of this group is ”severely impaired.” That means nearly nine million adults are now disabled, to some extent, by this condition.

It’s also important to note that this disability doesn’t arise solely from the fact that people treated with antidepressants are at high risk of suffering recurrent episodes of depression. SSRIs also cause a multitude of troubling side effects. These include sexual dysfunction, suppression of REM sleep, muscle tics, fatigue, emotional blunting, and apathy.

Animal tests led to tragic conclusions: ”Rats fed high doses of SSRIs for four days ended up with neurons that were swollen and twisted like corkscrews.”

Chapter 9 deals with the ”bipolar boom.” In brief, starting from the late 1980s, the propaganda machine popularized the ”bipolar” condition. Being ”bipolar” became sort of cool - after all, Hemingway, Plath, Churchill, and Lincoln had likely been bipolars. The psychiatrists began to discover hundreds of thousands of bipolars. Prescriptions were written, and profits were made.

In reality, (Ch. 9) ”Psychotropic drugs - both legal and illegal - have helped fuel the bipolar boom.” Long story short, the anti-depressants (and their fellow drugs) tend to cause ”bipolar” symptoms by baking people’s brains. The effects of the epidemic are frightening. Before Lithium, the incidence of the condition was 1 in 5,000 to 20,000. The prevalence of medicated bipolar illness today is 1 in 20 to 50 (!). The good long-term functional outcomes before were 75% to 90%; today they are 33%. Moreover, the bipolar people today are markedly sicker - obviously on account of the side effects of the drugs.

Chapter 11 deals with the attack on the children. In short, ”mental illness” used to be a grown-up thing. Now there are millions of children on toxic drugs. When a child becomes sad, they make it a depressive and give it ADs. If it is a healthy, active child, they say it has ADHD, and drug it, and the drugs lead to the development of a panoply of ”mental illnesses” on account of the brain damage, and the kids are put on cocktails of drug, and so on. We are in a tragic, despicable state of affairs. ADHD is a patent manufactured fraud. The symptoms, as found on Wikipedia, are:

Predominantly inattentive type symptoms may include:

Be easily distracted, miss details, forget things, and frequently switch from one activity to another; Have difficulty maintaining focus on one task; Become bored with a task after only a few minutes, unless doing something enjoyable; Have difficulty focusing attention on organizing and completing a task or learning something new or trouble completing or turning in homework assignments, often losing things (e.g., pencils, toys, assignments)

needed to complete tasks or activities; Not seem to listen when spoken to; Daydream, become easily confused, and move slowly; Have difficulty processing information as quickly and accurately as others; Struggle to follow instructions.

Predominantly hyperactive-impulsive type symptoms may include:

Fidget and squirm in their seats; Talk nonstop; Dash around, touching or playing with anything and everything in sight; Have trouble sitting still during dinner, school, and story time; Be constantly in motion; Have difficulty doing quiet tasks or activities.

and also these manifestations primarily of impulsivity:

Be very impatient; Blurt out inappropriate comments, show their emotions without restraint, and act without regard for consequences; Have difficulty waiting for things they want or waiting their turns in games

So now being alive is a sickness. What child does not daydream? Fidget? Play with everything in sight? Blurt out inappropriate comments? Hate homework?

Are children to behave like robots?

ADHD is an absurdity. Putting children on drugs on account of ADHD is not mere folly, but a great crime.

And thus,

(Ch. 11) Suddenly, ADHD children could be found in every classroom. The number of children so diagnosed rose to nearly 1 million in 1990, and more than doubled over the next five years. Today, perhaps 3.5 million American children take a stimulant for ADHD, with the Centers for Disease Control reporting in 2007 that one in every twenty-three American children four to seventeen years old is so medicated. This prescribing practice is mostly a U.S. phenomenon - children here consume three times the quantity of stimulants consumed by the rest of the world's children combined.

Of course, the fact that only the American children are on the drug indicates that the disease does not exist, except of in the morbid imagination of certain prescription-happy psychiatrists.

In Chapter 13, Whitaker correctly attributes the root cause of our problems to a "biological psychiatry" *ideology*. The details of the rise of the psycho-pharmaceutical outlook are interesting, but I will omit them, and focus on the profits aspect.

In brief,

(Ch. 15) All of this has produced a growth industry of impressive dimensions. In 1985, outpatient sales of antidepressants and antipsychotics in the United States amounted to \$503 million. Twenty-three years later, U.S. sales of antidepressants and anti psychotics reached \$24.2 billion, nearly a fiftyfold increase. Anti psychotics - a class of drugs previously seen as extremely problematic in kind, useful only in severely ill patients - were the top revenue-producing class of drugs in 2008, ahead even of the cholesterol-lowering agents.¹² Total sales of all psychotropic drugs in 2008 topped \$40 billion. Today - and this shows how crowded the drugstore has become - one in every eight Americans takes a psychiatric drug on a regular basis.

Big Pharma is killing the golden goose, but that does not seem to register.

The psychiatric establishment is thoroughly corrupt.

(Ch. 15) Naturally, this flourishing business enterprise generates great personal wealth for executives at pharmaceutical companies, and money also flows in fairly copious amounts to the academic psychiatrists who tout their drugs. Indeed, the profits from this enterprise trickle down to nearly all of those who tell the "psychiatric drugs are good" story

to our society. To get a sense of the amounts involved, we can look at the money that the different players in this enterprise receive.

...

The pharmaceutical companies would not have been able to build a \$40 billion market for psychiatric drugs without the help of psychiatrists at academic medical centers. The public looks to doctors for information about illnesses and how best to treat them, and so it was the academic psychiatrists - paid by drug companies to serve as consultants, on advisory boards, and as speakers - who in essence acted as the salesmen for this enterprise. The pharmaceutical companies, in their internal memos, accurately call these psychiatrists "key opinion leaders," or KOLs for short.

Thanks to a 2008 investigation by Iowa senator Charles Grassley, the public got a glimpse of the amount of money that the pharmaceutical companies pay their KOLs. The academic psychiatrists regularly receive federal NIH grants, and as such, they are required to inform their institutions how much they receive from pharmaceutical companies, with the medical schools expected to manage the "conflict of interest" whenever this amount exceeds \$10,000 annually. Grassley investigated the records of twenty or so academic psychiatrists, and he found that not only were many making much more than \$10,000 a year, they were also hiding this fact from their schools.

Follow five notable examples; there are more, but we only want to convey the general idea.

- From 2000 to 2007, Charles Nemeroff, chair of the psychiatry department at Emory Medical School, earned at least \$2.8 million as a speaker and consultant for drug firms, with GlaxoSmithKline alone paying him \$960,000 to promote Paxil and Wellbutrin. He is a coauthor of the APA's *Textbook of Psychopharmacology*, which is the bestselling textbook in the field. He also wrote a trade book about psychiatric medications, *The Peace of Mind Prescription*, for the general public. He has served on the editorial boards of more than sixty medical journals and for a time was editor in chief of *Neuropsychopharmacology*. In December of 2008, he resigned as chair of Emory's psychiatry department, as he had failed to inform Emory of his drug-company paychecks.
- Zachary Stowe, also a professor of psychiatry at Emory, received \$250,000 from GlaxoSmithKline in 2007 and 2008, partly to promote the use of Paxil by breast-feeding women. Emory "reprimanded" him for failing to properly disclose these payments to the school.
- Another member of GlaxoSmithKlines speaker bureau was Frederick Goodwin, a former director of the NIMH. The company paid him \$1.2 million from 2000 to 2008, mostly to promote the use of mood stabilizers for bipolar illness (GlaxoSmithKline sells Lamictal, which is a mood stabilizer). Goodwin is the coauthor of *Manic-Depressive Illness*, the authoritative textbook on this disorder, and he also was the longtime host of a popular radio show, *The Infinite Mind*, which was carried on NPR stations nationwide. His show regularly featured discussions of psychiatric medications, with Goodwin, in a program broadcast on September 20, 2005, warning that if children with bipolar disorder were not treated, they could suffer brain damage. Goodwin has been a speaker or consultant for a number of other pharmaceutical companies; the \$1.2 million was what he received from GlaxoSmithKline alone. In an interview with the *New York Times*, Goodwin explained that he was only "doing what every other expert in the field does."
- From 2000 to 2005, Karen Wagner, director of child and adolescent psychiatry at the University of Texas, collected more than \$160,000 from GlaxoSmithKline. She

promoted the use of Paxil in children, and did so in part by coauthoring an article that falsely reported the results of a pediatric trial of the drug.

In a confidential document written in October 1998, GlaxoSmithKline concluded that in the study, Paxil "failed to demonstrate a statistically significant difference from placebo on the primary efficacy measures." In addition, five of the ninety-three adolescents treated with Paxil in the study suffered "extreme lability," versus one in the placebo group, which meant that the drug markedly elevated the suicide risk. The study had shown Paxil to be neither safe nor effective in adolescents. However, in a 2001 article published in the *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, Wagner and twenty-one other leading child psychiatrists stated that the study proved that Paxil is "generally well tolerated and effective for major depression in adolescents." They did not discuss the sharply elevated suicide risk, writing instead that only one child treated with Paxil had suffered a serious adverse event, with that child developing a "headache." New York State attorney general Eliot Spitzer sued GlaxoSmithKline for fraudulently marketing Paxil to adolescents, a case which was settled out of court.

All told, Wagner has been a consultant or advisor to at least seventeen pharmaceutical companies. The \$160,000 was the amount she received from GlaxoSmithKline alone; she told her school that she had received \$600.

- From 2003 to 2007, Melissa DelBello, an associate professor of psychiatry at the University of Cincinnati, received at least \$418,000 from AstraZeneca. She promoted the prescribing of atypical antipsychotics, including AstraZeneca's Seroquel, to juvenile bipolar patients. DelBello worked for at least seven other pharmaceutical companies. "Trust me, I don't take much" from drug firms, she told the New York Times prior to Grassley's report.

In short, the top level of the psychiatric establishment is utterly corrupt. Nor are the lower orders free of the taint:

The KOLs are the "stars" of the field, as they are the ones who "influence" their peers at a national and international level, but the pharmaceutical companies also pay physicians to promote their drugs on a more local basis, with these speakers giving talks at dinners or to other physicians in their offices. Pay typically starts at \$750 per event and rises from there. Two states, Minnesota and Vermont, have passed "sunshine" laws that disclose these payments, and their reports provide insight into the flow of money to these doctors. In 2006, pharmaceutical firms gave \$2.1 million to Minnesota psychiatrists, up from \$1.4 million in 2005. From 2002 to 2006, the recipients of drug-company money included seven past presidents of the Minnesota Psychiatric Society and seventeen faculty psychiatrists at the University of Minnesota. John Simon, who was a member of the state's Medicaid formulary committee, which guides the state's spending on drugs, was the top-paid psychiatrist, earning \$570,000 for his services to drug companies. All told, 187 of 571 psychiatrists in Minnesota received pharmaceutical money for some reason or other during this period, a percentage that was "much higher" than for any other specialty. Their collective take was \$7.4 million

And so on.

Of course, much of the money comes from the public's coffers, and goes into private hands. I.e. the public subsidizes its own suicide.

The profits angle is obvious. There is, unfortunately, the darker, Malthusian angle, which most researchers fail to see - mostly because it is too gruesome to be believed.

But we do know that there is a high-level Malthusian cabal out there, and the Malthusians want to depopulate the planet. And we do know that the pills cause sexual dysfunction, and all other sorts

of damage disruptive to normal human existence. The conclusions are inescapable and self-evident.

Conclusions

In brief, 1) the psychiatric establishment, ideally, should be the secular sister of the clerical community - the priests should care of the soul, and the psychiatrists should take care of the mind - and the mind and the soul are related; 2) in reality, psychiatry, as it has developed over the 20th century, is thoroughly corrupt, and has committed spectacular atrocities; 3) there exist, of course, many good psychiatrists - really "counselors" - who do a true service to the community; 4) the current psycho-pharmacological craze is, in effect, slow genocide, and is destroying the fabric of society by frying the brains of the population and explicitly attacking the children; 5) the problem is well-understood and thoroughly documented; 6) those concerned in all walks of life must take action.

Destroying the mind is equivalent to murder. Modern Western society is experiencing a slow-motion genocide.

The issue is one of life and death. Those on the psychotropic drugs should consider gradual withdrawal. Parents should protect their children from the psycho-pharmaceutical abuse. The pushers of prescription drugs should be banned from the schools. The serious, good members of the psychiatric establishment must speak out. The journalists must write on the subject. Politicians must pass legislation.

Either that, or face psycho-pharmapocalypse.

10.6 Modern Medicine

The reader can extrapolate from the previous sections to figure out what modern medicine is doing.

Hence, I will limit our discussion of the subject. Let us set the tone with the following quote:

How truly deadly the [Cult of Modern Medicine] is comes into stark relief whenever there's a doctors' strike. In 1970 in Bogota, Colombia, there was a fifty-two day period in which doctors disappeared altogether except for emergency care. The "National Catholic Reporter" described a "string of unusual side effects" from the strike. The death rate went down thirty-five percent. A spokesman for the National Morticians' Association said "It might be a coincidence but it is a fact." An eighteen percent drop in the death rate occurred in Los Angeles county in 1976 when doctors there went on strike to protest soaring malpractice insurance premiums. Dr. Milton Roemer, Professor of Health Care Administration at UCLA, surveyed seventeen major hospitals and found that sixty percent fewer operations were performed. When the strike ended and the medical machines started grinding again, the death rate went right back up to where it had been before the strike. The same thing happened in Israel in 1973 when the doctors reduced their daily patient contact from 65,000 to 7,000. The strike lasted a month. According to the Jerusalem Burial Society, the Israeli death rate dropped fifty percent during that month. There had not been such a profound decrease in mortality since the last doctors' strike twenty years before! When the doctors were asked to explain this phenomenon, they said that since they only attended emergency cases, they could invest their best energies into the care of the truly ill people. When they didn't have to listen to the day-to-day, presumably unimportant complaints of the average patients, they could devote themselves to a greater saving of life.

That's not such a bad answer. I've been saying right along that what we need is a perpetual doctors' strike. If doctors reduced their involvement with people by ninety percent and attended only emergencies, there's no doubt in my mind that we'd be better off.

The excerpt is from Dr. Robert S. Mendelsohn's *Confessions of a Medical Heretic* (1979). Mendelsohn (1926-1988) was an American pediatrician. He taught and served at Northwestern University and the University of Illinois College of Medicine. The man knew what he was talking about. Charles Eisenstein's *Ascent of Humanity* is in the spirit of Mendelsohn's book, but arrives from a far different perspective.

Ivan Illich's *Medical Nemesis* (1975) is another classic.

Mendelsohn says the following: 1) "Modern Medicine" is in a fact a religion, whose God is Death, whose priests are the doctors, whose temples are the hospitals, whose icons are the gadgets found in the hospitals, and whose creed is a technocratic, anthropocentric one; 2) (Ch. 1) "The entire diagnostic procedure - from the moment you enter the office to the moment you leave clutching a prescription or a referral appointment - is a seldom useful ritual." 3) (Ch. 2) On the prescription of drugs - "The doctor, once the agent of cure, has become the agent of disease. By going too far and diffusing the power of the extreme on the mean, Modern Medicine has weakened and corrupted even the management of extreme cases. The miracle I and other doctors were once proud to take part in has become a miracle of mayhem." 4) (Ch. 3) On surgery (i.e. butchery) - "Conservative estimates - such as that made by a congressional subcommittee - say that about 2.4 million operations performed every year are unnecessary, and that these operations cost \$4 billion and 12,000 lives, or five percent of the quarter million deaths following or during surgery each year. The Independent Health Research Group says the number of unnecessary operations is more than 3 million. And various studies have put the number of useless operations between eleven and thirty percent. My feeling is that somewhere around ninety percent of surgery is a waste of time, energy, money, and life." 5) (Ch. 4) On hospitals ("the Temples of Doom") - "A hospital is like a war. You should try your best to stay out of it. And if you get into it you should take along as many allies as possible and get out as soon as you can." Hospitals are incredibly dirty, dehumanizing, and, literally, deadly. 6) (Ch. 5) On the Cult's effect on the family - "If you were set on destroying the family you couldn't do a better job than Modern Medicine. That the family is disintegrating has been common knowledge for years. One child out of every six is now raised by single adult. Every other marriage is doomed." 7) (Ch. 6) "What resides at the core of every religion, the core from which hope radiates when all human attempts to deal with earthly conditions fail, is the Deity, the One Who Transcends it all. To get to the core of Modern Medicine you have to wade through an ocean of man-made drugs and fight your way through endless tons of machinery. If you then don't understand why the Church is savagely idolatrous and must be destroyed, you will when you stare its Deity in the face. The God of Modern Medicine is Death." 8) (Ch. 7) On the doctors as priests: "I always laugh when someone from the American Medical Association or some other doctors' organization claims that doctors have no special powers over people. After I finish laughing, I always ask how many people can tell you to take off your clothes and you'll do it." 9) (Ch. 8) "We've already seen what a disaster curative medicine has become, but so-called preventive medicine is just as dangerous. In fact, the juggernaut of Modern Medicine's drive for power over our lives is preventive medicine. It's no secret what mayhem power-hungry institutions - including governments - can get away with hiding behind the intention of "preventing" trouble. Modern Medicine gets away with even more. For example, the Defense Department explains the billions it spends by forwarding the old "we're protecting you from camels" routine. Though a great portion of those billions is no doubt wasted money, at least the Defense Department can point to the virtual absence of camels as evidence that some of the money is spent on worthwhile activities. Modern Medicine can't even make that claim. There's no way anybody can justify the billions of dollars we spend every year on "health care." We're not getting healthier as the bill gets higher, were getting sicker. Whether or not we have national health insurance is, at best, irrelevant and, at worst, one of the most dangerous decisions facing us in the years ahead. Because even if all doctors' services were free, disease and disability would not decrease." 10) (Ch. 9) "Faith is the first requirement for a religion, and you still need faith to practice the New Medicine. But you won't need faith in technology or doctors, or drugs, or professionals. You need faith in life."

Mendelsohn's statements, written a third of a century ago, reinforce our findings.

I have no personal quarrel with the maddocs. I have a hide and a head, and I use the latter to protect the former. One has to tackle vital issues at some time in life, and when, out of natural curiosity, I looked at modern Western medicine, I realized that it was insane, deadly, hubristic, and to a large extent fraudulent.

The basic argument against modern medicine is trivial and overwhelming: is society becoming healthier? Obviously not. Autism, obesity, mental illness, etc. Hence, modern medicine has failed in satisfying its *raison d'être*. The maddocs may (i.e. certainly would) reply that it is not their fault that people are too stupid to take care of themselves. To which I say, 1) the maddocs have a perverse incentive to allow or cause society to rot, since they derive both their prestige and their riches from human suffering; and 2) there are clear, explicit cases of doctor-caused disease, the standard example being the psycho-pharma-genocide.

Elaborating on the second point, it is elementary induction to suppose that if people are being poisoned via vaccines and psychotropic drugs, then, perhaps, practically the entire medicinal magic bullet arsenal is toxic.

Thus, one incessantly hears of the dangerous new strands of antibiotic-resistant super-bacteria. And yet when one goes to the doctor with a sore throat, the doctor prescribes antibiotics. What's next? Foot amputation for an ingrown toenail? As a child, I could not understand how "antibiotics" could heal the "bio"-logical human beings. Then I realized that the antibiotics were supposed to only kill a few bad bacteria. Antibiotics being deadly and dangerous, I assumed, were only used in egregious cases. When I grew up, I saw, to my horror, that people drank antibiotics like apple juice, and that my childish impressions had been exactly correct.

By the way, another favorite fallacy of the maddocs, a residue of their recent eugenical mass delusion, is the notion that such problems as autism and mental illness stem from inherent, "genetic" deficiencies, and that the doctors are to be congratulated for saving all those inferiors who would have died in infancy without their help. This perverted view is too stupid, arrogant, and insulting to debate.

For it is hard to argue with the fanatics, the arrogant, and the truly foolish.

We insert the caveat here that, as with the other corrupt professions we examined, there are decent medical professionals like Mendelsohn and Tenpenny out there - but then, one need not apologize to them, because they know the score.

And so, Modern Medicine has two main purposes today: 1) to kill at the altar of Malthus, Darwin, Galton, Mammon, and the Grim Reaper; and 2) to rob the people of every last dime they have. Follow two illustration, one for each purpose.

10.6.1 Some Data

"Preventable errors" (i.e. arrogant maddocs not washing their hands or just not giving a damn) murder thousands of Americans every year:

Medical errors in the USA: human or systemic?

The Lancet, Volume 377, Issue 9774, Page 1289, 16 April 2011

The US Institute of Medicine's landmark 1999 report, *To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System*, estimated that avoidable medical errors contributed annually to 44 000-98 000 deaths in US hospitals. Hospital-based errors were reported as the eighth leading cause of death nationwide, ahead of breast cancer, AIDS, and motor-vehicle accidents. The report put medical errors under the national spotlight.

Over 10 years later, the problem of medical errors remains and might even have escalated.

In the April issue of Health Affairs, David Classen reports that as many as one in three patients in the USA encounters a medical error during a hospital stay. The most common are medication errors, followed by surgical errors, procedure errors, and nosocomial infections.

...

Two other recent studies confirmed that medical errors in hospitals in the USA are a serious problem. Christopher Landrigan reported in 2010 that even in places where local governments have made efforts to improve safety of inpatient care, such as in hospitals in North Carolina, the high rate of detected events did not change over a 5-year period between 2002 and 2007. Similarly, a November, 2010, document from the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services reported that, when in hospital, one in seven beneficiaries of Medicare (the government-sponsored health-care programme for those aged 65 years and older) have complications from medical errors, which contribute to about 180,000 deaths of patients per year.

And this is just the periscope of the medical submarine. The figures are all underestimates, or they would never have been published.

Next, the greed.

Medical Bankruptcy in the United States, 2007: Results of a National Study

David U. Himmelstein, MD,^a Deborah Thorne, PhD,^b Elizabeth Warren, JD,^c Steffie Woolhandler, MD, MPH^a

The Journal of American Medicine

As recently as 1981, only 8% of families filing for bankruptcy did so in the aftermath of a serious medical problem. By contrast, our 2001 study in 5 states found that illness or medical bills contributed to about half of bankruptcies. Since then, the number of un- and underinsured Americans has grown; health costs have increased; and Congress tightened the bankruptcy laws.

...

- 62.1% of all bankruptcies have a medical cause.
- Most medical debtors were well educated and middle class; three quarters had health insurance.
- The share of bankruptcies attributable to medical problems rose by 50% between 2001 and 2007.
- Mean age of the bankruptcies - 44.
- Mean family size - 2.71 .

In short, the rising medical costs are destroying the so-called "middle class" and the family. Where did the costs come from? The population certainly is not getting any healthier! It is clear that the hospitals are filling up with useless gadgets, and that the doctors are administering useless expensive tests instead of trying to think, and that the various pills and treatments tend to suppress symptoms and cause new illnesses as side effects, rather than to cure anything.

Bankruptcies of this sort are unsustainable. They signal the disintegration of a society. By itself, a problem of this magnitude would be major but not insoluble. But, of course, the rate of medical bankruptcies is merely one symptom of the accelerating, and, at this stage, likely terminal, decline of American (and by proxy Western) society.

Fortunately, this particular problem is easy to resolve. It only requires the reform of the national medical system combined with a massive debt moratorium. In principle, a strong president can accomplish all of that in a day, with a few strokes of a quill. If the American people fail to demand their privileges (as in, the privilege to be alive) from their government, they have only themselves to blame.

Consider the following:

Financing Health Care: Businesses, Households, and Governments, 1987-2003

Cathy A. Cowan, M.B.A. and Micah B. Hartman

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services [US Government outfit]

Expenditures for Health Services and Supplies in billions: 1987 \$477.8; 1992 \$797.1; 1997 \$1,055.8; 2000 \$1,260.9; 2001 \$1,373.8; 2002 \$1,499.8; 2003 \$1,614.2;

...

The share of HSS financed by businesses, households, and other private sources decreased from 69 percent in 1987 to 61 percent in 2003 as the public share grew from 31 to 39 percent - narrowing the gap between public and private financing.

National Health Expenditures 2010 Highlights

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

U.S. health care spending grew 3.9 percent in 2010 following record slow growth of 3.8 percent in 2009; the two slowest rates of growth in the fifty-one year history of the National Health Expenditure Accounts. Total health expenditures reached \$2.6 trillion, which translates to \$8,402 per person or 17.9 percent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

...

The federal government financed 29 percent of total health spending in 2010, a substantial increase from its share of 23 percent in 2007. Meanwhile, the shares of the total health care bill financed by state and local governments (16 percent), private businesses (21 percent), and households (28 percent) declined during the same time period.

The US nominal GDP was about \$4.7 trillion back in 1987, about \$11 trillion in 2003, and about \$15 trillion in 2011. So, the US per-capita health care cost has almost doubled since 1987 - in only a quarter of a century! - and yet the people are getting sicker.

It is worth noting that tuition costs have also exploded during the same period. Housing prices ballooned. The three bubbles have left an entire generation in the skids.

The free-marketeers are correct in claiming that the government intervention is creating a mess, but not for the right reasons. In principle, in an all-private medical care system, the government has to make sure all people get enough money to obtain basic medical care. In a functional, reasonably equitable society, there would be little need for regulation.

Since serious health problems arise rarely, people ought to pool contingency money within their communities. Hence insurance. The existence of an insurance business is pure insanity - why should anyone make profits on something that could be done without the element of greed? Health care can not accommodate the profit motive! Let people pool some money on their own. If it is not enough, ask for more. If it is too much, either return it or use it for something that needs to be done. In principle, from what I can see, the pools should be constituted on a per-community (county?) basis, though state and national plans could also work. The difference is that the population can control the money when it is at the local level, while the state controls the action in a national insurance plan.

Thus, in an ideal fully private system, local communities would make their own profit-free pools, and hire doctors at will.

Which brings up the next point: how should the doctors organize? In the 19th century, the American doctors were more or less disorganized and credential-less, and worked privately. There were quacks, but there also were thinking, innovative people. These days, the American doctors have the powerful American Medical Association, which is, in effect, the mightiest union in the land. The war for credentials is merciless. Nominalism has won. One could be a miracle worker, and be considered a

quack sans a diploma; and one can be an incompetent butcher, and be revered for a piece of paper. In general, it is a terrible idea to delegate great monopoly power to a sole oligarchical body. Accreditation agencies can serve useful purposes, but they should be numerous, relatively politically independent, relatively politically powerless, and heterogeneous.

And so, 1) the insurance aspect must be kept free of conflicting interests (i.e. profits) and all people should have access to insurance; 2) the power of the accreditation agencies must be contained due to its propensity toward monopoly and blackmail; 3) the government's role lies in ensuring the first two conditions occur.

Thus the government can simply take the entire business into its own hand (social medicine; has been fairly effective in the former Warsaw Pact Bloc and in Britain), or it can regulate to make sure that all people receive basic medical care and that the doctors do not acquire too much power (this is the *laissez-faire* type arrangement that the libertarians dream about; it was the norm prior to the rise of the modern states). When the families and the communities are strong, the national wealth is not too concentrated, and the doctors are relatively independent, there is almost no need for regulation.

The choice of system depends to a large degree on the mentality of the population and on other political conditions.

In America, unfortunately, things are the polar opposite of what they should be. Insurance is profitable and does not cover the entire population. The accreditation agencies, the pharmaceuticals, the insurance giants, and the doctors' union have been allowed to merge into an unholy rapacious beast. This beast has acquired a fair degree of control over the government, thus rendering it incapable of fulfilling its duties. Medicare and Medicaid are essential and as efficient as possible, but due to the structural arrangement of the American health care system, they channel taxpayer money into private hands, thus inflating the cost of health services. Fixing this is easy - the government has to go in and regulate the health "industry." It has to cap the profits of the insurance companies, it has to make pills cheaper, it has to make sure that no unnecessary procedures are conducted, it has to make sure the pills actually work, and it has to promote life (as opposed to abortion and medical butchery) amongst the population. The US government is doing none of those things - not because government is inherently evil, but because the Americans have allowed a few Oligarchical creeps to take over Washington.

The Americans, being good gun lovers, should know that guns are not inherently evil, but merely powerful. Hence, if a gun emits a bullet and kills a man, the courts of law sue not the gun, but the one who pulled the trigger.

The Canadian health care system is not much better. The Canadian doctors' union is tremendously powerful, and the "socialized" system is one of crony-capitalism/corporate-socialism, since it channels taxpayers' money to "private sector" outfits. Big Pharma makes a killing, and the doctors' union is happy, but the Canadians are getting skinned alive, though not as badly as their southern neighbours. Canadians pay "only" about CND5,500 per annum per capita. (The Americans, about USD8,000.) The problems of 1) public funds inflating the costs by flowing into private hands; and 2) insufficient third-party regulation of the medical industry, are prominent in the Canadian medical system. Nevertheless, at least the Canadians pay less and are all insured.

The much touted March 2010 Obama Healthcare Bill totally failed to address the tremendous problems of the American healthcare machine. The bill failed to insure all Americans; it failed to curb the cost inflation; it failed to diminish the corporate influence on the system; it failed to correct the egregious foundational mistakes of the medical establishment; it was a disaster. Big Pharma and Big Insurance stock prices went up the week the bill was passed. As Lindsey Williams once said, the bill had nothing to do with health care - it was about control.

And so, America and the Western world have yet another stupendous problem at their hands. The Western medical care system is a parasite, which murders and robs its host.

10.7 The Demographic Collapse

The fertility debacle we can sum up as follows: the USA is shuffling along; Western Europe and Japan are in some trouble; and Eastern Europe is facing disaster.

I have taken the figures below from the World Bank's webpage. The fellows at the World Bank, in their kindness, have also provided us with a map of world fertility, in which infertile, dying nations manifest in sterile, whitish pink, and the growing, fertile nations are in bright angry red. The World Bank's source is the United Nations' (de-)Population Division."

The "stable" fertility rate is 2.1 - two children per woman, with the tenth woman bearing three. One for the woman, one for her husband, and a tenth of a child to account for early deaths.

America's fertility rate is a "stable" 2.1 . The only real population growth America experiences stems from immigration. To claim that America, on its vast, fertile continent, is overpopulated, is a stretch.

Canada's fertility rate is 1.7 . That is why the Canadians have been taking so many immigrants. Canada has plenty of room to grow in, and should not suffer its population to decline in the 21st century culture of death.

We remark again, that migration is not bad *per se*. The problem is that unassimilable immigration creates social tension, and that the emigration of the young and the bright emasculates emigrant nations.

In Western Europe, the situation is dire. The United Kingdom's fertility has recently risen slightly to edge near the stable rate - it went from 1.8 in 2006 to 2.0 in 2009. On the continent, things are worse.

France, with its historic demographic problems, hovers at the 2.0 level.

Germany has abandoned reality and life and has a fertility rate of 1.4 . This is compatible with the rates in Eastern Europe - except that Eastern Europe suffered bulldozing in the 1990s, while Germany remains one of the most prosperous and powerful nations on Earth. In 2006, Germany's fertility was even lower, at 1.3 . With the ongoing urbanization, entire Germany villages are closing shutters and becoming ghost towns.

The situation in Spain is equally dreadful. The Spaniards have a fertility rate of about 1.4 .

So does Italy - 1.4 .

Netherlands - 1.7-1.8; Belgium - 1.8-1.9; Austria - 1.4; Portugal - 1.3-1.4.

Scandinavia: Denmark - 1.8-1.9; Norway 1.9-2.0; Sweden - 1.9.

Japan is in demographic collapse - 1.3-1.4; China, with the one-child policy, has a fertility rate of 1.6. It is interesting how Japan, which does not have a one-child policy, has a fertility rate lower than China's. One could make the argument for both these East Asian societies, that their lands are overpopulated and could use a reduction of "burden" - but I would not waste my breath defending such a sickening proposition.

Eastern Europe, of all places, is definitely not "overpopulated." The vastness of Siberia awaits settlement. And yet, the fertility rates go as follows:

In Russia, the decade of semi-recovery has lifted the rate to about 1.5 .

The Ukraine, which is fairly densely populated, has a rate of 2.0 .

Belarus - 1.3-1.4; Poland - 1.3-1.4; Czech Republic - 1.4-1.5; Hungary - 1.3-1.4; Romania - 1.3-1.4; Bulgaria - 1.5-1.6; Serbia - 1.4; Croatia - 1.5; Greece - 1.4-1.5.

Two additional factors compound the demographic problem of Eastern Europe: First, the Eastern European fertility rates were even lower than the present ones during the 1990s. Second, Eastern Europe experienced a net migrant outflow during the course of the recent ill-fated era of globaloney. The Eastern European emigrants were middle aged and educated.

South America has a growing population, as does Africa.

10.7.1 Causes and Effects

What are the causes for the population decline?

There are three types of causes: shock causes, social causes, and physiological causes.

It is obvious that wars, famines, and plagues ravage human populations. The western world has experienced no major wars since 1945; certainly no famines; and no great plagues since the Spanish Flu of 1918.

As a caveat, one can regard the sugar-poisoning of the Western world as an induced famine.

The physiological cause of infertility is self-evident. With the decline in male sperm quality in the West - a consequence of the Oligarchical policy of mass poisoning - couples have hard times conceiving. Artificial insemination, and ultimately designer babies (perhaps of a hermaphroditic, "neo-human" variety), are the long-term goal.

On the social front, the problem lies in the rot of modern culture. Western culture, in this early 21st century, is a culture of Benthamite hedonism and Malthusian death.

The people, under a regiment of brainwashing, have mixed up their wants and needs. They want sex, though they need intimacy and children. They want entertainment to relieve the boredom, though they need learning and contemplation. They want snacks, though they need nutrition. They want stimuli, though they need tranquillity. They want drugs as painkillers or pastimes, though they need action to solve their problems and to kill their boredom. They want to "elect" leaders who will make things right, though they need to get their act together and stand up for themselves. They want "social contacts," though they need family and friends. They want credentials and diplomas, though they need learning. They want careers, money, and prestige, though they need meaningful work. Demoralized and sickened by such self-deception and self-destruction, the people want pills to make things right - though they need understanding - and perhaps, religion.

And thus, people choose not to have children, in order to have cheap sex and "careers." They choose infanticide and hedonism rather than responsibility and the pleasure of parenting. They choose to "save the planet" by living fast, dying young, and praising euthanasia and genocide ("Save the animals! Blow up a dam today!") - rather than by planting trees and inventing new sources of clean energy. They choose to entertain the hedonistic vogue of homosexuality, rather than to create families.

We may have been brainwashed - but we always had a choice! Therein the conundrum - manipulative Oligarchs there may be - but the people always had the final word - and they spoke too soon, and uttered nonsense.

There is more, of course. The takeover of the world's agriculture has destroyed the small farming community, which had defined the human race for six millennia, and has created, via urbanization, the megacity. The American suburbs are, somehow, both spacious and claustrophobic. But the denser cities are too tightly packed. It is hard to have too many children, when half your wages go to pay the rent of a one-bedroom apartment.

The removal of the women from the household struck another blow to the nations' ability to exist and survive. And for some reason, nobody asks the question: How come society could afford to leave its women in the household back in the old days, when the levels of technology, transport, and communications were so much lower than they are today? Nobody seems to notice - because people adapt far too easily, and have been brainwashed into thinking that every crackpot "new" idea, no matter how contradictory to the historical experience, represents "progress."

Next, what are the effects of demographic crisis?

To begin with, if there are not enough people to man the factories and live in the houses, the capital stock of the nation decays. In our time of fairly rapid technological progress, and mass offshoring, there may be nothing left to decay.

Another problem is that, historically and biologically, the young must take care of the old when the latter retire. When the old compose 10% of the population, and those of working age, 40%, there is nothing to worry about. But when the cohort of the aged constitutes one third of the population, and another third has to support both the old and the children, problems arise. Generational conflicts arise. One suspects that the Oligarchical elements would like to goad the young into legalizing euthanasia.

Such is the problem. Its solutions are self-evident.

Chapter 11

What Do We Do?

11.1 A Summary of the Problems We Face

In brief, 1) there exists a push for the enslavement and the "culling" of the human race; 2) the culprits are certain elements at the pinnacle of the world power structure; 3) historically, they have manipulated Britain and the United States - the two great powers of the last two centuries; 4) these folks operate via the various secret societies; 5) their outlook is hubristic, anti-human, anti-scientific, anti-technological, and frankly insane; 6) for the past century, they have engaged in massive social engineering; 7) as a consequence of their efforts, we have a society on the brink of collapse; 8) their key trump, perhaps, is their control of the world's money supply; 9) they are behind practically all the major events of the past century; 10) the moment of truth is nigh.

Our problems, in particular, include: 1) A world economic system on the brink of collapse; 2) the possibility of a thermonuclear World War III; 3) a thoroughly corrupt academic system; 4) a decrepit educational system; 5) a pervasive culture of death, manifested in mass abortions, declining birth rates, etc; 6) a dysfunctional medical system, which is killing people, and is approaching collapse; 7) an epidemic of "mental illness" of unheard of proportions; 8) a potential worldwide famine; 9) a corrupt mass-media; 10) a culture of mindless, anti-human hedonism; 11) a global outlook infested with pernicious, false, often outright evil belief systems; and so on.

11.2 Where Things Are Going

Unless serious people interfere and dismantle the Oligarchical machine, we are likely going to see developments along the following lines:

- **The Cashless Society** - ultimately, the Oligarchs want to eliminate cash. In a cashless society, they can monitor and tax every single non-barter economic transaction that takes place. They can do away with all pretences of currency, and switch to a full-blown credit-only system. If allowed to, they will forbid savings. One's money would last a week. One goes to work, gets his weekly credit boost, and loses what he does not spend. Those who transgress the rules are eliminated from the system and allowed to starve to save the planet.
The Peak Oilers have proposed exactly such a worldwide credit-currency system. With cash, one retains some form of control over one's money. One can stash cash in the Mattress Bank on Sunday and go out for a walk in the park - to enjoy the sun and smell the flowers and have a laugh or two. Without cash, one is at the mercy of the banks. That people are abandoning cash should be obvious to anyone who goes to the store in a "middle-class" neighbourhood anywhere in the world. People have learned to reflexively pay with credit- and debit-cards. The convenience is great, but convenience has its hidden costs.
- **Neo-Humans** - I omitted examining post-humanism in detail. The reader can study the issue

on his or her own. Bill Cooper and Alan Watt have both expressed the (studied) opinion that the Oligarchical end-goal is the creation of incubator hermaphrodites. From what I have read, their thesis is correct.

The ultimate aim of Darwinism always was the deliberate engineering of humans. That is clear from the works of both H.G. Wells and Aldous Huxley. I find it impossible to tell whether the top honchos truly believe in Darwinism, or are merely using the creed to mask their efforts. I suspect the former, but I respect their intelligence enough to have doubts. Whatever the case, they do want to try to play God and engineer "humans" in an effort to obtain immortality - for themselves, you understand. Certainly not for members of the "herd" like you and me. Next, there exists a perceptible trend toward feminizing the Western males and masculinizing the Western girls. This has been accomplished via both psychological and physiological avenues. For example, a pre-school in Sweden has recently banned any references to gender.¹

(Pravda.ru) The category of gender was canceled at one of Swedish kindergartens. The words "boy" and "girl" are no longer used there, while pronouns "he" and "she" were replaced with "it". Kindergarten teachers believe that they are successfully breaking the gender stereotypes so that the people of two sexes would not feel predominant towards each other. Experts say, though, that such seeming equality may lead to the genetic rebirth of the population and to the decline of human civilization. The bizarre mission is taking place in the Swedish preschool called "Egalia." In this kindergarten, pronouns 'han' (he) and 'hon' (she) were replaced with genderless 'hen'.

The conflation of the sexes is being accomplished in various ways. The traditional boundaries between "male" and "female" jobs are being annihilated. Women are encouraged to play such masculine sports as soccer.

The author has to admit to having played soccer with girls who were quite feminine, and quite agile to boot.

Nevertheless, the point holds.

On the physiological front,

(Globe-and-Mail) Back in the summer of 2001, a team of Canadian and U.S. researchers spiked a lake in Northwestern Ontario with traces of synthetic estrogen used in human birth control pills. They then repeated the unusual treatment for the next two years and sat back and watched what happened to minnows living in the lake.

The results were nothing short of frightening. Exposing fish to tiny doses of the active ingredient in the pill, amounts little more than a whiff of estrogen, started turning male fish into females. Instead of sperm, they started developing eggs. Instead of looking like males, they became indistinguishable from females. Within a year of exposure, the minnow population began to crash. Within a few years, the fish, which at one time teemed in the lake, had practically vanished.

...

More than a million women in Canada and more than 100 million worldwide are on the pill, making it one of the most commonly prescribed drugs. Women on the pill pass on some of the estrogen in their urine, from which it gets into surface waters.

...

It's not known what effect, if any, human exposure to estrogen in drinking water might have, although Dr. Kidd said it is an area that should be a research priority. Reproductive problems in human males, such as declining sperm counts and testicular cancer, have been rising in recent decades, and the causes are not known.

"Not known" indeed.

¹http://english.pravda.ru/society/stories/20-07-2011/118541-gender_equality-0/, Jan 18, 2012.

Finally, we do have posthumanist enthusiasts like Ray Kurzweil on the academic scene. To get another indication of where things are headed, take a look at Frenchman Michel Houellebecq's writings. Houellebecq (1956-) recently won the highly prestigious Prix Goncourt. The man's favorite themes are the terminal hedonism of Western society, and the coming race of neo-humans, which is to supplant the decaying morally and physically obsolete current version of humanity. He has written four-five titles *on these same two themes*. Thus, apart from being heinous in tone, Houellebecq's work is highly repetitive. Houellebecq has been rewriting the same story over and over for twenty years, adding lurid sexual imagery for shock value. From the purely technical perspective, Houellebecq's writing is of interest, because it does reflect the modern outlook, and because it does tackle interesting themes. Still, Houellebecq's writing is too ugly and too "post-modern" to qualify as true, lasting art. The larger point here, however, is that those in charge bestowed the Goncourt on Houellebecq in order to promote and spread his posthumanist ideas.

While I would not encourage the stereotype of the pretty housewife with her apron and dust-brush, I do think that the delineation between male and female should be clearly expressed in a healthy society. What such a delineation would entail is subject to further debate.

- **Virtual Reality** - Computer games and "personal electronics" (i.e. gadgetry) are moving toward virtual reality. Such a thing, if it arrives, will come in two forms. First, there will be a full-blown virtual reality of the type imagined by the science fiction writers - you put on a helmet and gloves, and off you go in the imaginary world. Second, we may see an imposition of a "virtual," information-overloaded world, upon the real one, via personal chip implants, glasses with electronic screens, various "apps" for the phones, and so on. Virtual reality would serve a dual function: first, it would offer wonderful new avenues for brainwashing and monitoring; and second, it would provide a type of Soma, a way to escape an ugly reality for prolonged periods of time.
- **Soma** - The attempts at producing a wonder-drug of the type imagined by Aldous Huxley will continue.
- **Cloud-Control of the Internet** - To control the Internet, I suspect that the Oligarchs will try to achieve the following: They will try to replace all personal computers with simple screens connected to a global grid, and will keep everything on controlled privately owned servers. That is, in a sense, the idea of the "cloud." Their excuses for implementing such a system will be the usual ones - convenience and security. For example, with fast enough Internet, it will be cheaper to play computer games on the "cloud" (such services already exist) for a monthly fee, than to play games on potentially expensive personal computers. Next, the head honchos will announce that to protect "intellectual property" and to "fight terrorism," they have to monitor the contents of all peoples' hard-drives. Right now it would seem that such a development is far in the future, but then, 20 years ago, few people had personal computers, the Internet did not exist in its present form, and the cell phones were expensive brick-like walkie-talkies. Things change fast these days.
- **The Chip** - From the perspective of a healthy Oligarch desirous of controlling society, nothing could be more wonderful than the mandatory chip. Have every person wear a chip at all times. Preferably, the chip should be implanted at birth; but a chipped national ID card would serve until the pro-implants brainwashing has done its job. Indeed, the biometrics ID cards have made their way into the Brave New English society at the time of this writing. The cards are spreading all over the globe. The British cards bear fingerprints, but as far as I know, mass chipped IDs are not yet a reality - thought the push toward them is ostensible, as a quick search on, say, YouTube, will verify. The "need" for RFID will be inculcated in the population via the usual techniques of playing on people's fears and offering convenience and fashion. For example, it will be (or rather, has

already been) explained that children will be safer with RFID. Such devices may be useful in locating runaways and accident victims, but any person serious enough to kidnap a child will be serious enough to remove its chip, via amputation if necessary. Gruesome, but true. Chips won't protect the children. Reforming society's current idiotic outlook will.

A new 9/11 type false-flag event, ostensibly organized by "domestic terrorists," would allow states to mandate the introduction of mass chipping for "security" purposes.

Another aspect of the global privation-of-privacy program is the expansion of biometric and mass surveillance programs. The goal appears to be the development of accurate biometric identification procedures, coupled with the installation of a global grid of CCTV cameras across the world's populated areas. Biometrics are advancing and can recognize gait as well as facial features. In an Oligarchically ideal situation, every person in the world will be trackable most of the time.

Other aspects of the surveillance society include online snooping and the collection of personal data from all possible sources. Facebook, grocery store customer cards, library cards, they track and record everything.

One standard argument for mass surveillance says "if you have nothing to hide, then you have nothing to complain about." That contradicts the principle of "innocent until proven guilty." Nobody should be allowed to meddle in one's affairs under false pretences or without an official warrant. This is what makes Facebook so sweet. People voluntarily divulge their intimate secrets on that mighty website, which consists, in the physical world, of a few dump-trucks' worth of computers, but which was valued in January 2011, in the imaginary world of finance, at something above \$80 billion. Ford and GM, at the same time, were valued at about \$55 billion each. Humanity had existed sans ennui before Facebook reamed popularity around 2007, and there is little Facebook does that one can not accomplish via email - and yet the company is worth more than Ford and GM, which were major worldwide industrial giants for the better part of the 20th century. I leave it to the reader to decipher the logic behind this state of affairs.

- **Mass Migration** - At some point, the Oligarchs intend to slam shut the gates, and imprison people in urban slums (i.e. *Agenda 21*). But before this moment of truth arrives, the effort will be made to "globalize" the world by mixing people of all creeds and races into one beautiful multicultural stew. Cultural distinctions will have to make way to mass Hollywoodization. A primal soup worthy of Darwin himself is to emerge.

The inevitable "multicultural" misunderstandings will serve many purposes. They will provide an invaluable divide-and-conquer opening for the politically astute. They will allow the Oligarchs to install brainwashing "tolerance" campaigns. They will allow the restriction of "free speech" via the censure of "political correctness." Which raises the next point:

- **Mass Censorship** - Unofficial censorship exists and always has existed in the United States. Those who own and control the media exercise censorship - that is a given. That is censorship from the so-called "right." From the so-called "socialist left," we have the censorship of "political correctness." Political correctness is double-speak and the criminalization of thoughts. If one complains in regard to sensitive social issues, one loses access to the mainstream of publicised discussion. That such behavior is a form precisely of "discrimination" does not seem to register.

Furthermore, some of the politically correct terms make no sense at all. Take "African American." One can easily find examples of white South African immigrants to America who have tried to take advantage of (say) minority scholarships for "African Americans." Since they are not black, such people receive a great indignant boot for their efforts. Why so? Are they not African? Are they not American? But of course, "African American" means Black. It is now considered inappropriate to label those of better tan "Black," as if being Black is somehow shameful. "African American" is an ungainly euphemism at best, and an insult to people's intelligence at worst. If the touchy-feely pseudo-liberals really cared about the Blacks, they

would have resisted the imprisonment of Black America.

Or take "Native American." This means "American Indian," which is another absurdity. Now, any person born and raised in the United States is a "native American." Whether the person's relatives arrived to America ten years, a century, or God knows how many millennia ago, is another point entirely. The term "Native American" is an insult to the English language and to those unfortunate enough to have been herded into "reserves."

Nor could one comprehend the logic behind the term "Caucasian." Evidently, some historian at some time decided that the "white" people came from the Caucasus mountains. That is all fine and dandy, but, strictly speaking, a Caucasian should be a "native" Georgian or Azerbaijani. A white person from Spain is not Caucasian, but Spanish (or Iberian). Then there are the Basques, who are another issue entirely.

Political correctness is a combination of "new-speak," and the criminalization of "political incorrectness" is the introduction of thought crime.

Which raises another point - where does a society draw the line with "free speech"? For example, should active bonafide Nazis have the "right" to propagandise and proselytize? One could argue that people dumb enough to listen to Nazis are too stupid to cause much trouble - but then, we have the case of 1930s Germany. So let us ban pro-Nazism. Supposing Nazism is taboo in the United States, then why were people in the West allowed to publish swaths of anti-Muslim literature in the 1990s and 2000s? How is hateful anti-Muslim literature any different from the Nazi anti-Jewish literature of the 1930s? Sure, there are a few crazed maniacs among the Muslims - and so what? Every society has its nutcases, and the Westerners even decided to put some of their worst lunatics in charge of the Western governments. Does that mean Americans are evil? Does the fact that America destroyed Iraq without a valid *casus belli* make Americans evil? Then why the anti-Muslim propaganda? But of course, to ask the question is to answer it.

One notable example of the blatant hypocrisy and double-standard of Western society can be found in the recent controversy regarding the cartoons bearing the image of the prophet Muhammad. Suppose someone publishes a caricature of the Jewish stereotype - beady eyes, long nose, etc. In the eyes of the media, the person would become a pariah, an anti-Semite, and a Nazi overnight (See Helen Thomas's fate.). And yet the authors of the Muhammad cartoons became celebrities and champions of "free speech." What a farce!

The Muhammad cartoons were direct insults at all Muslims, and by association, at all Arabs. "Free speech" had nothing to do with that particular farce. And what a farce it was! Worthy of a John Kennedy Toole! Proto-Nazis and "atheistic" (or just anti-Muslim) bigots everywhere swarmed in defence of "free (hate-)speech." Enraged Muslims foolishly reacted to the provocation with useless violence. The media had a field day.

In the real world, if went up to someone, told him stuff about his mother, and went home with a few broken teeth and a black eye, you received what you bargained for. The Muslims were right to be angry, and the provocateurs did commit semi-criminal smearing. From the purely strategic political viewpoint, however, the Muslims should have responded with accusations of hypocrisy, and absolutely no violence under any circumstances. No need to add fuel to the fire. But then, that was the whole point.

Fortunately, the Americans still possess an impressive degree of Free Speech. They should preserve this treasure, but not to waste it on absurd slander and cruel provocation.

And speak of Nazis, we should remember that the New Age cult is, to a large degree, Nazi.

- **Toward Euthanasia** - As Bill Gates accurately explained, to decrease a population, one must decrease birth rates or increase death rates. Euthanasia can serve to accomplish the latter. The feelers have been made (Switzerland), the propaganda base has been established (e.g. *Million Dollar Baby* (2004)), and the push toward euthanasia gathers steam. With the breakdown of the family, old people in the West find their way to "retirement homes," which are, really, euthanasia hotels. The old are put there to die. Their children literally do not have the time

(and often, the desire) to care for them.

But in the long run, the goal, most likely, is to enhance the existing culture of death to the point where euthanasia becomes acceptable, and - why not? - fashionable.

Imagine a billboard bearing the following message: "Tired of slings and arrows of outrageous fortune? Dreaming a sleeping the big sleep? Eager to save the planet? Bored of grandpa? Visit the euthanasia clinic in your neighbourhood! (All credit cards accepted.)"

Can they do it? Given a society in economic and cultural collapse, and a proper Gaian brain-washing ("Become one with Mother Earth! You will be reborn as a squirrel or a bunny rabbit!" "Oh, boy! Them bunny rabbits sure are great lovers! Jim, where's the nearest suicide booth?"), what is there to stop them?

- **The Destruction of the Family** - The Oligarchs managed to crush the Western "extended" family during the 20th century, and have now commenced to work on the dismantling of the "nuclear" family. They want, most likely, to: 1) ban marriage, and 2) take the children away from the parents. We have already detailed the various fronts of the war against the family: the promotion of sexual hedonism, the promotion of man-hatred on the part of women via "radical feminism," the promotion of homosexuality, etc. In the long run, should marriage rates decline to a sufficiently low level, perhaps it will be announced that marriage is a form of "discrimination" against the single majority, and also an obsolescent tradition of the Cowardly Old World.

In regard to the children, the Oligarchs will likely attempt to 1) install longer school hours, 2) intensify cross-generational conflicts in the age of constant "change," and 3) try to keep parents away from their children however possible - via longer working hours, via forced hospitalizations, via forcing people to roam the world in search of work, etc.

- **The Emergence of Technocracy** - "Technocrats" will try to gain power all over the world. Late 2011 saw the installation of Papademos (Boston Fed) in Greece, and Mario Monti (Goldman Sachs, Bilderberg) in Italy. "Technocrats" means New World Order enthusiasts, proto-fascists, secret society members, and other such types.

The long-term goal is the inauguration of a global technocratic dictatorship. Most likely, the argument for technocracy will go along the classic lines of "Things are bad because of you stupid hordes (herds) of morons, but luckily, we, the 'technocrats,' are able and willing to take power and fix the mess for you." Of course, the technocrats were the ones to cause the entire debacle to begin with. But those are minor details. And the technocrats have learned from their mistakes, anyway - just like they learned from their mistakes the previous ten times they screwed up. What we need is gonzo technocratic action, and the sooner the better.

- **False-Flag Events?** - Because of the controversy surrounding 9/11, the Oligarchs have been reluctant to attempt new false-flag attacks (though they did do London; what happened in Spain is less clear). Should their plans fail to proceed according to schedule, however, they will likely resort to new and improved Pearl Harbors. Obviously, they may try to explode a nuclear payload, and blame it on the Iranians, or on the North Koreans, or on the Russians or on God knows whom.

Should such an event occur, the serious elements in the US military and intelligence circles have the moral duty to instigate an instant coup and to conduct a thorough investigation of the affair. No more 9/11 Commissions and Warren Reports!

- **War?** - If their plans go awry, the Oligarchs will also try to resort to their other classic contingency tactic - the provocation of war. At the time of this writing in January 2012, the drums of war are beating in the vicinity of Iran. The United States have taken diplomatic moves against Iran, which, were sides to switch, Washington would have regarded as acts of war against itself. Now, a war against Iran may involve nuclear warheads. As in the scenario above, should the White House, or anyone within the Pentagon, attempt to use nuclear weapons, the serious

generals have to mutiny, push a coup, and declare the current government clinically insane. Nuclear weapons are clinically insane. Nuclear weapons are for having, not for using. Anyone who wants to use nuclear weapons is mad and must vacate his office, if necessary under appropriate escort.

Coups and revolutions are generally a bad idea, but the choice between thermonuclear war and revolution is a non-choice. Should even one nuke fly in the Middle East, relations between the Sino-Russian alignment, and the Anglo-American crowd, will rapidly deteriorate. Such a turn of events should, and must, be prevented.

- **Induced Mass Epidemic?** - The Malthusians must have toyed with the idea of inducing a mass epidemic. The proper way to accomplish such a feat would be via a bait&switch type operation. The plan, one suspects, is as follows: The WHO declares a pandemic alert. The world governments institute compulsory vaccination. The Oligarchs, in control the pharmaceutical manufacturers, make sure to poison some vaccines with deadly or sterilizing agents. The "pandemic" gets the blame for all the problems. The SARS, "bird," and "swine" flu scares were, more likely than not, practice runs. There are books written on the subject. People must vigorously oppose compulsory vaccination.
- **Induced Mass Starvation** - As we mentioned in Chapter 10, starvation is the best way to kill billions of people. If the Oligarchs manage to damage the world supply networks and agricultural production centers to a sufficient degree, mass starvation will occur. Moreover, there is a grave difference between local famines and a potential worldwide famine. Fellow nations can always curb any local famine. But should the entire world go hungry, succour will have to come in the hands of Jesus or the aliens. Are you holding your breath?
- **A False Messiah?** - The "Maitreya" babbling of the New Age cult raises interesting possibilities. What if the Oligarchs have decided to stage a grand hoax by giving a Messiah to the world? All major religions have patiently waited for their messiahs for centuries upon centuries. What if, to destroy the old religions, the Oligarchs try to manufacture such a Messiah? After all, if they could create a synthetic entity such as Obama, could they not, in a time of artificial crises, stage the ultimate con? Curiously, such a Messiah would be the prophesied Antichrist of the Bible. This is not to say that we should accept the Bible as literal truth, but rather that clever people can try to fulfil existing prophesies in order to entrance the gullible. After all, what is the difference between a prophecy and a plan? To account for the Antichrist prophesy, the Oligarchs may attempt a double bluff - two Messiahs for the price of one! I must admit that this particular idea is a bit far-fetched.
- **Fake Space Threat?** - As Wernher Von Braun's secretary Carol Rosin explained, when the specious global "threats" of "terrorism" and "global warming" run their courses, the Oligarchs may try to invent an imaginary interstellar menace - either meteorites or aliens. Suppose a few top scientists announce that in their opinion, the Solar System has entered a dangerous galactic meteorite field. The UN backs their findings. In light of AGW, what do you think would happen? Or imagine that they make "disclosures" regarding Eisenhower's supposed encounters with space aliens. Who knows what scams those lunatics may undertake? Having managed to invent the Soviet, terrorist, and global warming threats, the Oligarchs deserve some credit.
- **Worldwide Hyperinflation** - If the world manufactured derivative debt fails to meet an eraser, and the central banks keep pumping funny-money, a hyperinflationary explosion will occur. Those holding tangible commodities will be the winners.

- **Economic Collapse** - Barring swift and decisive worldwide - or at least American or European - economic reform (including debt reductions, the reintroduction of Glass-Steagall, Tobin Tax, end of GATT, nationalization of central banks, etc), there will be a terrible new wave of global economic meltdown.
- **And so on** - The reader can extrapolate on the given themes.

11.3 So What Do We Do?

When I discuss the issues described in this book with others, they invariably say: "There is nothing I can do, so why should I care?" Some even say: "I am too busy to think about the plan to decrease the world population."

These are problematic points of view. How can one be too busy to think about issues of life and death? One's own life at death? And furthermore, discussing our problems already constitutes "doing" something extremely useful. How can you solve a problem without thinking about it? The ostrich head-in-the-sand mentality is one of the most serious problems we face. I have the impression that people frankly do not care. They do not really care if they live or die. It does not matter to them if the world ends. After all, if things deteriorate rapidly enough, one can always commit suicide! Forget the human race, forget progeny, forget fighting - there is an easy way out! I know people think that way, partly from trying to pay attention to what people say, and partly from paying attention to my own thoughts.

With those reluctant to listen, one must make a decision. If the interlocutor responds to at least some strands of conversation, or exhibits psychological windows to reality (Christian beliefs, a strong moral sense, doubt of authority, interest in history, etc), one should pursue contact with the aim of, as they say, waking the person up. But if the other person shows absolutely no interest in serious subjects, there is little to be done.

The last point is critical. If the information in this book was news to you, you will try to discuss the various issues with your friends and relatives. To your horror, many of them will respond negatively. Avoid antagonizing those who do not at all listen. Keep working on those who show interest. Conduct your own research so that you can furnish convincing arguments. Post properly-researched pieces online.

But let us get to the crux of the subject.

11.4 General Principles

- **The Goal** - To orient ourselves, we need to establish a general goal or set of goals. In the broadest sense, I propose the following: 1) as a short-term goal, we must halt the current world crisis; 2) and as a long-term goal, we should aim to get humanity back on track. Stopping the crisis entails the following: 1) There must be no world famine. Efforts must be made to increase food production as quickly as possible. 2) There must be no World War III. The Oligarchs must be prevented from attacking Iran, and their indirect attacks on Pakistan, Russia, and China must be curtailed. 3) We must lift the world economic depression. That involves debt moratoriums, the abolition of economic liberalism, the nationalization of the power of producing credit, or at least Tobin and Glass-Steagall to begin with. 4) We must stop the chemical poisoning of humanity. Install taxes on corn syrup. Ban psycho-pharmaceutical-psychiatry. Ban mandatory vaccination. Ban fluoridation. Regulate the medical establishment. Kill the international drug trade. Promote better nutrition. To get humanity back on track, people should: 1) Destroy the various pernicious ideologies:

Communism, free-marketeering, Darwinism, Malthusianism, eugenics, Global Warmery, New Agery, post-humanism, Benthamite consumerism, etc - send all down the drain. 2) End the culture of death and promote a culture of life. 3) Reform the decrepit academic world. There must be less specialization, less accreditation, and more serious thinking on *relevant problems*. 4) Reform world education. Compulsory education should be abolished or at least massively curtailed (3-4 years of compulsory education for the purposes of creating social bonds may be a reasonable idea - though there should be better ways of forging such bonds). Behaviorist "educational" (i.e. animal training) techniques must go down the trash chute. Classical education should be promoted. The Internet can become a new Alexandrian Library. 5) Humanity should have some purpose. The false dichotomy of "Communism" vs "Capitalism" forces people to choose between the human-hive and the "existentialist" (really nihilist) Benthamite hedonistic wage-slave society. Both creeds stem from philosophical materialism and positivism. Neither is any good. The old Christian ideal of living a moral life in the service of others and of God is a serviceable foundation for a society. To that, we can add some long-term massive project, just so that people have something to look forward to and to work on. Interplanetary colonization is the obvious candidate. An oceanic colonization on Earth is also a viable option. Deep oceanic exploration could be interesting. A Manhattan Project-type effort toward the development of cheap energy sources is very necessary. Physicists can try to construct time machines and teleportation devices. Why not?

And when I say "we can add," I mean, have a referendum and let the people choose what they want to do.

- **Against Optimism and Pessimism** - In pursuing those goals, we must avoid unnecessary forays into either pessimism or optimism. Excessive pessimism leads to defeatism, lack of initiative, and inaction. Excessive optimism leads to recklessness and foolhardiness. Of the two, optimism is by far preferable. But I say - drop both, and focus on your efforts. The logic here is not that of "the important thing is to try." Trying implies having some choice in the matter. We do not have a choice! (Suicide does not count as an option.) We are at war; battle is upon us; our backs are to the wall; and so we resist now and think later. Our prospects of success and failure are of no consequence. Work and win; and we will sort things out afterwards.

Though it should be allowed that resistance can be indirect, i.e. minding one's own business without thinking about any "Oligarchs" may be perfectly fine if the "business" is a sensible one.

- **Against Vengeance** - It is important to realize that dismantling the Oligarchs *is not a goal in itself*. It is merely a means. Removing the Oligarchs from power is a necessary, but not sufficient, step toward realizing our goals. Getting rid of the New World Order crowd will not magically fix the economy, end the culture of death, or improve the health of the population. It will merely make possible the adoption of solutions to the various given problems. Moreover, exacting vengeance from the Oligarchs, while pleasant in contemplation, is not a necessary condition for victory. If possible, they should be tried for crimes against humanity. If not possible, let them spend their lives in luxury on some Elba or St Helena, or even in Paris or Rome. If they agree to peacefully surrender power on the condition of pardon, pardon them. It must be understood that a trapped animal is a desperate animal, and our Oligarchical friends may have their fingers on the nuclear button.

There is a distinction between retaliation and vengeance. The strong retaliate. The weak avenge. The principle "an eye for two, a tooth for a jaw" is the proper way to fight bullies; but then, few bullies are stupid enough to bother the strong.

Whatever happens, the idea of a Second Nuremberg is perfectly acceptable.

- **"If you can't join them, beat them."** (Ferdinand Demara?) - There are wiseguys who advertise themselves to the New World Order. Now, the New World Order is the type of club

which does not take advertisement. They want to kill people. They think they have to. There is no reasoning with them. There is no joining them. So if you can't join them - then beat them.

- **Passivity Useless** - A decade or two ago it was still possible to just ignore the NWO and hope it would go away. Since 2001, and particularly since 2008, we do not have the option to not act. Time is running out. The situation is one of life and death. Inaction means death.
- **Against Martyrdom** - One persistent theme in the history of popular revolts and movements is the popular leaders' aptitude in getting killed. Huey Long got killed, JFK got killed, MLK got killed, RFK got killed, Bill Cooper got killed, everybody got killed. Bill Cooper in particular died in a very unnecessary way. That they had him in their sights is clear, and so he should have been cagier in his behavior. But then, Bill was a no-nonsense man - which is why he was so loved.

Nevertheless, it is a truism that in our world, the living are more useful than the dead. We have enough martyrs.

Militia members should be particularly careful when (if?) all hell breaks loose. My impression is that militias are like nuclear weapons - they are for having, not for using. In a total collapse, militias will be useful. In a slow-motion, police state collapse, the army will make short work of any militias. People should avoid getting uselessly killed in the latter case.

And in general, let us have less bravado and more common sense.

- **Against Messiahs** - As we discussed earlier, leadership entails an intrinsic conundrum. Potent leaders can accomplish miracles, but one bullet can kill a potent leader and reduce a movement to a shambles. Strong leaders should be supported, but efforts should be made toward the provision for the contingency of their deaths. Moreover, people must learn from the Obama debacle. The Oligarchs will continue to deliver their own fake messiahs. Those must be identified and publicly vilified. We must judge people by their action, not their rhetoric.
- **Against "Holier Than Thou," But For Morality** - We must argue from a logical as well as from a moral perspective. I stress that before engaging in the research presented here, I was quite heavily brainwashed, just like everybody else. That I managed to overcome the indoctrination to some degree was a matter of, among everything else, a great deal of fortune. Free will, yes; effort, yes; but also plain luck. So I must apologize to anyone whom I may have insulted inadvertently.

At the same time, I take the view that there are such things as Good and Evil, and that one must take a strong moral position on certain issues. Thus, I can understand war in the context of power. The United States was strong, and took over Iraq, which was weak. Fine. Disgusting, but understandable. But I can not excuse the hypocrisy in claiming that wars of that type help any large groups of people. The war in Iraq was bad for the Americans and it was awful for the Iraqis. The 2011 war in Libya was revolting beyond belief. People like Amy Goodman shamed and prostituted themselves in an unprecedented manner.

I also can not accept the arrogance of the medical-psychiatric community. Those people have the absolute imperative to think and to check if their actions do not actually harm their "patients." And they have failed. The psychiatric drugs are obviously toxic. A great deal of literature exists on the subject. And yet they feed them to children, to the defenceless, to the weak!

One's attitude in criticising such behavior is not "holier than though," bur rather, "are you mad?"

- **Beware Depression** - I know from experience that upon beginning to understand the true state of world affairs, many people collapse psychologically. If that happens to you, make the effort to resist the onslaught of depression. Remember that the dark spell *will* lift. The world will appear bleak and you will go through episodes of self-hatred. Do not succumb! Wait it

out. Avoid hard drugs, and be sparing with the booze and the dope. Allow those close to you to help if they can, but keep them away if they react unfavorably. Wait it out. The monster will go away.

- **Humor Is Good** - We face gruesome problems. Try to approach them analytically and satirically. It is impossible to avoid emotional involvement. Anger has its uses, but you must not let it guide your actions. Humor is a potent weapon. Crack wise, smile with the corner of your mouth, and shoot at everything in sight. Counter attempts at arguments from authority with broadsides of jokes. But be careful! Be sure to indicate that you are not a clown. The humor is there to lighten the tone; but the issues we must discuss are grave in the extreme.
- **In Defence of Christianity** - Whether we "believe in God" or not, we should defend (true) Christianity. This is not a matter of preferring this or that, but a matter of doctrine. True Christianity is for the brotherhood of men; for the concept of man in the image of God; for the sanctity of life; for the notion of the good God; for the use of reason in an effort to understand God; for the priority of morality over greed; against usury; and so on. Any belief system constructed upon similar doctrines should be defended. This goes beyond personal preferences. I am unconcerned with the joys or damnations of Buddhism, or "Wicca" (witchcraft), or Scientology, or any other religion. If a religion espouses reasonable doctrines, I say support it - with the proviso that "support" is not the same as "adherence." Christianity says all the right things, and so I am for it. Belief in God is beyond the point. The true Christian is not the one claiming to be a Christian, but the one who lives according to Christian dogma. Note that we must distinguish between Christianity and its Churches. The Catholic Church has become corrupt, and should be regarded with suspicion. True Catholics may have to enforce a schism at some point. That is their own business. I feel that the pious cardinals should do their utmost to elect a true Pope, and the Church should retrench and start blasting secular humanism, Darwinism, Communism, abortionism, and the other such creeds, along with their promoters. Anathemize, excommunicate, and attack on all fronts! But then, let the Catholics figure this one out.
- **Know Your Enemy** - It is tough enough making people realize that we are in a war. Assuming one understands the situation, one must prepare to wage war. And to do that, as the ancients knew, one must begin with two basic questions: What forces have I, and forces has the enemy?
Who are the Oligarchs, anyway? I will not risk misidentifying specific people. The reader can make a few informed guesses on the basis of the current work. To name names, we need to conduct heavy biographical research, and we need access to secret documents.
For practical purposes, the Oligarchs are the Anglo-American top honchos, and their allies, notably certain ostensibly "Jewish" interests. I find it impossible to tell whether the Oligarchical machine is heterogeneous, or ruled by a tiny invisible clique at the top. I would presume the former.
The power of the Oligarchy is the power of deception, dissimulation, and make-believe. They rule, as Jim Marrs put it, "by secrecy." So, to combat them, one must figure out their tricks, and devise counter-stratagems. Those can be devastatingly simple. For example, to counter school indoctrination, opt for home school. And so on.
- **Know Thyself** - (Alan Watt has been vocal on this point.) To wage war, one must know oneself. One must know one's strengths and weaknesses. One must know the source of one's beliefs. I found out, in the space of a few years, that most of what I thought I knew was wrong. My morality had been more or less reasonable (and I'm no angel), not because, but rather despite, the beliefs that had been inculcated in my mind. Many ideas that I considered my own had been carefully planted in my head, mostly via television and schooling. So I must ask, dear reader, with pity, horror, and respect; what of you?

Given these principles, what next?

11.5 The Wizards of Oz and Exponential Growth

For simplicity, one can adopt the following categorization of society - the masses (both blue and white collar), the professionals (doctors, lawyers, academics, etc), and the rich (small rich and big rich). We can implement other, overlapping, categories - e.g. children, adults, aged; men and women; thinking and unthinking; etc. Let us use those in stride.

Now, one's ability to combat the Oligarchical disease varies according to one's social status. That is understood. Those members of the masses affected by defeatism despair of their own political impotence and proclaim that there is nothing to be done.

I disagree.

Consider **the principle of the Wizard of Oz**. The Wizard was an old clown in a pair of pajamas, who governed an entire society via elementary scams. Dorothy and her pals (Scarecrow represented the farmers; Tinman represented the industrial workers; Lion represented the decent politicians) ended the scam by pulling the curtain, which hid the Wizard from the public. The Platonic Cave metaphor applies here - to those in the know, the Wizard was a joker behind a screen. To the ignorant, the Wizard was a great terrible shadow.

So why don't we pull down the curtain of the Wizards of Oz and expose them for the frauds they are? Who are those guys, anyway? They are flesh and blood, warts and phlegm, decrepit creeps, ghouls, and vampire bats. They can only do what they do because people *obey their orders reflexively*. Those men do not have real power of the type, say, Superman the imaginary character has. They have the power of suggestion, brainwashing, and dissimulation. The Oligarchs have power, because the people think that the Oligarchs have power. They do and they don't.

To see the idea, consider a piece-of-paper IOU. If society believes that the IOU must be respected, the piece of paper can buy you real wealth. With your magical piece of paper, you can get a dozen eggs, three pieces of bread, a motorcycle, fifteen lawnmowers, and, depending on the age you live in, perhaps a slave or two (domestic servants?). But suppose that society suddenly decides that your piece of paper is worthless. All of sudden all you have is a piece of paper. If you also find a pencil, you can have some fun and draw yourself a picture. But that is about it, as far as the your piece of paper is concerned.

And that is how hidden power works. Rather than real power, it relies on the strength of *mistaken* belief. The difference between real power and fake power is as follows: Germany in 1914 had real power - an army, an industry, an educated population. That is true strength. Huey Long had real power - he could get up on a stump and rouse the population by not only making promises, but also by fulfilling promises. That is strength. For better or for worse, bullets can destroy the lone focal nodes of concentrations of strength.

The historical British strength, for example, was of a different type. The British power lay in hypocrisy and fraud. The British could get the other nations to war against each other, and the British could exercise disproportionate influence in the world by controlling certain key areas of worldwide organization (notably maritime trade). This type of power is both greater and lesser than ordinary material power. With the might of trickery, the British in the 1910s managed to destroy both Germany and Russia - but had their opponents awoken to the deceit, and allied, the British Oligarchs would have been in trouble.

And what of the Oligarchs? They manipulate the world from behind the shadows, via their foundations, banks, and propaganda agencies. Close the foundations, nationalize the banks, regulate the propaganda outfits (some trust-busting should suffice), and the Oligarchs have nothing. Put them in the spotlight, pour a bucket of water on their heads, and they will melt like the Wicked Witches of Oz.

The problem in the old days was that 1) it was hard to get the low-down on the Oligarchical machine, and 2) it was hard to publicise one's own research.

Today, however, we have the Internet - and that means instant communication and access to the world's rare books. Both major impediments are gone. We can act.

They can and will try to regulate the Internet; but even in its most limited and controlled form, the Internet will allow instant communication, and will permit the rapid spread of ideas and information.

Which brings up the notion of **exponential growth**. Now, the standard term for understanding the global scam is "waking up." Those who have perceived the problem and seen the Truth have "woken up." Suppose each person who has woken up awakens a fellow slumberer in turn. That gives us linear growth - the first five people recruit five others, who awaken five more, and so on. The number of Platonic souls who have seen the Sun goes 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, etc.

The moment the average number of recruits per person rises above one, we obtain exponential growth. Suppose every awakened person wakes up two of his fellows. The first five wake up ten others. Those ten awaken twenty. The total number of, shall we say, Truth-seekers, rises as follows: 5, 10, 20, 40, 80, etc. That is exponential growth!

What do you think will happen when 20% of the educated, influential population - or of the entire population - knows the score?

And therein lies the power of Truth. Truth will not halt tanks, but it can pull the curtain, behind which covers the Oligarchical cockroach.

It follows that discussion and research, in themselves, comprise powerful weapons. Research, and you will 1) awaken yourself, and 2) acquire an arsenal of convincing arguments for the arousal of others. Discuss your findings, and you feed the exponential growth. Both research and discussion are available to all. Everyone can contribute.

Moreover, research and discussion are fun. We watch all these movies, play all these computer games, waste our time in so many silly ways. What are the movies and the television shows, but fancy stories? And what greater repository of stories exists, than History? What greater drama, than the Game of Thrones? What greater tragedy, than the World Wars? What greater comedy, than the antics of Ferdinand Demara, or the wisecracks of Huey Long? But the difference is, that History is real, and Hollywood's pabulum is fake.

Then there is the pleasure of conversation and discovery. Now, amusing as the topics of sex and slander are, have we not chewed both to death? Let people try to understand the real troubles that they face. Let them read, think, and discuss, rather than sagely repeat the one-liners gleaned from television. Sip whiskey and admire the intricacies of the Kinsey scam with a friend. Make toasts every time you see the name "Rockefeller."

Let us have some good clean fun, for crying out loud!

And so, everyone can resist the Oligarchs, and resisting them is pleasure - the monumental pleasure of discovery and thought.

Thus, members of the underclass have two main weapons of resistance - education and organization. Education requires almost no material resources. Only effort and time. Unfortunately, the wage-slavery system drains people's energy and exhausts their time. Nevertheless, if we have time for television and cinema, we have time for research.

Organization requires more, including some money. In particular, to organize, one needs a sense of community. For better and for worse, I have lived in five cities in four countries on three continents in the last fifteen years. I have gone through the educational systems of five nations, three of them great powers. On the positive side, I obtained a breadth of outlook. On the negative side, my sense

of community has been annihilated. I feel comfortable by myself, and have a circle of friends, but I find it hard to connect with my neighbours. For that matter, I hardly even bother to talk to them, knowing that I will be somewhere else in a few years, anyway.

Those who have spent their lives in one country, or better yet, in one city, are in an entirely different situation. They have connections and they have community. They can go out and organize - lectures, co-ops, research and debate circles, community surveillance groups, etc. That they can do, and that they should do. Churchgoers in particular can use their churches as focal centers for organization.

In organizing, people should follow the following two general principles: first, the higher up you go, the more corrupt and remote power will be. Unless you have connections or wealth, forget the federal government. Try to land local or state offices. Then read all the books regarding your office, find all loopholes, and exercise as much power as possible to curb the efforts of the Oligarchs.

Second, as Ferdinand Demara the Great Impostor explained, "expand into the vacuum." When you land a post, do not fight for influence with the older hands. They will beat you. Rather, create your own influence by inventing new committees and making a nuisance of yourself all over the place. That is the way to go.

The last point should remind people that it is always better to create your own job than to wait for someone to give you a job. If you create your own job, nobody will be able to replace you. How hard could it be?

The professionals face a tough conundrum. On the one hand, they possess certain levels of prestige and visibility. On the other hand, they face censure. Any professional who transgresses the boundaries of the mainstream outlook will be purged. Everybody who has bothered to research the situation knows that. "Academic freedom" is a farce.

And so, professionals have to toe the line. They should try to carefully approach their more open-minded fellows, but only at the personal level. Outbursts such as that of Andrew Wakefield have to happen once in a while, but their instigators must make sure that the net benefit outweighs the net damage. I.e., one must create some noise before going down. Those professionals who enter the meat-grinder must spend their ammunition wisely. Falling bravely but quietly in defence of one's principles is melodramatic, but useless. Either keep quiet and work behind the scenes, or go down screaming and flailing when they come to get you.

In principle, it would be optimal if an entire department in a major university blasts a certain pernicious creed. If the History Department of UCLA collectively proclaims that history can only be understood through the prism of secret societies, we are in business. If the heads of the Russian Academy lambast Darwinism, the world will take note. If a powerful organization of lawyers decides to go after Wall Street, the gesture will create an impression. If sufficiently many doctors protest against compulsory vaccination, others will look into the subject.

Unity is strength. It is relatively easy to isolate and destroy a single person. It is very hard to destroy a group. This is a fundamental principle of warfare - "Blitzkrieg" amounted to penetrating the enemy lines and breaking up the enemy formation, in order to isolate and surround discrete enemy units. The symbol of the fascis has been around forever. It is easy to break a single stick in two, but hard to break a bundle of sticks.

Hence, professionals should try to recruit as many of their fellows as possible, but carefully. Professionals have some major problems: 1) their brainwashing has been thorough; 2) they have much to lose by going against the grain; and 3) the silly accreditations bestow arrogance. Hence, one must operate extremely carefully amongst professionals. The three factors also make professionals susceptible to recruitment from above, as the experience of the Illuminati suggests. Given to choose between "joining them" and "beating them," most professionals will opt for the former. At the same time, most professionals tend to consider themselves moral people, and may respond favorably to arguments, which go along the lines of morality.

Finally, we have the rich. The small-time rich have much to lose in a New World Order. The relatively opulent have more to lose. The richest consider themselves invulnerable, and, to a degree, compose the New World Order crowd.

The problem with rich people is that they tend to be clannish and greedy, and that they tend to allow their clannish instincts and their rapacity to overcome their moral instincts. Now, a society can have an aristocracy of any type, as long as the aristocracy fulfils its duties - which comprise, in general terms, the honorable government of society. Let the rich keep their money and their power - as long as they make sure that the poor have food, housing, education, and something good to live for. Only in fulfilling these duties do the rich obtain the "right" to their possessions! Soon after an aristocracy foregoes its *raison d'être*, it loses its legitimacy.

Moreover, the rich of our time have purely selfish reasons to oppose the New World Order. An economic collapse would wipe many millions of sweet dollars. What use money, when you can buy nothing with it? So let the rich beware, and defend themselves along with the larger society.

Because of their resources, the rich can organize and propagandise far more efficiently than the other elements of the population. For example, whereas the professional will keep quiet for fear of getting fired, the rich person can go out and harangue at leisure. The rich can create their own media outlets, they can fund friendly outfits, they can do plenty. Ralph Nader made exactly this point recently, with his *Only the Super-Rich Can Save Us!* (2009). Unfortunately, Ralph asked the foxes to guard the henhouse - because the "super-rich" are, by and large, from what one can see, the Oligarchs.

The lesser rich, on the other hand, should organize against the New World Order - because of moral duty, and for self-preservation.

Politicians as a class fall somewhere between the rich and the professionals. The politicians have some power and some freedom of action, but they are too dependant on the rich (and the Oligarchs) for funds and for publicity. Nevertheless, those few politicians who touch sensitive issues tend to produce ripple effects.

We need more real populists out there, as opposed to demagogues of Obama's ilk.

The military and intelligence types are important players. They possess real power, for which they owe limited accountability. The brass and spooks are also far more sensitive to power relations, have access to better information, and should therefore be more aware than others to the realities of the world. Of the influential anti-NWO researchers, for example, Bill Cooper, John Coleman, and Texe Marrs all served in various intelligence services.

Therefore, those in the military/intelligence world should be particularly energetic in awakening others. Furthermore, the patriots inside the military and intelligence communities have sworn to defend their nations - and, beyond a doubt, the Oligarchs present grave dangers to *all* the nations of the world.

So what do we do? 1) We must inform ourselves and educate as many people as possible. 2) We must use the tactic of non-participation wherever possible: Avoid brainwashing by homeschooling. Avoid poisoning by refusing vaccination. Avoid brain damage by ignoring the psychiatrists. Avoid hypnosis by not watching TV. Etc, etc. As Quigley pointed out, when a civilization collapses, the people just stop going along with the crowd. They drop out, and make their own communities. 3) People should undertake action according to their opportunities. The popular members of tight-knit communities can organize seminars and political fronts. The politicians can try to introduce anti-NWO legislation. The anti-NWO rich can do all sorts of things. The academics can protest against anti-science like "Global Warming" or Liberal Economics. Etc, etc.

The military/intelligence types must be particularly careful and astute. They have the responsibility to intervene should the entire system collapse. It is beyond debate that nuclear war must be prevented via a court coup if necessary. Heads of state can be declared insane. Economic policy can be enforced against the wishes of the bankers with the backing of the militaries.

Should a collapse occur, the brass must make sure to fulfil its duty of protecting the citizenry. They must mutiny against the orders of the Oligarchs. They must not allow themselves to fall into the Nazi trap of blind adherence to orders. Natural law supersedes man-made law.

For obvious reasons, I do not know the configurations of power within the world military outfits and intelligence agencies. My impression is that the Oligarchs have a few high-ranking agents and a great deal of brainwashed dupes. Beyond a doubt, there must be anti-NWO groups within the Anglo-American armies. The Germans, the French, and the Japanese should be even more aware of the problem - though who knows? The Russians and the Chinese are no fools, and surely recognize the general shape of the situation by now. So let the generals and spooks of the world talk to each other and prevent a World War III.

11.6 Concluding Thoughts

Beyond a doubt, modern society is headed toward some kind of a collapse. The Oligarchs went berserk after 1900, and the people gradually lost the plot. No society can withstand so grievous an assault unscathed.

Two questions arise: How bad is the situation? And what would a collapse look like? Both questions are hard to impossible to answer.

My impression is that things are bad, but not terminally bad. Modern society is poorly educated and severely brainwashed, but, at the same time, significant proportions of the population are educated enough and capable of overcoming their brainwashing.

We are poisoned, but we are not yet dropping like flies.

Fertility is low, but we are not sterile.

A significant proportion of the mental and physical illnesses people experience stem from faulty psychological and medical treatments. With a proper diet, and with proper medical care, the public's health should rapidly improve.

The problem with war is a binary one. Either you go to war or you do not. There will be no war if the sane people in positions of power show some guts and announce that they will not suffer further wars.

The economic problem is slightly more complicated. To a large degree, it is political. But it is also physical, in the sense that the Oligarchical policies have ruined the capital stocks of much of the world. If some group manages to oust the Oligarchical banker cabal, and to garner sufficient popular support, that group will be able to fix the world economic problems relatively quickly. We have the technology! We have the will! We only need the opportunity.

On the cultural front, we face a dire situation. People do not change their outlooks overnight. On the other hand, people are prone to falling for fads, and so, if a significant enough segment of society adopts a worldview which favors life, elegance, and thought (in the stead of death, pettiness, and mindlessness), the rest of society will go along with the new current. This particular question requires more thought and discussion. I do not know what will happen or what is to be done.

The academy is quite corrupt and requires serious overhauls. Professors are notoriously resistant to change and meddling. We may see a collapse of the academy when people realize that 1) the degrees do not correlate with knowledge or ability, but with the payment of fees and the regurgitation of spoon-fed thoughts; 2) the possession of degrees does not guarantee the acquisition of prestigious jobs; 3) the rising tuitions are unaffordable. People will simply stop going to the universities, and will study on their own, often on the job. On the other hand, if tuitions fall, and the deans realize their folly, we may see a relatively rapid turn-around. The academics are not exactly dumb, they have just been trained not to ask the right questions. We will see how everything pans out.

The school system is also nearing collapse. The current high-school graduation rates in the United

States are at about 75%.² We must assume that a fair degree of those who did manage to obtain diplomas did not fulfil the real graduation requirements, low as those are, and were kindly helped out for reasons of prestige. Some of the drop-outs must be thinking people, who see that high-school is a waste of time; unfortunately, many drop-outs are spectacularly ignorant. In principle, home-school is the proper way out. Unfortunately, with the demise of the family, home-schooling is not an option for everyone. Serious, relevant adult-education programs must be instituted. Alternative cheap private schools must be founded. Meanwhile, the formal educational system may well collapse under its own weight. The teachers' unions are entrenched. One suspects that many teachers are decent, but scared of unemployment, and awfully brainwashed. The fight for proper education will be a tough one.

The Internet has opened a new type of medium, which allows people to bypass the old controllable channels of television and print. For the first time in history, the masses have access to their own tool of communication. It is up to them to stop watching pornography and to use the Internet to their common advantage.

The prospect of a world famine is a terrifying one. Repairing the world's food production capabilities will take a while even under favorable circumstances. The problem is that even one year of hunger can kill billions. This must not be allowed. Famine prevention must be a top priority. We have food now; we know how to grow food; we have the land; but we must wrestle control of the land from the Oligarchical mega-corporations. The issue is one of life and death. People must gain traction on the problem of food as soon as possible.

In principle, regional and world federal unifications are desirable, and, given further improvements in transportation and communication, inevitable. The problem is that in trying to construct a feudal, anti-technological, genocidal World Order, the Oligarchs have forced the manifestation of forces contrary to their aims. Barring intelligent dialogues and interventions, short-sighted nationalism, and potentially trade wars, will begin to emerge as the current crisis unravels.

Mutually beneficial trade is good, but the Oligarchs insist on using trade to enslave peoples. Regional integration is useful, but the Oligarchs want to use their dominance in the governing bodies to - again - enslave people. They have created an impossible situation! World Union should have been pursued (and many delusional people think it is being pursued) on sane and benevolent grounds. Ultra-modern transportation networks should have been constructed. (The traditionally maritime-trade oriented Oligarchs tend to detest continental transportation networks, since those increase continental power.) Trade and industrial development blocs should have been organized on culturo-economic rather than political grounds - for example, Eastern Europe was only thrown into the EU to spite Russia. Eastern Europe should have used the residue of the Warsaw Pact to form its own economic bloc and to pursue its own development in harmony with Western Europe and Russia. Instead, it has become a quasi-colony of the West, to the misery, and perhaps, in the long-run, the annoyance of the population. The same holds for Mexico and Latin America - they should have integrated a bloc of their own. Trying to unify Mexico with the American-Canadian bloc was an insanity.

Another Oligarchical strategic manoeuvre, which strikes me as insane, was the destruction of the productive economies of the United States and Britain. Evidently, the Oligarchs are using the US and the UK as the world's bullies. Fine - but military power is a function of economic power. Why emaciate your own military strength by reducing the American and British economies? That development makes no sense, and can only be the consequence of spectacular strategic miscalculation and misunderstanding of economics. Perhaps they thought that they had to weaken the US to goad it into a world system, and decided that even an economically weak America would be sufficiently powerful to dominate the world militarily (to be fair to them, the US is indeed monstrously powerful). Either that, or they have aces up their sleeves, which we are yet to see. But I doubt that they have much. They seem desperate.

Not only that, but when they get into trouble, they will start fighting amongst themselves. There

²<http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/06/02/graduation-rates-by-state-and-race/>, Jan 20, 2012.

are multiple factions of Oligarchs. While the going is good, they stick together - but their loose alliance will not last forever.

And while they push for this loose integration, the Oligarchs also work toward the disintegration of the larger, more powerful states. They dismembered Yugoslavia, and if allowed, will tear the Middle East to tiny controllable pieces. Thus, they are trying to both build and demolish. They want small powerless states dominated by a large powerful umbrella mega-government. They are trying to make the UN (and the EU) look good and the domestic governments look bad, but the troubled people of the world are beginning to hate all government or to call for strong local/national government. What the Oligarchs may get, once and if the world's political actors start thinking and regain sanity, are mid-sized blocs desperate for fleeing Anglo-American "Washington Consensus" domination. The potentially tremendous Sino-Russian power beckons. If the Chinese and the Russians manage to form a serious enough alliance - and they are getting there - Japan and Europe will gravitate toward the Moscow-Beijing coalition, and the Anglo-American(-Israeli) manipulators will resort, almost without a doubt, to nuclear threats and other shenanigans. Should such a point arrive, one of three things will happen: 1) the Oligarchical types will not follow their bluffs, and the world will polarize with an isolated Anglo-American bloc competing against a dominant Eurasia; 2) there will be a nuclear war and we will all die; 3) the Anglo-American military types will stage a coup and integrate their nations into a sane, progressive world system.

It is hard to tell when all of this will happen, but judging by the current political climate, there is a high probability that we will see some sort of closure to the current situation by 2020, perhaps even by 2015. This is why we should be particularly energetic in the near future, until the crisis has been resolved, one way or the other. We can rest and turn to more mundane, more private activities, once the world has stabilized in one of the following scenarios: 1) megadeath; 2) New World Order; 3) the formation of vast international blocs (or myriads of minor statelets), one of them in the paws of the Oligarchs; 4) the inauguration of a true, honest, good international system free of Oligarchical domination. The first option merits no discussion. In the second case, we will have to turn inward to quietly resist the NWO at local, even individual levels. In the third case there will be all sorts of opportunities, and the fourth case will offer an interesting and potentially highly enjoyable rebirth of humanity.

That is the situation. It is bad and potentially terminal, but it also offers grand possibilities.

Next, what may the collapse look like? In principle, there is slow decay and there is sudden collapse. Slow decay is bad in that it may last for centuries, but good in that it offers opportunities to those of daring and intelligence. You can have great fun and great success in a period of slow decay. The various institution will not function, there will be too many laws, the official language will not make sense; but if you are clever and discrete, you will be able to accomplish things and to live a decent life.

Rapid collapse is, generally, universally bad. In a rapid collapse, people die by the millions, luck supersedes effort, fatalism and despair settle in, and Humpty Dumpty goes to pieces. The one positive thing about rapid collapse, is that the crash may destroy that which caused it. The survivors can then have a renaissance. Fat good that would do the dead. Moreover, the rapid collapse may precede a period of slow decay, combining worse with bad.

From what I can see, we are in a time of gradual accelerating decay. Sometime in the near future, there will be a full-scale collapse. The Oligarchs have bungled. Their ambition is too great. They are too greedy, too arrogant, and not nearly smart enough. They could have inspired a new Golden Age, but instead they have brought the world to the edge of the abyss. Oh, they are opportunists, bunglers, and fools! They plan their little plans, and construct their pipe dreams from corroded steel, and build sand castles over foundations of water. They have miscalculated their own strength and the psychology of humanity.

Their "New World Order" is impossible. It is absurd. They can never achieve a stable prison-planet;

all they can obtain is a caste system in constant decay. The big problem is that a rotten civilization can crawl along for centuries, until someone gives it the *coup de grâce*. Hence, should they establish a global Order, there will be no one to give them the killing blow. Their system would not work, but, perhaps, neither would it collapse.

They can not do what they want to do, it is too much. They may, however, manage to - inadvertently, or in revenge - cause the destruction of humanity. A few nukes and we are all through. That is why they must be stopped.

So when the collapse comes, those true souls who today wield some power, must intervene, remove the Oligarchs, and swiftly restart the world system. That they must do, or go down with the ship. The younger and less powerful among us should try to spread the word, to revive people's faculties of thought, to spark signal fires in the darkness. The conflict of our time, and perhaps of all times, is in the minds of men. One can resist the Oligarchs obliquely, by living like a true human rather than like a monkey in search of more bananas; by appreciating and creating true beauty; by admiring the good in those around oneself, while quietly protesting against the bad.

Before we conclude, let us take one last bow from the inimitable professor Quigley.

LIFE³

Written by Professor Quigley in the hopes of assisting a troubled colleague.

1. Some things are important, but most things are only necessary.
2. Necessary things are only important when you do not have them and are generally ignored when they are amply supplied. These include oxygen, food, drink, shelter, and all physical needs.
3. Important things are important all the time whether you have them or not, whether you realize it or not.
4. People who regard necessary things as important are unhappy and frustrated even when they get them and even if they are quite unaware that the important things exist.
5. Important things are those which can be made ends in themselves, worth seeking and worth having. Necessary things, since they are not important for their own sakes, should never be made ends in themselves, but must be permitted only to be means to important ends. Thus, material wealth, power, popularity, and prestige should never be ends but only means to ends, because however necessary they may be they are never important.
6. THE ONLY THING WHICH IS IMPORTANT IS TRUTH - that is the total structure of reality. The meaning of anything arises from its relationship to that total structure. The reason that material things are not important is because of the subordinate position they hold in that total structure.
7. From this point of view, important things may exist on any level of reality. For example, physical health, exercise, and coordination are important on the physical level, but are not as important as things on higher levels, even though they can be made ends in themselves.
8. On the higher levels are such things as feelings, and intellectual awareness.
9. The important things are those concerned with the realization of the potentialities of an individual because such realization brings the individual in closer contact with the total structure of reality - that is, with TRUTH.
10. Each individual is so inadequate that there are only a few things he can do to help realize his potentialities. Among these few are will - the desire to do this and the determination to do it.
11. Because of the inadequacy of the individual - that is, his basic need for other persons and his inability to direct his efforts unless he has recognition of his relationships with the

³<http://www.carrollquigley.net/misc/Life.htm>

rest of reality, the individual can achieve nothing by seeking to obtain things for himself, because this makes him the center of the universe, which he is not. Thus, selfishness achieves nothing.

12. Thus the chief immediate aim in life of each individual must be to help others realize their potentialities. This is what Kant meant when he said that others must never be treated as means to be used, but always as ends in themselves. It is basic in human experience that those things a person seeks for himself directly are never obtained. They are only obtained indirectly as a by-product of an effort to obtain them for others. Thus the man who seeks only wealth for himself never feels rich, as the man who seeks power never feels secure, and the man who seeks pleasure never feels satisfied. But the man who seeks important things for others often feels rich, secure, and satisfied.

13. The need for others is present on all levels, the physical, emotional, and intellectual. Indeed, every relationship has in it all three aspects. The desire to help others experience these things and to grow as a result of such experiences is called love. Such love is the real motivating force of the universe and is, in its ultimate nature, a manifestation of the love of God. Because while God is pure Reason and man's ultimate goal is Reason, it can not be reached directly and must always be approached step by step, not alone but in companionship with others, and thus through love. Thus love of others, ultimately love of God, are the steps by which man develops reason and slowly approaches pure Reason. Carroll Quigley, August 1967.

A useful system of beliefs; perhaps not mine; perhaps not yours; but one worth looking at.

Take then, reader, this book, for what it is. I tried to portray the world as accurately as I could at the current level of development of my thoughts; and I tried to be honest in presenting my belief structure and my reasons for adopting that belief structure. I wrote what I wrote, out of sympathy for my fellow men and women, out of a desire to stop the annihilation of the world I have to live in, and because, frankly, it is all so incredibly amusing! Take this work, then, and do with it as you will. Take also my regards.

Here we stand, now, reader! Our world is at the Threshold of History. Before us lies a future of unfathomable joys, possibilities, and exciting dangers. Behind us lurk millennia of grave errors, desperate inventions, and billions of human lives, many of them somewhat bleak and somewhat grimy, but most of them also worthy and beautiful. Should we step forward, we will partake in a new Renaissance, the greatest one recorded yet. And should we fall... Well!

Should we fall, we will drink vodka with the Valkyries up in the reaches of Valhalla. It is best drank cold, and without ice.

Selected Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor - *The Culture Industry* (2001)
- Ames, Mark - *Going Postal* (2005)
- Ames, Mark - various articles for *The eXiled*
- Attali, Jacques - *Millennium Winners and Losers in the Coming Order* (1992)
- Babiak, Paul; Hare, Robert D. - *Snakes in Suits When Psychopaths Go to Work* (2006)
- Bacon, Francis - *The New Atlantis* (1624)
- Bakunin, Mikhail - *God and the State* (1882)
- Banyan, Will - *The Proud Internationalist* (2006)
- Bauerlein, Mark - *The Dumbest Generation* (2008)
- Behe, Michael J. - *Darwin's Black Box The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (1996)
- Bernays, Edward - *Crystallizing Public Opinion* (1923)
- Bernays, Edward - *Propaganda* (1928)
- Bigelsen, Harvey - *Doctors Are More Harmful Than Germs* (2011)
- Billington, James - *Fire in the Minds of Men* (1980)
- Blum, William - *Killing Hope* (2003 edition)
- Blum, William - *Rogue State* (2000)
- Blumenfeld, Samuel L. - *NEA Trojan Horse in American Education*
- Blumenfeld, Samuel L. - *Is Public Education Necessary?*
- Bon, Gustav Le - *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (1895)
- Breggin, Peter R. - *Brain Disabling Treatments in Psychiatry* (2008)
- Breggin, Peter R.; Scruggs, Dick - *Talking Back to Ritalin* (2001)
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew - *Between Two Ages* (1970)
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew - *The Grand Chessboard* (1997)
- Buford, Bill - *Among the Thugs* (1991)
- Butler, Smedley D. - *War is a Racket* (c. 1935)
- Celente, Gerald - *Trends Journal*, various issues; various interviews
- Cleckley, Hervey - *The Mask of Sanity* (1941)
- Chase, Allan - *The Legacy of Malthus* (1980)
- Chomsky, Noam - lectures, interviews
- Chomsky, Noam - *Manufacturing Consent* (1989)
- Chossudovsky, Michel - *America's War on Terrorism* (2005)
- Chossudovsky, Michel - *The Globalization of Poverty* (1997)
- Chossudovsky, Michel; Marshall, Andrew Gavin - *The Global Economic Crisis* (2010)
- Chossudovsky, Michel - various articles
- Coleman, John - *Diplomacy by Deception* (1993)
- Coleman, John - *The Committee of 300* (1992-)
- Coleman, John - *The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations*
- Compton, Piers - *The Broken Cross* (1983)
- Consett, M.W.W.P. - *The Triumph of Unarmed Forces* (1923)
- Cooper, Milton William - *Behold a Pale Horse* (1991)
- Cooper, Milton William - *Mystery Babylon* lectures (transcriptions) (lectures conducted over the 1990s, transcripts released since)
- Cude, Wilfred - *The Ph.D. Trap (Revisited)* (2000)
- Cumbey, Constance - *The Hidden Dangers of the Rainbow* (1983)
- Curtis, Mark - *Unpeople: Britain's Secret Human Rights Abuses* (2004)
- Curtis, Mark - *Web of Deceit: Britain's Real Role in the World* (2003)
- Daraul, Arkon - *A History of Secret Societies* (1984)
- Darwin, Charles - *The Origin of Species* (1859)
- Darwin, Charles - *The Descent of Man* (1871)
- Darwin, Charles Galton - *The Next Million Years* (1952)
- Diamond, Jared - *Collapse* (2005)
- Diamond, Jared - *Guns, Germs and Steel* (1997)
- Dilling, Elizabeth - *The Jewish Religion* (1963)
- de Grand Pre, Donn - *Barbarians Inside the Gates* (2000)
- Dodd, Bella - *The School of Darkness* (1954)
- Dugin, Alexander - *Conspirology* (2005)

- Dunegan, Lawrence - *The New Order of the Barbarians* (tapes, 1988)
- Eakman, Beverly K. - *Educating for the New World Order* (1991)
- Eisenstein, Charles - *The Ascent of Humanity* (2007)
- Engdahl, F. William - *A Century of War* (2004)
- Engdahl, F. William - *Seeds of Destruction*
- Engdahl, F. William - *Gods of Money* (2010)
- Engdahl, F. William - *Full Spectrum Dominance* (2009)
- Engler, Yves - *The Black Book of Canadian Foreign Policy* (2009)
- Epperson, A. Ralph - *The Unseen Hand* (1982)
- Epperson, A. Ralph - *New World Order* (1990)
- Estulin, Daniel - *The True Story of the Bilderberg Group* (2009)
- Eustis, Mimi L. - *Mardi Gras Secrets* (samizdat, online, c. 2005)
- Finkelstein, Norman - *The Holocaust Industry* (2000)
- Finkelstein, Norman - *This Time We Went Too Far* (2010)
- Flynn, Ted - *Hope of the Wicked: The Master Plan to Rule the World* (2000)
- Fraser, Jill Andresky - *White-Collar Sweatshop* (2002)
- Fromm, Erich - *The Sane Society* (1955)
- Galeano, Eduardo - *Open Veins in Latin America* (1971)
- Gatto, John Taylor - *Dumbing Us Down* (1992)
- Gatto, John Taylor - *The Underground History of American Education* (2001)
- Gatto, John Taylor - *Weapons of Mass Instruction* (2008)
- Gatto, John Taylor - various interviews
- Griffin, David Ray - *The New Pearl Harbor* (2004)
- Griffin, G. Edward - *The Creature from Jekyll Island* (1994)
- Grossman, Dave - *On Killing* (1995)
- Goulevitch A. - *Tsarism and Revolution*
- Gunderson, Ted - interviews, lectures
- Hare, Robert - *Without Conscience* (1993)
- Healy, David - *The Creation of Psychopharmacology* (2002)
- Hedges, Chris - *Empire of Illusions* (2009)
- Hedges, Chris - *Death of the Liberal Class* (2010)
- Hedges, Chris - *American Fascists* (2007)
- Heinberg, Richard - *Memories and Visions of Paradise* (1989)
- Heinberg, Richard - *The Party's Over* (2003)
- Hobbes, Thomas - *Leviathan* (1651)
- Hodson, H.V. - *The British Commonwealth and the Future* (1939)
- Holdren, John - *Ecoscience* (1978)
- Huxley, Aldous - *Brave New World* (1932)
- Huxley, Aldous - *Brave New World Revisited* (1958)
- Huxley, Aldous - the two interviews (1958 Mike Wallace; 1962 Berkeley)
- Huxley, Julian - Unesco Manifesto
- Illich, Ivan - *Deschooling Society* (1971)
- Illich, Ivan - *Medical Nemesis* (1974)
- Iserbyt, Charlotte - *The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America* (1999)
- Johnson, Chalmers - *Blowback* (2001)
- Johnson, Chalmers - *The Sorrows of Empire* (2004)
- Johnson, Chalmers - *Nemesis* (2007)
- Johnson, Phillip E. - *Darwin on Trial* (1993)
- Josephson, Matthew - *The Robber Barons* (1934)
- Kah, Gary - *En Route to Global Occupation* (1996)
- Kirby, David - *Animal Factory* (2010)
- Kirsch, Irving - *The Emperor's New Drugs: Exploding the Antidepressant Myth* (2010)
- Klein, Naomi - *The Shock Doctrine* (2007)
- Knight, Stephen - *The Brotherhood* (1984)
- Knuth, E.C. - *The Empire of the City* (1944)
- Koestler, Arthur - *The Ghost in the Machine* (1967)
- Kunstler, James Howard - *The Long Emergency* (2005)
- Lancot, Guylaine - *The Medical Mafia* (1995)
- Landowski, J. - *Red Symphony*
- Lee, Martin; Shlain, Bruce - *Acid Dreams* (1985)
- Lionni, Paolo - *The Leipzig Connection: Sabotage of the US Educational System* (1980)
- Livingstone, David - *Terrorism and the Illuminati* (2007)
- Lobaczewski, Andrew M. - *Political Ponerology* (2006)
- Long, Huey - *My First Day In The White House* (1935)
- Long, Huey - *Every Man a King* (1933)
- MacDonald, Kevin - *The Culture of Critique* (1998)
- Machiavelli, Niccolo - *The Prince* (1532)
- Magee, Glenn - *Hegel and the Hermetic Tradition* (2001)
- MakCinnon, Mark - *The New Cold War* (2007)
- Makow, Henry - *Illuminati I&II* (2008, 2010)
- Malthus, Thomas - *Principle of Population* (1798; 6th ed 1826)
- Mander, Jerry - *Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television* (1978)

- nation of Television* (1978)
- Marrs, Texe - various lectures and interviews
- Marx, Karl - *Communist Manifesto* (1848)
- McCoy, Alfred W. - *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia* (1972)
- Melanson, Terry - *Perfectibilists* (2009)
- Mills, C. Wright - *White Collar* (1951)
- Monteith, Stanley - *The Brotherhood of Darkness* (2000)
- More, Thomas - *Utopia* (1516)
- Mullins, Eustace - *The World Order: A Study in the Hegemony of Parasitism* (1985)
- Mullins, Eustace - *Murder by Injection* (1988)
- Mullins, Eustace - *Secrets of the Federal Reserve Bank* (1952)
- Niwa, Debra - *International Baccalaureate IB Unraveled* (paper, 2010)
- Orwell, George - *1984* (1949)
- Orwell, George - *Animal Farm* (1945)
- Ostrovsky, Victor - *By Way of Deception* (1990)
- Packard, Vance - *The Hidden Persuaders* (1957)
- Parenti, Michael - various lectures
- Parenti, Michael - *Democracy for the Few* (7th ed - 2001; there is a 9th ed - 2011)
- Parenti, Michael - *The Assassination of Julius Caesar* (2003)
- Parenti, Michael - *History as Mystery* (1999)
- Parenti, Michael - *Inventing Reality, The Politics of News Media* (1986)
- Parenti, Michael - *God and his Demons* (2010)
- Parenti, Michael - *Make-Believe Media* (1992)
- Perkins, John - *Confessions of an Economic Hitman* (2004)
- Perkins, John - *The Secret History of the American Empire* (2007)
- Perloff, James - *The Shadows of Power* (1988)
- Perloff, James - *Tornado in a Junkyard* (1999)
- Phillips, Kevin - *American Dynasty* (2004)
- Pike, Albert - *Morals and Dogma* (1871)
- Plath, Sylvia - *The Bell Jar* (1963)
- Plato - *The Republic* (c. 380 BC)
- Preparata, Guido Giacomo - *Conjuring Hitler* (2005)
- Queenborough, Edith - *Occult Theocracy* (1933)
- Quigley, Carroll - *The Anglo-American Establishment* (1981)
- Quigley, Carroll - *The Evolution of Civilizations* (1961)
- Quigley, Carroll - *Tragedy and Hope* (1966)
- Quigley, Carroll - *Weapons Systems and Political Stability* (1983)
- Quigley, Carroll - various essays, letters and book reviews
- Reed, Fred - various articles
- Reisman, Judith - *Sexual Sabotage* (2010)
- Reisman, Judith - *Kinsey: Crimes & Consequences* (1998)
- Reisman, Judith - *Soft Porn Plays Hardball* (1991)
- Reisman, Judith - *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud* (1990)
- Rivera, David Allen - *Final Warning* (1st ed. 1994)
- Robinson, John J. - *Born in Blood* (1990)
- Robison, John - *Proofs of a Conspiracy* (1798)
- Rosin, Carol - interviews
- Roth, Samuel - *The Jews Must Live* (1934)
- Ruppert, Michael C. - *Crossing the Rubicon* (2004)
- Russell, Bertrand - *The Impact of Science on Society* (1953)
- Russell, Bertrand - *The Scientific Outlook* (1931)
- Russo, Aaron - documentaries, interviews
- Schmidt, Jeff - *Disciplined Minds* (2001)
- Schlosser, Eric - *Fast Food Nation* (2002)
- Shahak, Israel - Jewish History, Jewish Religion (1994)
- Simon, George K. Jr. - *In Sheep's Clothing* (1996)
- Slezkine, Yuri - *The Jewish Century* (2004)
- Smith, Alan - *The Wealth of Nations* (1776)
- Stevens, Mitchell L. - *Creating a Class* (2007)
- Sutton, Antony C. - *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* (1974)
- Sutton, Antony C. - *Wall Street and FDR* (1976)
- Sutton, Antony C. - *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler* (1976)
- Sutton, Antony C. - *The Best Enemy Money Can Buy* (1986)
- Sutton, Antony C. - *America's Secret Establishment* (1983)
- Szasz, Thomas - various
- Taibbi, Matt - *Griftopia* (2010)
- Tainter, Joseph - *The Collapse of Complex Societies* (1990)
- Tarpley, Webster G. - *Barrack H Obama: The Unauthorized Biography* (2008)
- Tarpley, Webster G. - *George H.W. Bush: The Unauthorized Biography* (1992)
- Tarpley, Webster G. - *911 Synthetic Terror Made in USA* (2005)
- Tarpley, Webster G. - *Against Oligarchy* (1996)
- Tarpley, Webster G. - *Obama The Postmodern Coup* (2008)
- Tarpley, Webster G. - *Surviving the Cataclysm*

- (1999)
- Taylor, Ian T. - *In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order* (1st ed. 1984; 5th ed. 2003)
- Tenpenny, Sherri - *Vaccines: Risk, Benefits, Choices* (DVD, c. 2004)
- Tenpenny, Sherri - *FOWL! Bird Flu: It's Not What You Think* (2006)
- Tocqueville, Alexis de - *Democracy in America* (1835)
- Toffler, Alvin - *Future Shock* (1970)
- Toffler, Alvin - *The Third Wave* (1980)
- Toffler, Alvin - *Powershift* (1990)
- Tuchman, Barbara W. - *A Distant Mirror* (1978)
- Tuchman, Barbara W. - *The Guns of August* (1962)
- Warburg, Sindy - *Hitler's Secret Backers* (c.1933)
- Warren, Elizabeth - *The Two-Income Trap* (2003)
- Watt, Alan - lectures, interviews, books
- Webb, Gary - *Dark Alliance* (1996)
- Webster, Nesta H. - *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* (1924)
- Webster, Nesta H. - *World Revolution* (1921)
- Wells, Herbert G. - *The Time Machine* (1895)
- Wells, Herbert G. - *A Modern Utopia* (1905)
- Wells, Herbert G. - *The Shape of Things to Come* (1933)
- Wells, Herbert G. - *The Open Conspiracy* (1928)
- Wells, Herbert G. - *The New World Order* (1939)
- Wells, Jonathan - *Icons of Evolution* (2002)
- Wilder-Smith, A. E. - various lectures
- Williams, T. Harry - *Huey Long* (1969)
- Whitaker, Robert - *Anatomy of an Epidemic* (2010)
- Wormser, Rene - *Foundations: Their Power and Influence* (1958)
- Zinn, Howard - *A People's History of the United States* (1980)
- DSM IV (psychiatric manual)
- EIR (LaRouche Crew) - *Dope Inc.* (1978)
- NSSM200*
- PNAC: Project for the New American Century - *Rebuilding America's Defences* (2000)
- Report From Iron Mountain* (1967)