

THE BEST KEPT SECRETS

**A HISTORY OF WHAT HAS BEEN GOING ON
BEHIND THE SCENES FOR MORE THAN 100 YEARS**

The Best Kept Secrets

A History Of What Has Been Going On
Behind The Scenes For More Than 100 Years

First Edition

Published on July 4, 2017

Researched and Written by:

Kristin B. Thompson
Jason A. Wright

Editing of early drafts by Tom Anderson and John L. Revere.
Final proofreading by Rick and Julie Braden.

About the Research Team

This Brother-Sister duo has dedicated themselves to researching corruption and shining light on information that very few people realize.

Public Domain

This research is hereby placed in the public domain. It is hoped that free and easy access to this document will enable those who value freedom to reach a deeper and more coherent understanding of the corruption happening behind the scenes that continues to infringe on their liberty.

TO
ALL WHO CARE
AND SEEK TO HELP

INTRODUCTION

First off, this document is for anyone interested in understanding how and why things are the way they are. It provides lessons in history that were never taught in school, and exposes a secret history of our World that no one is supposed to know about. The information contained within these pages is well documented in the historical record. Second, this document is FREE. There is no agenda except to hopefully shine some light on what has been going on secretly behind the scenes for over 100 years with few people even realizing. Third, every effort has been made to describe and to analyze, not to give personal opinion or beliefs.

It begins with a historical look at one of the best-kept secrets of all time, and then examines a wide range of seemingly unconnected topics to include banking, medicine, media, education, cancer research, subversion, pharmaceuticals, politics, vaccines, foreign policy, war, and many other key aspects of American society—you will see that it is all interrelated. And together, it tells the much bigger story of the well-documented existence of a solidly entrenched secret network, concealed from public gaze, that has been—and is—profoundly shaping our World behind the scenes.

This document provides answers to anyone interested in understanding the real World of today; if you have ever wondered what's really going on in this world or where exactly things are headed, then this document is for you.

Contents

PREFACE

FOREWORD

01. One Of The Best-Kept Secrets Of All Time
02. The Takeover Of U.S. Foreign Policy
03. The Takeover Of The U.S. Monetary System
04. The Takeover Of The Media And Free Press
05. The Profound Impact On America
06. The Takeover Of The Communist Movement
07. The Destruction Of The Fundamental Principles On Which America Was Founded
08. The Takeover Of The Pharmaceutical Industry
09. The Takeover Of Modern Medicine
10. The Takeover Of America's Education System
11. The Takeover Of America's Political System
12. The Untold History Of The United Nations
13. A Closer Look At Democracies
14. A Closer Look At America's Wars
15. The Nature Of Truth

CONCLUSION

APPENDICES

- Appendix I. The Takeover Of Modern Cancer Therapy
 - Appendix II. An In-Depth Look At Vaccine Corruption
 - Appendix III. A Closer Look At Common Core Education
-

Preface

In 1965 one of the nation's leading historians quietly finished the last draft of a massive 1311-page book on world history. He walked over to his typewriter and secured the last pages of the book and placed them into a small box and wrapped it for mailing. He then walked to the Post Office and mailed the final draft to his publisher in New York City. The editor was somewhat overwhelmed and perhaps even inhibited by the scholarly treatise. The last thing he wanted to do was to read the huge draft. He knew and trusted the professor.

After all, he was one of the leading scholars in the western world. They had been acquaintances for several years. He had already signed an agreement to publish the book before it was finished. He had read several chapters of the early draft. They were boring, at least to him. He decided to give the book to a young editor who had just been promoted to his assistant. The young editor was also overwhelmed but happy to oblige the Senior Editor. The young editor was unaware of the importance of the manuscript and of the revelations which it contained. To the young editor this was just another textbook or so he thought.

Somehow one of the most revealing books ever published slipped through the editorial offices of one of the major publishing houses in New York and found its way into the bookstores of America in 1966.

The above historian was Dr. Carroll Quigley and the book he wrote was entitled, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*. It was published in 1966 and is clearly one of the most important books ever written. Professor Quigley was an extraordinarily gifted historian and geo-political analyst. The insights and information contained in his massive study open the door to a true understanding of world history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is a work of exceptional scholarship and is truly a classic.

Knowledge of who Dr. Carroll Quigley was is essential for understanding the real world of today. His close relationship with a secret group of elites and his approval of its aims made it possible to provide an insider's analysis of the minds and methods of this global elite. Without this knowledge, the actions of those who dominate the U.S. government and the Western world would not make as much sense. With it, everything falls into place.

Using Quigley's work as a starting point, this document will highlight the extensive history of a small group of dominant men that were able to secretly secure control of local, national, continental, and even global policy at the turn of the 20th century. Then by examining the well documented history of our nation's educational, financial, medical, media, governmental, pharmaceutical and political system, one can understand the enormous control this secret network wields behind the scenes, and finally make sense of why things are the way they are in America—and the future that is being shaped for us.

Carroll Quigley was no wild-eyed conspiracy theorist. Quite the contrary, Quigley was a prominent historian who specialized in studying the evolution of civilizations as well as secret societies. Dr. Quigley studied history at Harvard University, where he earned his bachelor's, master's, and PhD degrees. He taught at Princeton University, Harvard University, and the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. He was the author of the widely used textbook *Evolution of Civilization*. He was a member of the editorial board of the monthly periodical *Current History*. He had done extensive research in the

archives of France, Italy, and England. He was a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Anthropological Association and the American Economic Association. For many years he lectured on Russian history at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and on Africa at the Brookings Institution. He worked as an advisor to the US Defense Department and the US Navy. In 1958 he served as a consultant to the Congressional Select Committee which set up the National Space Agency. He was a frequent lecturer and consultant for such groups as the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, the Brookings Institution, the U.S. Naval Weapons Laboratory, the Naval College, the Smithsonian Institute, and the State Department.¹ This was an individual that President Bill Clinton, on numerous times during his presidency, publicly paid homage to, for the influence that Dr. Quigley had on his life. Dr. Quigley was also closely associated with many of the family dynasties of the super-rich. In short, Carroll Quigley was a well-connected and well-credentialed member of the world's money power structure and Ivy League society.

Dr. Quigley, has provided a great contribution to our understanding of modern history which was presented in his historical works, to include, *Tragedy and Hope*, *A History of the World in Our Time* and *The Anglo-American Establishment*. His disclosures placed him in such potential danger from an Establishment backlash, so much so that the latter was never published in his lifetime. He gained access to evidence from people directly involved with the secret 'network' that no outsider had ever seen. In fact, he admits that he was even permitted for two years to examine its papers and secret records. Quigley's exposé - together with his *Tragedy and Hope* - is unique among historical works in that it provides a detailed and verifiable account of the origins, development and aims of a secret network of organizations created for the purpose of world domination by certain international financial interests.

¹ Bio of Carroll Quigley <http://www.carrollquigley.net/biography.htm>

**I
ONE OF THE BEST-KEPT SECRETS OF ALL TIME**

When Dr. Quigley wrote *Tragedy and Hope*, it was obvious that it would never be read by the masses. At over thirteen hundred pages, approximately six hundred thousand words, and weighing in around five pounds, it's safe to say that it wasn't written for the casual reader. Nor was it written like a novel, bursting with scandalous and interesting conspiratorial tidbits on every page. Rather, as one would expect from an Ivy League historian, it is a long and often tedious read of which 95 percent consists of basic economic, political, and diplomatic history. However, within the other 5 percent, you'll find crucial 'keys' without which 20th century political, economic, and military events can never be fully understood. Quigley provides truly astonishing admissions about the existence, nature, and effectiveness of covert power—explosive details of a secret network of organizations comprised of international bankers, aristocrats and other powerful, unelected men who have controlled the levers of power, finance and foreign policy in Great Britain and the United States of America since the beginning of the twentieth century.

In *Tragedy and Hope* and *The Anglo-American Establishment*, Quigley reveals with great detail the existence of this secret history:

Cecil Rhodes Organized a Secret Society in 1891

“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.²

To be sure, this secret society is not a childish thing like the Ku Klux Klan, and it does not have any secret robes, secret handclasps, or secret passwords. It does not need any of these, since its members know each other intimately.³

[T]his 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.⁴

I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its instruments.⁵

² *The Anglo-American Establishment*, page ix

³ *The Anglo-American Establishment*, page ix

⁴ *The Anglo-American Establishment*, page ix-x

⁵ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 950

Some of these facts came to me from sources which I am not permitted to name, and I have mentioned them only where I can produce documentary evidence available to everyone. Nevertheless, it would have been very difficult to write this book if I had not received a certain amount of assistance of a personal nature from persons close to the Group.⁶

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.⁷

I approached the subject as a historian. This attitude I have kept. I have tried to describe or to analyze, not to praise or to condemn.⁸

But I feel that the truth has a right to be told, and, once told, can be an injury to no men of good will. Only by a knowledge of the errors of the past is it possible to correct the tactics of the future.⁹

History of the Secret Society

The new imperialism after 1870 was quite different in tone from that which the Little Englanders had opposed earlier. The chief changes were that it was justified on grounds of moral duty and of social reform and not, as earlier, on grounds of missionary activity and material advantage. The man most responsible for this change was John Ruskin.¹⁰

Until 1870 there was no professorship of fine arts at Oxford, but in that year, thanks to the Slade bequest, John Ruskin was named to such a chair. He hit Oxford like an earthquake, not so much because he talked about fine arts, but because he talked also about the empire and England's downtrodden masses, and above all because he talked about all three of these things as moral issues. Until the end of the nineteenth century the poverty-stricken masses in the cities of England lived in want, ignorance, and crime very much as they have been described by Charles Dickens.¹¹

Ruskin spoke to the Oxford undergraduates as members of the privileged ruling class. He told them that they were the possessors of a magnificent tradition of education, beauty, rule of law, freedom, decency, and self-

⁶ The Anglo-American Establishment, page x

⁷ The Anglo-American Establishment, page ix

⁸ The Anglo-American Establishment, page xi

⁹ The Anglo-American Establishment, page xi

¹⁰ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

¹¹ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

discipline, but that this tradition could not be saved, and did not deserve to be saved, unless it could be extended to the lower classes in England itself and to the non-English masses throughout the world. Ruskin's message had a sensational impact. His inaugural lecture was copied out in long-hand by one undergraduate, Cecil Rhodes, who kept it with him for thirty years.¹²

Rhodes (1853-1902) feverishly exploited the diamond and goldfields of South Africa, rose to be prime minister of the Cape Colony (1890-1896), contributed money to political parties, controlled parliamentary seats both in England and in South Africa, and sought to win a strip of British territory across Africa from the Cape of Good Hope to Egypt and to join these two extremes together with telegraph line and ultimately with a Cape-to-Cairo Railway.¹³

Rhodes inspired devoted support for his goals from others in South Africa and in England. With financial support from Lord Rothschild and Alfred Beit, he was able to monopolize the diamond mines of South Africa as De Beers Consolidated Mines and to build up a great gold mining enterprise as Consolidated Gold Fields.¹⁴

In the middle 1890's Rhodes had a personal income of at least a million pounds sterling a year (then about five million dollars) which was spent so freely for his mysterious purposes that he was usually overdrawn on his account. **These purposes centered on his desire to federate the English-speaking peoples and to bring all the habitable portions of the world under their control.**¹⁵ For this purpose Rhodes left part of his great fortune to found the Rhodes Scholarships at Oxford in order to spread the English ruling class tradition throughout the English-speaking world as Ruskin had wanted.¹⁶

Among Ruskin's most devoted disciples at Oxford were a group of intimate friends including Arnold Toynbee, Alfred (later Lord) Milner, Arthur Glazebrook, George (later Sir George) Parkin, Philip Lyttelton Gell, and Henry (later Sir Henry) Birchenough. These were so moved by Ruskin that they devoted the rest of their lives to carrying out his ideas.¹⁷

¹² Tragedy and Hope, page 131

¹³ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

¹⁴ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

¹⁵ Throughout this document, unless otherwise noted, all **emphasis** in quoted text has been added.

¹⁶ Tragedy and Hope, page 130-131

¹⁷ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

This association was formally established on February 5, 1891, when Rhodes and Stead organized a secret society of which Rhodes had been dreaming for sixteen years. In this secret society Rhodes was to be leader; Stead, Brett (Lord Esher), and Milner were to form an executive committee; Arthur (Lord) Balfour, (Sir) Harry Johnston, Lord Rothschild, Albert (Lord) Grey, and others were listed as potential members of a "Circle of Initiates"; while there was to be an outer circle known as the "Association of Helpers" (later organized by Milner as the Round Table organization). Brett was invited to join this organization the same day and Milner a couple of weeks later, on his return from Egypt. Both accepted with enthusiasm. Thus, the central part of the secret society was established by March 1891. It continued to function as a formal group, although the outer circle was, apparently, not organized until 1909–1913.¹⁸

This was done on behalf of Lord Milner, the dominant Trustee of the Rhodes Trust in the two decades 1905–1925. The original purpose of these groups was to seek to federate the English-speaking world along lines laid down by Cecil Rhodes (1853–1902) and William T. Stead (1849–1912), and the money for the organizational work came originally from the Rhodes Trust.¹⁹

As governor-general and high commissioner of South Africa in the period 1897–1905, Milner recruited a group of young men, chiefly from Oxford and from Toynbee Hall, to assist him in organizing his administration. Through his influence these men were able to win influential posts in government and international finance and became the dominant influence in British imperial and foreign affairs up to 1939. Under Milner in South Africa they were known as Milner's Kindergarten until 1910. In 1909–1913 they organized semi-secret groups, known as Round Table Groups, in the chief British dependencies and the United States. These **still** function in eight countries.²⁰

The power and influence of this Rhodes–Milner group in British imperial affairs and in foreign policy since 1889, although not widely recognized, can hardly be exaggerated.²¹ It plotted the Jameson Raid of 1895; it caused the Boer War of 1899–1902; it set up and controls the Rhodes Trust; it created the Union of South Africa in 1906–1910; it established the South African periodical *The State* in 1908; it founded the British Empire periodical *The*

¹⁸ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

¹⁹ Tragedy and Hope, page 950

²⁰ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

²¹ Tragedy and Hope, page 133

Round Table in 1910, ... it has controlled The Times for more than fifty years, with the exception of the three years 1919–1922, it publicized the idea of and the name "British Commonwealth of Nations" in the period 1908–1918, it was the chief influence in Lloyd George's war administration in 1917–1919 and dominated the British delegation to the Peace Conference of 1919; it had a great deal to do with the formation and management of the League of Nations and of the system of mandates; it founded the Royal Institute of International Affairs in 1919 and still controls it; it was one of the chief influences on British policy toward Ireland, Palestine, and India in the period 1917–1945; it was a very important influence on the policy of appeasement of Germany during the years 1920–1940; and it controlled and still controls, to a very considerable extent, the sources and the writing of the history of British Imperial and foreign policy since the Boer War.²²

The more moderate Round Table group, including Lionel Curtis, Leopold Amery (who was the shadow of Lord Milner), Lord Lothian, Lord Brand, and Lord Astor, sought to weaken the League of Nations and destroy all possibility of collective security in order to strengthen Germany in respect to both France and the Soviet Union, and above all to free Britain from Europe in order to build up an "Atlantic bloc" of Great Britain, the British Dominions, and the United States. They prepared the way for this "Union" through the Rhodes Scholarship organization (of which Lord Milner was the head in 1905–1925 and Lord Lothian was secretary in 1925–1940), through the Round Table groups (which had been set up in the United States, India, and the British Dominions in 1910–1917), through the Chatham House organization, which set up Royal Institutes of International Affairs in all the dominions and a Council on Foreign Relations in New York, as well as through "Unofficial Commonwealth Relations Conferences" held irregularly, and the Institutes of Pacific Relations set up in various countries as autonomous branches of the Royal Institutes of International Affairs.²³

The varied character of the British imperial possessions, the backwardness of many of the native peoples involved, the independence of many of the white colonists overseas, and the growing international tension which culminated in the First World War made it impossible to carry out the plan for Imperial Federation, although the five colonies in Australia were joined into the Commonwealth of Australia in 1901 and the four colonies in

²² The Anglo–American Establishment, page 5

²³ Tragedy and Hope, page 582

South Africa were joined into the Union of South Africa in 1910.²⁴

As a result of complex and secret negotiations in which Lord Rosebery was the chief figure, Britain kept Uganda, Rhodes was made a privy councilor, Rosebery replaced his father-in-law, Lord Rothschild, in Rhodes's secret group and was made a Trustee under Rhodes's next (and last) will.²⁵

It would be expected that a Group which could number among its achievements such accomplishments as these would be a familiar subject for discussion among students of history and public affairs. In this case, the expectation is not realized, partly because of the deliberate policy of secrecy which this Group has adopted, partly because the Group itself is not closely integrated but rather appears as a series of overlapping circles or rings partly concealed by being hidden behind formally organized groups of no obvious political significance.²⁶

This organization has been able to conceal its existence quite successfully, and many of its most influential members, satisfied to possess the reality rather than the appearance of power, are unknown even to close students of British history. This is the more surprising when we learn that one of the chief methods by which this Group works has been through propaganda.²⁷

We might mention as an example that this group dominated *The Times* from 1890 to 1912, and has controlled it completely since 1912 (except for the years 1919–1922). Numerous other papers and journals have been under the control or influence of this group since 1889. They have also established and influenced numerous university and other chairs of imperial affairs and international relations.²⁸

In 1919 they founded the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) ... Similar Institutes of International Affairs were established in the chief British dominions and in the United States (where it is known as the Council on Foreign Relations) in the period 1919–1927. After 1925 a somewhat similar structure of organizations, known as the Institute of Pacific Relations, was set up in twelve countries holding territory in the Pacific area, the units in each British dominion existing on an interlocking

²⁴ Tragedy and Hope, page 133

²⁵ Tragedy and Hope, page 135

²⁶ The Anglo–American Establishment, page 5

²⁷ The Anglo–American Establishment, page 4

²⁸ Tragedy and Hope, page 133

basis with the Round Table Group and the Royal Institute of International Affairs in the same country.”²⁹

The Formation Of A Secret Group In England

Using Quigley’s work as a starting point, this next section will explore the historical record to gain a better understanding of the roots and purpose of this Secret Round Table Organization.

In 1870, a wealthy British socialist by the name of John Ruskin was appointed as professor of fine arts at Oxford University in London. He taught his students that the state must take control of the means of production and organize them for the good of the community as a whole. But he advocated placing control of the state into the hands of a single dictator. He said:

“My continual aim has been to show the eternal superiority of some men to others, sometimes even of one man to all others.”

Dr. Quigley tells us:

“Ruskin spoke to the Oxford undergraduates as members of the privileged ruling class. He told them that they were the possessors of a magnificent tradition of education, beauty, rule of law, freedom, decency, and self-discipline, but that this tradition could not be saved, and did not deserve to be saved, unless it could be extended to the lower classes in England itself and to the non-English masses throughout the world. Ruskin's message had a sensational impact. His inaugural lecture was copied out in long-hand by one undergraduate, Cecil Rhodes, who kept it with him for thirty years.”

Ruskin advocated a utopian society, and espoused theories, which by extension, furthered the teaching found in Plato’s Republic. Plato called for “...a ruling class with a powerful army to keep it in power and a society completely subordinate to the monolithic authority of the rulers.” Rhodes was also greatly influenced by Windom Reade’s book *The Martyrdom of Man*, published in 1872, which advocated Darwinism and the tremendous suffering that man must undergo, which was epitomized in the phrase “the survival of the fittest.” The book said that the “inevitable progress of man (was) to perfection.” Rhodes incorporated this rationalization into his thinking.

Cecil Rhodes went on to make one of the world's greatest fortunes. With help from international bankers, he was able to establish a virtual monopoly over all of the diamonds that came from South Africa and most of the gold as well. Throughout his entire life, Cecil Rhodes spent most of his vast income to advance the ruling-class ideas of John Ruskin.

Rhodes dreamed about starting an organization to preserve and extend the British Empire. He said in 1877:

“It is our duty to seize every opportunity of acquiring more territory ... more territory simply means more of the Anglo-Saxon race, more of the best, the

²⁹ Tragedy and Hope, page 132

most human, most honorable race the world possesses ... the absorption of the greater portion of the world under our rule simply means the end of all wars.”

It was this mentality that fueled his desire to unite the world under one form of government. Many people are familiar with the world-famous Rhodes Scholarships which were established to promote the less controversial aspects of John Ruskin's dream, but very few are familiar with the fact that Cecil Rhodes established a secret society to promote the rest of that dream.³⁰

In 1877, while still studying at Oxford (it took him 8 years because of having to run the diamond mines), he wrote the first of seven wills, in which each became a separate and legally binding document. It called for the establishment of a “secret society with but one object- the furtherance of the British Empire and the bringing of the whole uncivilized world under British rule, for the recovery of the United States, (and) for ... making the Anglo-Saxon race but one Empire.” Frank Aydelotte, a founding member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and the American Secretary to the Rhodes Trustees, wrote in his book, *American Rhodes Scholarships*: “In his first will Rhodes states his aim still more specifically: ‘The extension of British rule throughout the world ... the foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible and promote the interests of humanity’.”

The first instrument created by Rhodes and his associates was the secret society itself. Using the Jesuits and the Illuminati (which will be analyzed further in chapter V), and the Masons (of which he was a member),³¹ as organizational models, Rhodes, Lord Alfred Milner; other Ruskin associates at Oxford; joined together to form a secret group, on February 5, 1891.³² Dr. Quigley explains:

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

Here, then, was the way the secret society was constructed, at the center, there is a tiny group in complete control with one man as the undisputed leader. Next comes a circle of secondary leadership that, for the most part, is completely unaware of an inner core. They are led to believe that they are the inner-most ring. In time, it would be built from the center out, forming additional rings of organization. Those in the outer echelons may never even suspect an inner control. The center ring was initially composed of Rhodes and just three other individuals, whom would control all of the outer rings. Of the three individuals who shared the inner ring with Rhodes, Alfred Milner (later awarded the title Lord Milner) became the strongest.

After monopolizing the diamond and gold industries, the enormous wealth and

³⁰ Tragedy and Hope, page 130

³¹ Wikipedia, Cecil Rhodes

³² The Anglo-American Establishment, page 3

influence that Rhodes secured enabled him to steadily increase The Secret Round Table Group's reach. Quigley explains:

"Rhodes feverishly exploited the diamond and goldfields of South Africa, rose to be Prime Minister of the Cape Colony (1890–1896), contributed money to political parties, controlled parliamentary seats both in England and in South Africa, and sought to win a strip of British territory across Africa from the Cape of Good Hope to Egypt."³³

Not surprisingly, Rhodes didn't feel any moral conflict about his imperial desires or the methods that he used to attain them. He viewed himself as superior to those he intended to subjugate. In his last will and testament, he wrote:

"I contend that we are the finest race in the world and that the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race. Just fancy those parts that are at present inhabited by the most despicable specimens of human beings what an alteration there would be if they were brought under Anglo-Saxon influence."³⁴

A PBS series titled Queen Victoria's Empire credits Rhodes with inspiring a burst of "imperialistic fervor" in Britain. Near the end of the piece, it says of Rhodes:

"Cecil John Rhodes...became the greatest empire builder of his generation. To fund his dreams of conquest, he embarked on a ruthless pursuit of diamonds, gold and power that made him the most formidable and the most hated man in Africa."

But this story is much bigger than the effect Cecil Rhodes had on Africa or British Imperialism over a century ago. Obviously, to properly tell the story of this secret society, a handful of important individuals like Rhodes do need to be mentioned. However, to be clear, these individuals are not the main focus of this document. **Instead, our focus will fall mainly on the instruments that Rhodes and his followers created or infiltrated, as well as the tactics they employed to secretly further their goals. (As powerful as any one individual might have been or currently is within this Network, the Instruments and tactics are where the real power lies. Men eventually die; instruments and tactics can live on indefinitely.)** Dr. Quigley further explained:

"The goals which Rhodes and Milner sought and the methods by which they hoped to achieve them were so similar by 1902 that the two are almost indistinguishable. Both sought to **unite the world...in a federal structure** around Britain. Both felt that this goal could best be achieved by a secret band of men united to one another by devotion to the common cause...Both felt that this band should pursue its goal **by secret political and economic influence behind the scenes and by the control of journalistic, educational, and**

³³ Tragedy and Hope, page 130

³⁴ Cecil Rhodes "Confession of Faith, June 2, 1877

propaganda agencies.”³⁵

To put it more bluntly, the goal of this Round Table Network was to eventually establish an authoritarian world super-state with them as the rulers. They saw England, not as a European power, but as an Atlantic power, and wanted to have a federation of the English-speaking world, which would be controlled by them.

With the death of Rhodes in 1902, Lord Milner obtained control of Rhodes’s money and was able to use it to lubricate the workings of his propaganda machine. This is exactly as Rhodes had wanted and had intended. Milner was Rhodes’s heir, and both men knew it...In 1898...Rhodes said, “I support Milner absolutely without reserve. If he says peace, I say peace; if he says war, I say war. Whatever happens, I say ditto to Milner.”³⁶

While he was Governor-General and High Commissioner of South Africa from 1897–1905, Milner (one of the most influential men in the political and financial circles in England) began to recruit young men, mostly from Oxford and Toynbee Hall, to help run his Administration. He used his influence to place the new recruits into positions of power.

Through his influence these men were able to win influential posts in government and international finance and became the dominant influence in British imperial and foreign affairs...Under Milner in South Africa they were known as Milner’s Kindergarten until 1910.

The Anglo-American Establishment describes the Network’s basic system of recruitment and placement this way:

“The inner circle of this group, because of its close contact with Oxford and with All Souls, was in a position to notice able young undergraduates at Oxford. These were admitted to All Souls and at once given opportunities in public life and in writing or teaching, to test their abilities and loyalty to the ideals of the Milner Group. If they passed both of these tests, they were gradually admitted to the Milner Group’s great fiefs such as the Royal Institute of International Affairs, The Times, The Round Table, or, on the larger scene, to the ranks of the Foreign or Colonial Offices.”³⁷

Between 1909–1913, Milner, and others in the inner circle of this Secret Society used these recruits to establish semi-secret groups, known as “Round Table Groups”, in England; the main British dependencies, South Africa, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and India; and the United States. They were all controlled from England, and maintained contact through personal correspondence, frequent trips, and a quarterly journal begun in 1910, called The Round Table. The membership consisted of men who not only had a vast amount of political clout, but some who served in the highest levels of the British government.³⁸

³⁵ The Anglo-American Establishment, page 42

³⁶ The Anglo-American Establishment, page 49

³⁷ The Anglo-American Establishment, page 91

³⁸ Tragedy and Hope, page 132

Early Accomplishments of this Secret Network

This system proved to be very effective. It allowed the growing Network to remain hidden, while its founders exercised a level of control that can “hardly be exaggerated.” As proof, Quigley provides a partial list of the group’s so-called accomplishments. Among them:

- The Second Boer War (1899–1902)
- The partitioning of Ireland, Palestine, and India
- Formation and management of the League of Nations
- British “appeasement” policy (empowerment policy) of Hitler
- Control of The Times, Oxford, and those who write “the history of British Imperial and foreign policy”

Quigley goes on to say:

“It would be expected that a Group which could number among its achievements such accomplishments as these would be a familiar subject for discussion among students of history...In this case, the expectation is not realized.”³⁹

Something else that is “not realized” when dispassionately rattling off a list of “accomplishments” like those above is the true gravity and life-altering impact of those events.

To provide a little perspective, we’ll briefly cover one of the aforementioned accomplishments here.

The Second Boer War

Rhodes, needed money to fund his global-domination agenda, and he had no problem using his dominant influence over British Imperial policy (the ability to direct British military force) against the Boers in South Africa to seize their valuable resources.

It should be noted that his first attempt to grab Boer land and resources, a scheme known as the Jameson Raid, failed miserably. And though he and his Network had clearly directed the conspiracy and though the leaders he selected to overthrow the Boer government were caught in the act, the consequences of the attempted coup weren’t sufficient to prevent a more ambitious conspiracy (the Second Boer War) that followed a few years later.

Side Note: Cecil’s brother, Frank Rhodes, was among the leaders who were captured and tried by the Boer government for the Jameson Raid. If there are any doubts about the benefits of being among the ruling class, this should settle the issue:

“For conspiring with Dr. Jameson...members of the Reform Committee...were tried in the Transvaal courts and found guilty of high treason. The four leaders were sentenced to death by hanging, but this sentence was next day commuted to 15 years’ imprisonment; and in June 1896 [six months later] the other members of the Committee were released on payment of £2,000 each in fines,

³⁹ The Anglo-American Establishment, page 5

all of which were paid by Cecil Rhodes.”⁴⁰

In the years following the failed Jameson Raid, the Network began agitating for British annexation of the Boer Republics. After a sufficient British military buildup and failed negotiations, the inevitable finally came.

And war they did have, with all of the injustice and brutality that one should expect: theft, subjugation, suffering, and murder. Though the Network and its supporters expected a fast and easy victory over the “trumpety little” states that dared to challenge the British Empire, such was not the case. The Boers were skilled hunters and competent fighters. As weeks turned into months, and months turned into years, the Boers (determined to regain the independence of their own territory) drove the British to employ a scorched–earth policy.

As British troops swept the countryside, they systematically destroyed crops, burned homesteads and farms, poisoned wells, and interned Boer and African women, children and workers in concentration camps.

The Boer War concentration camp system was the first time that a whole nation had been systematically targeted, and the first in which some whole regions had been depopulated. Although most black Africans were not considered by the British to be hostile, many tens of thousands were also forcibly removed from Boer areas and also placed in concentration camps.

Ultimately, the concentration camp system proved more deadly than the battlefield. By war’s end, nearly 50 percent of all Boer children under sixteen years of age had “died of starvation, disease and exposure in the concentration camps.” All told, approximately 25 percent of the Boer inmate population died, and total civilian deaths in the camps (mostly women and children) reached twenty–six thousand.⁴¹

Sadly, these numbers account for only Boer civilians killed. In all, the death toll of the Second Boer War exceeded seventy thousand lives, with more than twenty–five thousand combatants killed and an additional twenty thousand Africans, 75 percent of whom died in the British concentration camps. But, of course, this was only just the beginning and a small price to pay for this Secret Network. The defeated republics were absorbed into the empire and were eventually folded into the Union of South Africa (also a creation of the Secret Round Table Network, which served as a British ally during the two World Wars).⁴²

Hopefully, this short outline of the Second Boer War adds some depth to one of the early “accomplishments” of Rhodes and his fellow conspirators. Factor in the immeasurable suffering of some of their other so–called accomplishments, like the million or so who died when they decided to partition India, or the millions more who died as a result of their Hitler–empowerment project, and Quigley’s assertion that this group is “one of the most important facts of the twentieth century” is hard to deny.

⁴⁰ Wikipedia, Jameson Raid

⁴¹ Wikipedia, Second Boer War

⁴² Wikipedia, Second Boer War

As the British government suffered the political consequences of the Network's decisions, and as the British citizenry and soldiers paid the costs in blood and treasure, the secret society that Rhodes created was able to operate without fear of direct repercussions. The British government was now one of its instruments. Oxford, The Times, the League of Nations, and the Royal Institute for International Affairs (to name a few) were also its instruments. On the surface, each of these appeared unconnected. Beneath the surface, each was dominated by the same group of individuals.

In a rare moment of honest criticism, Quigley warns his readers:

“No country that values its safety should allow...that a small number of men should be able to wield such power in administration and politics, should be given almost complete control over the publication of the documents relating to their actions, should be able to exercise such influence over the avenues of information that create public opinion.

Such power, whatever the goals at which it may be directed, is too much to be entrusted safely to any group.”⁴³

This Secret Network Comes To America

Dr. Quigley reveals in detail the origination of this secret organization in the United States:

“[T]he American branch of this organization (sometimes called the 'Eastern Establishment') has played a very significant role in the history of the United States in the last generation.⁴⁴

There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international Anglophile network which operates, to some extent, in the way the ... 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. I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies (notably to its belief that England was an Atlantic rather than a European Power and must be allied, or even federated, with the United States and must remain isolated from Europe), but in general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to

⁴³ The Anglo-American Establishment, page 197

⁴⁴ Tragedy and Hope, page 950

remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known.⁴⁵

Money for the widely ramified activities of this organization came originally from the associates and followers of Cecil Rhodes...Since 1925 there have been substantial contributions from wealthy individuals and from foundations and firms associated with the international banking fraternity, especially the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, and other organizations associated with J. P. Morgan, the Rockefeller and Whitney families, and the associates of Lazard Brothers and of Morgan, Grenfell, and Company.⁴⁶

On this basis...there grew up in the twentieth century a power structure between London and New York which penetrated deeply into university life, the press, and the practice of foreign policy. In England the center was the Round Table Group, while in the United States it was J. P. Morgan and Company or its local branches in Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland.⁴⁷ The chief backbone of this organization grew up along the already existing financial cooperation running from the Morgan Bank in New York to a group of international financiers in London led by Lazard Brothers.⁴⁸

At the end of the war of 1914, it became clear that the organization of this system had to be greatly extended. Once again the task was entrusted to Lionel Curtis who established, in England and each dominion, a front organization to the existing local Round Table Group. This front organization, called the Royal Institute of International Affairs, had as its nucleus in each area the existing submerged Round Table Group. **In New York it was known as the Council on Foreign Relations, and was a front for J. P. Morgan and Company in association with the very small American Round Table Group.**⁴⁹

Let us review what Quigley cautiously exposed, which is one of the best kept secrets of all time. In both *Tragedy and Hope* and *The Anglo-American Establishment*, Quigley revealed in very extensive detail the existence of a 'secret network:'

"I know of the operation of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its

⁴⁵ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 950

⁴⁶ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 951

⁴⁷ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 953

⁴⁸ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 951

⁴⁹ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 951-952

instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies...but in general my chief difference of opinion is that **it wishes to remain unknown**, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known.”⁵⁰

Dr. Quigley also revealed the purpose of the formation of this Network which was to establish dominion over all “habitable portions of the world”.⁵¹

“Rhodes inspired devoted support for his goals from others in South Africa and in England. With financial support from Lord Rothschild...he was able to monopolize the diamond mines of South Africa ... and...build up a great gold mining enterprise... In the middle 1890's Rhodes had a personal income of at least a million pounds sterling a year ...which was spent so freely for his mysterious purposes that he was usually overdrawn on his account. **These purposes centered on his desire to federate the English-speaking peoples and to bring all the habitable portions of the world under their control.** For this purpose Rhodes left part of his great fortune to found the Rhodes Scholarships at Oxford in order to spread the English ruling class tradition throughout the English-speaking world as Ruskin had wanted. Among Ruskin's most devoted disciples at Oxford...**they devoted the rest of their lives to carrying out his ideas.**”⁵²

Dr. Quigley points out that, during the past 200 years, while the peoples of the world gradually were winning their political freedom from monarchies, the major banking families of the world were nullifying the trend toward representative government by setting up new dynasties of political control, but behind the scenes, in the form of international financial combines. These banking dynasties had learned that all governments—whether they be monarchies or democracies—must borrow money in times of emergency, and that, by providing such funds from their own private resources—with strings attached, of course— gradually they could bring both kings and democratic leaders under their control. Dr. Quigley believed that people should be more familiar with the identities of these clever banking dynasties. They include such names as Baring, Hambros, Lazard, Erlangcr, Warburg, Schroder, Seligman, Speyers, Mirabaud, Mallet, Fould, Lehman, and above all, Rothschild, Rockefeller and Morgan.

It should be noted that, while the Rothschilds and other Jewish families cooperated together in these ventures, this was by no means a Jewish monopoly as some have alleged. Men of finance of many nationalities and many religious and non-religious backgrounds collaborated together to create this super-structure of hidden power. Its essence was not race, nor religion, nor nationality. It was simply a passion for control over other human beings.

These are not the same as the local commercial bankers with whom we deal with in everyday life. International bankers deal, not with the general public, but with the

⁵⁰ Tragedy and Hope, page 950

⁵¹ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

⁵² Tragedy and Hope, page 131

industrial giants of the world, with other financial institutions, and especially with governments.

Dr. Quigley cites a famous remark by Walter Rathenau, a former Foreign Minister of Germany:

“...a relatively small number of bankers were in positions of immense influence in European and American economic life. As early as 1909, Walter Rathenau, who was in a position to know (since he had inherited from his father control of the German General Electric Company and held scores of directorships himself), said, **“Three hundred men, all of whom know one another, direct the economic destiny of Europe and choose their successors from among themselves.”**⁵³

Dr. Quigley informs us further that in America this secret power structure was dominated by Wall Street Financiers:

“On this basis, which was originally financial and goes back to George Peabody,⁵⁴ there grew up in the twentieth century a power structure between London and New York which penetrated deeply into university life, the press, and the practice of foreign policy. In England, the center was the Round Table Group, while in the United States it was J. P. Morgan and Company or its local branches in Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland.⁵⁵

This 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 Ivy League colleges rested on the fact that the large endowments of these institutions required constant consultation with the financiers of Wall Street..J. P. Morgan and his associates were the most significant figures in policymaking at Harvard, Columbia, and to a lesser extent, Yale . . . The chief officials of these universities were beholden to these financial powers and usually owed their jobs to them.⁵⁶

The American branch of this “English Establishment” exerted much of its

⁵³ Tragedy and Hope, page 61

⁵⁴ While we're on the topic of front groups, it's worth noting that Rothschild interests likely used Morgan as a front man. In *The Secrets of the Federal Reserve*, Eustace Mullins writes on page 49: “Soon after he arrived in London, George Peabody was surprised to be summoned to an audience with the gruff Baron Nathan Mayer Rothschild. Without mincing words, Rothschild revealed to Peabody, that much of the London aristocracy openly disliked Rothschild and refused his invitations. He proposed that Peabody, a man of modest means, be established as a lavish host whose entertainments would soon be the talk of London. Rothschild would, of course, pay all the bills. Peabody accepted the offer, and soon became known as the most popular host in London. It's hardly surprising that the most popular host in London would also become a very successful businessman, particularly with the House of Rothschild supporting him behind the scenes.” Quigley acknowledges that the Morgan firm originated as George Peabody and Company (on pages 326 and 945 of *Tragedy and Hope*).

⁵⁵ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 953

⁵⁶ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 937

influence through five American newspapers (The New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Christian Science Monitor, the Washington Post, and the lamented Boston Evening Transcript). In fact, the editor of the Christian Science Monitor was the chief American correspondent (anonymously)...It might be mentioned that the existence of this Wall Street, Anglo-American axis is quite obvious once it is pointed out.”⁵⁷

Quigley informs us further that this wealthy “Anglophile network” cooperates with any group that can help it achieve its goal.⁵⁸ (This includes Communists, which, on the surface, would seem to be the sworn enemy of the super-wealthy.) He chronicles how this Secret Network formed in the late 1800s in England and immediately began creating front groups. By 1919, it had formed the Royal Institute of International Affairs (also known as Chatham House), and it went on to create other extremely powerful institutes within “the chief British dominions and in the United States.”⁵⁹ Hiding behind these front groups, this Network began secretly exercising its power.

In the United States the main institute for this Round Table Group was named the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), which Quigley described as “a front for J. P. Morgan and company.”⁶⁰ Before long, the Network expanded its operations; spreading like cancer into our universities, media, and especially government “foreign policy.”

If the idea of powerful financial elites joining a secret international network to establish dominion over all “habitable portions of the world” and successfully penetrating “into university life, the press, and the practice of foreign policy” sounds like something you should have heard about, you’re right. But the secret to why you haven’t is contained in the story itself. (The extensive “penetration” of universities, the press, and the government which will be covered in great detail on later chapters) has proven quite useful to those who wish “to remain unknown.”). Notwithstanding, the fact that the real rulers in Washington are invisible, and exercise power from behind the scenes is surprisingly well-documented in the historical record.

Courageous attempts to sound a warning as a part of the documented record:

In 1836, John C. Calhoun, Vice President under Andrew Jackson, warned in a speech of a cohesive network of powerful interests that even back then was already “steadily becoming the government itself:

“A power has risen up in the government greater than the people themselves, consisting of many, and various, and powerful interests, combined into one mass, and held together by the cohesive power of the vast surplus in the banks. This mighty combination will be opposed to any change; and it is to be feared that, such is its influence, no measure to which it is opposed can become a law, however expedient and necessary, and that the public money will remain in their possession, to be disposed of, not as the public interest, but as theirs may dictate. The time, indeed, seems fast approaching, when no law can pass, nor

⁵⁷ Tragedy and Hope, page 953

⁵⁸ Tragedy and Hope, page 950

⁵⁹ Tragedy and Hope, page 132

⁶⁰ Tragedy and Hope, page 952

any honor be conferred, from the chief magistrate to the tide-waiter, without the assent of this powerful and interested combination, which is steadily becoming the government itself, to the utter subversion of the authority of the people”.⁶¹

Theodore Roosevelt, in a speech on April 19, 1906 warned of the existence of an invisible government:

“Behind the ostensible government sits no allegiance and acknowledging no responsibility to the people. To destroy this **invisible government**, to befoul the unholy alliance between corrupt business and corrupt politics is the first task of the statesmanship of the day.”

Former New York Mayor, John Hylan highlighted Theodore Roosevelt’s warning, and further explained that **Rockefeller** and a small group of powerful **international bankers** were at the center of this invisible government:

“The warning of Theodore Roosevelt has much timeliness today, for the real menace of our republic is this invisible government which like a giant octopus sprawls its slimy length over City, State, and nation... It seizes in its long and powerful tentacles our executive officers, our legislative bodies, our schools, our courts, our newspapers, and every agency created for the public protection... To depart from mere generalizations, let me say that **at the head of this octopus are the Rockefeller-Standard Oil interest and a small group of powerful banking houses generally referred to as the international Bankers**. The little coterie of powerful international Bankers virtually run the United States government for their own selfish purposes. They practically control both parties, write political platforms, make catspaws of party leaders, use the leading men of private organizations, and resort to every device to place in nomination for high public office only such candidates as will be amenable to the dictates of corrupt big business...”

William McAdoo, Former U.S. Representative, New York City Police Commissioner, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and President Wilson’s national campaign vice-chairman, wrote in 1912:

“The fact is that there is a serious danger of this country becoming a Pluto-democracy; that is, a sham republic with the real government in the hands of a small clique of enormously wealthy men, who speak through their money, and whose influence, even today, radiates to every corner of the United States.”

Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, wrote in 1913:

“Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men’s views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above

⁶¹ John C. Calhoun, Vice President (1825–1832 under Andrew Jackson) and U.S. Senator, from a speech given on May 27, 1836

their breath when they speak in condemnation of it.”

In a letter dated November 21, 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt wrote to confidant Colonel Edward House:

“The real truth of the matter is, as you and I know, that a financial element in the large centers has owned the government ever since the days of Andrew Jackson.”⁶²

According to famed historian Ferdinand Lundberg expert in the history of American wealth and power:

“The United States is owned and dominated today by a hierarchy of its sixty richest families, buttressed by no more than ninety families of lesser wealth... These families are the living center of the modern industrial oligarchy which dominates the United States, functioning discreetly under a de jure democratic form of government behind which a de facto government, absolutist and plutocratic in its lineaments, has gradually taken form since the Civil War. This de facto government is actually the government of the United States – informal, invisible, shadowy. It is the government of money in a dollar democracy.”⁶³

In the July 26th, 1936 issue of The New York Times" Joseph Kennedy, former Ambassador to the UK, first chairman of the SEC, politician, patriarch of the Kennedy family, admitted: **Fifty men have run America, and that's a high figure.**" In 1952, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, said: **“The real rulers in Washington are invisible, and exercise power from behind the scenes.”**

Senator William E. Jenner, first veteran of World War II to be elected to the U.S. Senate, in a congressional speech, February 23, 1954, he warned:

“Outwardly we have a Constitutional government. We have operating within our government and political system, another body representing another form of government, a bureaucratic elite which believes our Constitution is outmoded and is sure that it is the winning side... All the strange developments in foreign policy agreements may be traced to this group who are going to make us over to suit their pleasure This political action group has its own local political support organizations, its own pressure groups, its own vested interests, its foothold within our government, and its own propaganda apparatus.”

⁶² As quoted in F.D.R.: His Personal Letters.

⁶³ Ferdinand Lundberg, in his journalist expose, America’s Sixty Families, 1937

II

THE TAKEOVER OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

In this chapter, we'll take a closer look at The Round Table Groups' successful infiltration into the government of the United States.

As set out above, two powerful men from Britain, Cecil Rhodes and Lord Milner, played an indispensable role in the creation and expansion of this Secret Network. In his first will, Rhodes resolved to create a global power so great that it would "render wars impossible." Not surprisingly, this goal to create an unconquerable global power required "the ultimate control of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire."⁶⁴

After the death of Cecil Rhodes, the inner core of his secret society fell to the hands of Lord Alfred Milner, Governor-General and High Commissioner of South Africa. As director of a number of public banks "and corporate precursor of England's Midland Bank, he became one of the greatest political and financial powers in the world.

Milner led the group until his death in 1925, when the leadership was taken over by Lionel Curtis, the British High Commissioner to South Africa and Secretary to Sir Alfred Milner. Curtis advocated British imperialism, and the establishment of a World State. He believed that "men should strive to build the Kingdom of Heaven here upon this earth, and that the leadership in that task must fall first and foremost upon the English-speaking peoples."⁶⁵

The CFR became the American headquarters for the Round Table Group

In 1921 the secret society set up an inner circle of initiates which, in turn, established Round Table Groups in the "chief British dependencies⁶⁶ and the United States"—the Round Table Group in the United States promptly created an external organization known as the **CFR (the Council on Foreign Relations)**. It is through this organizational ring and then outward through tax-exempt foundations, universities, and government agencies that has dominated the domestic and foreign policies of the United States for almost a hundred years, as will be shown. And lest there is any doubt as to who is behind the CFR, Dr. Quigley tells us bluntly:

"In New York it was known as the Council on Foreign Relations, and was a front for J. P. Morgan and Company in association with the very small American Round Table Group."

The CFR was established in 1921 through the efforts of Col. Edward Mandell House, confidant extraordinaire to President Woodrow Wilson and about whom Wilson said, "Mr. House is my second personality... His thoughts and mine are one." House—as a member of the Round Table Group—was the initiator of the effort to establish this

⁶⁴ The Anglo-American Establishment, page 33

⁶⁵ Tragedy and Hope, page 147

⁶⁶ In 1919, the Secret Network established a front organization for the Round Table, known as the Royal Institute of International Affairs, which, after 1923, was headquartered at Chatham House (and is sometimes referred to as the Chatham House Study Group) at 10 St. James' Square in London. Today you'll also find the Institut des Relations Internationales in Belgium, the Institute for International Affairs in the Netherlands, the Institute for International Affairs in Rome, the Norwegian Institute for Foreign Affairs, the French Institute of International Relations, the Australian Institute of International Affairs, and many others.

American branch of the Secret Network. Prior to 1921, House's Round Table Group, "the Inquiry," called the CFR the "Institute of International Affairs."

The Council on Foreign Relations, and the Institute of International Affairs, both supporters of Wilson, strongly supported the League of Nations. However, the Round Table wanted to weaken the League by eliminating the possibility of collective security in order to strengthen Germany, and isolate England from Europe so an Atlantic power could be established, consisting of England, the British Dominions, and the United States.⁶⁷ In 1921, when it became apparent that the United States wasn't going to join the League, the Council on Foreign Relations was incorporated on July 21st, consisting of members from both groups, and others who had participated in the 1919 Paris Peace Talks. The name change was made so that the American branch of the Round Table would appear to be a separate entity, and not connected to the organization in England.

Led by House, who wrote the CFR Charter, they were financed by prominent international bankers Paul Warburg (CFR founding member), Jacob Schiff, William Averell Harriman (CFR founding member), Frank Vanderlip, Bernard Baruch, Nelson Aldrich, J. P. Morgan, Otto Kahn (CFR founding member), Albert H. Wiggin (CFR founding member), Herbert H. Lehman (CFR founding member), and John Rockefeller.

The CFR, from behind the curtain, has dominated this nation for decades

Since its founding in 1921, the CFR has been The Round Table Groups' chief link to the U.S. government. The CFR while remaining largely unknown to the public, has exercised decisive impact on U.S. policy, especially foreign policy, for numerous decades:

Pulitzer Prize winner Theodore White said that the CFR's "roster of members has for a generation, under Republican and Democratic administrations alike, been the chief recruiting ground for cabinet-level officials in Washington." The Christian Science Monitor once observed that "there is a constant flow of its members from private life to public service. Almost half of the council's members have been invited to assume official government positions or to act as consultants at one time or another." Indeed, Joseph Kraft, writing in Harper's, called the Council a "school for statesmen." David Halberstam puts it more wryly: "They walk in one door as acquisitive businessmen and come out the other door as statesmen-figures." In his New York Times magazine article, Anthony Lukas observed: "... everyone knows how fraternity brothers can help other brothers climb the ladder of life. If you want to make foreign policy, there's no better fraternity to belong to than the Council..." This "fraternity" of Insiders has been so successful that its members have virtually dominated every administration in Washington since the days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The New York Times wrote: "The Council's membership includes some of the most influential men in government, business, education and the press (and) for nearly half a century has made substantial contributions to the basic concepts of American foreign policy." Newsweek called the Council's leadership the "foreign policy establishment of the U.S." Well-known political observer and writer Theodore White said: "The Council counts among its members probably more important names in American life than any other private group in the country."

⁶⁷ The Anglo-American Establishment, 197-200

In Sen. Barry Goldwater's 1979 memoir, *With No Apologies*, he wrote: "When a new President comes on board, there is a great turnover in personnel but no change in policy." That's because CFR members have occupied the major policy-making positions under every Administration. Virtually every secretary of state, FBI Director, CIA Director, Treasury Secretary, Defense Secretary, key U.S. national security and foreign policy adviser, and most federal department heads, a fantastic percentage of the President's Cabinet, Under-Secretaries, the Federal Reserve Board, Ambassadors to other countries. Supreme Court Justices and presidential advisors have been CFR members.

As Quigley discovered, the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) is nothing more than a front group for the Round Table Network.⁶⁸ This being the case, and since the objective of this Network was "**centered on his desire to federate the English-speaking peoples and to bring all the habitable portions of the world under their control**"⁶⁹ its position on national sovereignty, as documented in the historical record, is predictable.

Admiral Chester Ward, former Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy, was a CFR member for sixteen years before resigning in disgust. In 1975, he stated that the Council's objective is:

"submergence of U.S. sovereignty into an all-powerful one-world government." He also said: "This lust to surrender the sovereignty and independence of the United States is pervasive throughout most of the membership." "In the entire CFR lexicon, there is no term of revulsion carrying a meaning so deep as 'America First.'"⁷⁰

Admiral Ward further explained:

"The Objective of the influential majority of members of CFR has not changed since its founding in 1922, more than 50 years ago. In the 50th anniversary issue of *Foreign Affairs* [the official quarterly publication of the CFR], the first and leading article was written by CFR member Kingman Brewster, Jr., entitled *Reflections on Our National Purpose*." He did not back away from defining it: **our national purpose should be to abolish our nationality.**"⁷¹

⁶⁸ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 951-952

⁶⁹ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 131

⁷⁰ Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward, *Kissinger on the Couch* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1975), 144-50.

⁷¹ Admiral Chester Ward, US Navy (Ret.), was a longtime member of the CFR who came out and testified against the organization. As a hotshot youngish Admiral, he had become Judge Advocate General of the Navy. As a "man on the rise" he was invited to become a member of the -prestigious- CFR. The Establishment obviously assumed that Admiral Ward, like so many hundreds before him, would succumb to the flattery of being invited into the inner sanctums of the Establishment, and that through subtle appeals to personal ambition would quickly fall in line. The Insiders badly underestimated the toughness and stern character of Admiral Ward. He soon became a vocal opponent of the organization.

Here are a few choice quotes from other CFR members:

“The house of world order will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down...an end run around national sovereignty, **eroding it piece by piece**, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault.”—CFR member Richard Gardner

“**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.”—CFR member James Paul Warburg⁷²

“Some dilution of the sovereignty system as it prevails in the world today must take place...to the immediate disadvantage of those nations which now possess the preponderance of power...**The United States must be prepared to make sacrifices...in setting up a world politico-economic order.**”—CFR member Foster Dulles

Again, this policy toward national sovereignty shouldn't come as a surprise. The CFR is simply a creation of the Round Table Groups, and, as such, it was created to help the organization achieve its goals. And though the CFR is just one of many instruments in the Network's arsenal, it is among the most powerful. Even though CFR members constitute only about .0015 percent of the U.S. population, they have held, and currently hold, an inexplicably high percentage of the most influential positions in our society.

The CFR has a formal membership of almost 5000 elite personalities. Every member was handpicked by David Rockefeller, who headed the inner circle of the CFR until his death in 2017. The CFR headquarters and library is located in the five-story Howard Pratt mansion (a gift from Pratt's widow, who was a heir to the Standard Oil fortune) at 58 E. 68th Street, in New York City (on the corner of fashionable Park Ave. and 68th Street), on the opposite corner of the Soviet Embassy to the United Nations.⁷³

During its almost 100 years of existence, the CFR was almost never mentioned by any of the moguls of the mass media. And when you realize that the membership of the CFR includes top executives and journalists from all the major media companies to include the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, the Knight newspaper chain, Chicago Daily News, The Christian Science Monitor, Harpers, Look, The Encyclopedia Britannic, Associated Press, NBC, ABC, FOX, CBS, PBS, Time, Life, Fortune, Business Week, Newsweek, U.S. News World Report, the MGM, The Motion Picture Association of America; they include directors of the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment Fund; and virtually all other key media outlets, you can be sure that such anonymity is not accidental; it is deliberate. The average American has never heard of the CFR, yet it is the unseen government of

⁷²This was a statement to Congress, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Revision of the United Nations Charter: Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, February 17th, 1950. Father was banker Paul Warburg, who was instrumental in the creation of the Council on Foreign Relations and Federal Reserve System).

⁷³ A searchable copy of the historical Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) membership roster can be found: [https://archive.org/download/2012bilderbergmeetingsspecialreport171/council%20on%20foreign%20relations%20%20membership%20rosters%20\(1922-2013\)-1,050.pdf](https://archive.org/download/2012bilderbergmeetingsspecialreport171/council%20on%20foreign%20relations%20%20membership%20rosters%20(1922-2013)-1,050.pdf)

the United States. Although the membership of the CFR is a veritable "Who's Who" in big business and the media, probably only one person in a thousand is familiar with the organization itself and even fewer are aware of its real purposes.

Again, almost all of America's leadership has come from this small group. That includes presidents and their advisors, cabinet members, ambassadors, board members of the Federal Reserve System, directors of the largest banks and investment houses, presidents of universities, and heads of metropolitan newspapers, news services, and TV networks.

The CFR advocates the creation of a world 'government'

In a 1996 editorial, the Boston Herald called the Council's members "foreign-policy fuzzy thinkers who worship world government."⁷⁴ Congress's Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (the Reece Committee) stated that the CFR's "productions are not objective but are directed overwhelmingly at promoting the globalist concept."⁷⁵

But we need not rely on critics to establish that the CFR advocates world government. The CFR publishes the influential journal *Foreign Affairs*. The following are typical of its pronouncements: In 1993, F. A. Kenichi Ohmae stated in *Foreign Affairs*:

"The nation state has become an unnatural, even dysfunctional unit for organizing human activity and managing economic endeavor."⁷⁶

In its first year of publication, 1922, *Foreign Affairs* declared:

"Obviously there is going to be no peace or prosperity for mankind so long as it remains divided into fifty or sixty independent states. . . The real problem today is that of world government."⁷⁷

Note well the words "peace" and "prosperity" –the CFR has consistently paired them to promote an all-powerful world government during the last century. The ultimate implication of this is that all power would be centralized in a single global authority; national identities and boundaries would be eliminated.

British Historian Arnold J. Toynbee (a high-ranking member of the Secret Round Table Network), left little doubt when he said:

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

⁷⁴ Boston Herald, "UN Not Immune to Criticism," August 27, 1996.

⁷⁵ Report, Special House Committee to Investigate Tax-Free Foundations, 1954, 176-77, quoted in John Stormer, *None Dare Call It Treason* (Florissant, Missouri: Liberty Bell Press, 1964), 210.

⁷⁶ Kenichi Ohmae, "The Rise of the Region State," *Foreign Affairs* (August 1993): 78.

⁷⁷ Philip Kerr, "From Empire to Commonwealth," *Foreign Affairs* (December 1922): 97-98.

Norman Cousins, CFR member, and honorary Chairman of Planetary Citizens for the World We Chose (as well as the President of the World Federalist Association) is quoted in the magazine Human Events as saying:

“World government is coming, in fact, it is inevitable. No arguments for or against it can change that fact.”

CFR member, Elmo Roper, deputy director of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) [predecessor to the CIA] explained in 1960 that the goal was World Government:

“For it becomes clear that the first step toward World Government cannot be completed until we have advanced on the four fronts: the economic, military, the political and the social.”

How the CFR influences American foreign policy

How does the Council influence American foreign policy? One method is its publications, including many books and especially its periodical Foreign Affairs, which Time magazine has called “the most influential journal in print.”⁷⁸

Most people haven’t heard of Foreign Affairs, but it’s a virtual instruction manual for U.S. foreign-policy makers. The CFR also has numerous interlocks with the media and universities. According to the Council’s 2011 annual report, more than 1,000 members were in media or education. But, again, the CFR’s most important means of controlling foreign policy is supplying cabinet-level and sub-cabinet level personnel to the government. So far, 8 Presidents, 8 Vice Presidents 21 Secretaries of Defense/ War, 20 Treasury Secretaries, 19 Secretaries of State, and 18 CIA directors have been CFR members.

In Harper’s magazine for July, 1958, there is an article entitled “School for Statesmen” written by CFR member Joseph Kraft. Boasting of how the CFR had succeeded in penetrating the Executive Branch of the Federal Government even before World War II, Kraft wrote:

“With the coming of hostilities, the Council’s assembled pool of talent and information came into sudden and dramatic play. Stimson went to Washington as Secretary of War, taking with him the small nucleus of men, many unknown then, who were to found this country’s modern defense establishment.

Whenever we needed a man,” John McCloy, the present Council chairman who served Stimson as personnel chief, recalls, “we thumbed through the roll of Council members and put through a call to New York.

At least as important, the Council provided for the U.S. government the first organized framework for postwar planning. Less than a fortnight after the guns began pounding in Europe, and a full two years before Pearl Harbor, Armstrong and the Council’s executive director, Walter Mallory, journeyed to Washington with a proposition. State lacked the appropriations to set up a planning division; Congress was bearish about any official move that hinted at U.S. intervention;

⁷⁸ Advertisement in Foreign Affairs, Summer 1986.

there was a danger that, if it finally did get going with a sudden jolt, postwar planning might be out of the hands of State. Why not, they asked, let the Council begin the work, privately, with the understanding that its apparatus would be turned over to State as soon as feasible?

Secretary Hull was in favor. Accordingly, in December 1939, the Council, with financial aid from the Rockefeller Foundation, established four separate planning groups—Security and Armaments; Economic and Financial; Political; Territorial—comprising about a dozen men each including research secretaries of the highest caliber (Jacob Vincr of Princeton and Alvin Hansen of Harvard in the economic group, for example).

A fifth group was added in 1941 to consider the problems of the exiled governments of the occupied European countries which the State Department, because the United States was neutral, had to treat gingerly. In 1942, the whole apparatus with most of the personnel was taken into the State Department as the nub of its Advisory Committee on Postwar Planning Problems. . . .It appears that Council studies played a considerable part in shaping the Charter of the United Nations."

That, of course, is a classic understatement. It is significant to realize that Alger Hiss, identified as a Communist agent by former Communist Whittaker Chambers, was one of those members of the CFR who was drafted into the State Department. His CFR connections had already earned him the position of special attorney for the Justice Department and Trustee for the Carnegie Endowment Fund for International Peace. Once in the State Department, he became Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs and was in charge of all postwar planning, most of which directly involved the creation of the United Nations.

At the San Francisco Conference, Alger Hiss was the chief planner and executive for the whole affair. He organized the American delegation and was acting Secretary-General. Visitor passes bore his signature. He also served on the steering and executive committees which were charged with the responsibility of actually writing the UN Charter. At the conclusion of the "Conference, Alger Hiss personally carried the freshly written document back to Washington by plane for Senate ratification.

While Alger Hiss the Communist is now well known, Alger Hiss the CFR member is not. Yet the latter connection was just as important—perhaps more so—for opening doors of government service to him and for his meteoric success.



Secretary of State Stettinius (CFR member) holds up first draft of UN charter before the steering committee at San Francisco, June 21, 1945. At center is acting UN Secretary-General Alger Hiss (also CFR member). At right is Andrei Gromyko, Soviet Ambassador and head of the U.S.S.R. delegation. It is a sobering fact that the UN was created predominantly by CFR members and Communists. Alger Hiss was both.

The CFR was able to work its success magic in practically all segments of the Federal Government and outside of government, as well. At the time of writing his article, Mr. Kraft boasted that the CFR membership, even then, included:

". . . the President, the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Board chairmen of three of the country's five largest industrial corporations, two of the four richest insurance companies, and two of the three biggest banks, plus the senior partners of two of the three leading Wall Street law firms, the publishers of the two biggest news magazines and of the country's most influential newspaper, and the presidents of the Big Three in both universities and foundations, as well as a score of her college presidents and a scattering of top scientists and journalists."

CFR member Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., penned a tome entitled *A Thousand Days* in 1965 in which provided the following insight:

“The New York financial and legal community was the heart of the American establishment...Its front organizations [were] the Rockefeller, Ford and Carnegie foundations and the Council on Foreign Relations.”

Former German Chancellor (Prime Minister) Helmut Schmidt, provides further insight into how American foreign policy is decided by the CFR:

“[The] large reservoir of discerning private persons, who were committed to foreign affairs and who had already served earlier administrations...frequently called “the establishment,” had both its forum and its center in the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. Its members were lawyers, bankers, some industrialists, and academics. The Council on Foreign Relations successfully drew carefully chosen young people into its discussions and prepared them at first for modest tasks; in the course of their careers they often took on top-level missions in the State Department, the Pentagon, the White House, or other centers of international policy – from trade agreements to disarmament...The foreign policy elite, which had very silent but effective ways of seeing to its own succession, was thus largely a matter of the East Coast.”⁷⁹

What policies has the CFR created?

Let's take three examples from immediately after World War II:

(1) **The United Nations.** The UN began with a group of CFR members in the U.S. State Department. Working under Secretary of State Cordell Hull (CFR member), they called themselves the “Informal Agenda Group” –selecting this innocuous name to arouse no suspicion. The group drew up the original plan for the UN. They then consulted three attorneys, all CFR members, who declared the scheme constitutional. Subsequently they met with President Roosevelt, who approved the plan and publicly announced it the same day.⁸⁰

After that, FDR made establishing the UN his central priority for postwar planning (just as the League of Nations had been to Woodrow Wilson). And when the UN held its founding conference in San Francisco in 1945, most of the American delegates –47 of them –were CFR members.

(2) **How about the Marshall Plan, America's postwar program of aid to Europe?** Allegedly it was the brainchild of General George Marshall, who enunciated it in a Harvard commencement speech. In reality, however, the plan was not conceived at all by Marshall, but by a CFR study group with David Rockefeller as secretary.⁸¹

⁷⁹ Helmut Schmidt, German Chancellor (1974–1982), memoirs, *Men and Powers* (Random House, 1987, pp. 221–222.

⁸⁰ Laurence H. Shoup and William Minter, *Imperial Brain Trust: The Council on Foreign Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977), 169–71.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*,

They originally intended President Truman to announce the proposal and call it the "Truman Plan." However, after deliberating they decided against this, realizing that Truman, as a Democrat, might fail to win support from Congressional Republicans.⁸²

Marshall, a CFR cohort, was chosen to reveal the plan because, as a military figure, he would be misperceived as politically neutral and win more bipartisan support. The strategy worked. Americans were told the funds were for Europe's needy. They were not told, however, that the goods sent to Europe, which their tax dollars purchased, came mostly from multinational corporations linked to the CFR, which had hatched the scheme. But the Marshall Plan had an even more shadowy aspect. Unknown to most Americans, Europeans were required to pay for Marshall Plan goods with printing press money called "counterpart funds."

CFR member John J. McCloy, appointed High Commissioner to Germany, was put in charge of this cash. He was then approached by Jean Monnet, renowned as founder of the Common Market, predecessor of today's European Union; Time called him "the Father of Europe." Foreign policy specialist Hilaire du Berrier commented on Monnet's ties to the world government intrigue:

"Sometime in 1913 Monnet was taken into the conspiratorial Canadian and British group planning a United Europe as a **step towards a single government for the world**. The Americans, Canadians and Britishers were not alone in this plot. During World War II the French initiates smuggled a truckload of papers from Paris to Lyon for safe-keeping. Lyon was near the Swiss border and had become an escape hatch for all sorts of conspirators. After the Germans occupied the city, French police searched for anything that might get them in trouble if the Germans found it first, and among the documents in a Lyon cellar they stumbled onto an elaborately bound volume containing detailed plans for a **revolutionary one-world empire**. According to this master plan the first step for the **establishment of a federalist world** was the forming of a regime "in which all power would be concentrated in the hands of a High Power and representatives duly mandated by banking groups, especially designated from each country." They were all there: Monnet's interlocking supporters in "the City," [London] the Rothschilds and Lazards in France, the **Rockefellers in America** and Societe Generale in Belgium. Study of the secret files revealed that the French wing had been active since 1922, when Monnet and Colonel House and their associates **were drawing up plans for a world state** as they proposed to shape it."⁸³

In 1947, Monnet sent agents to McCloy, who put millions of dollars in counterpart funds at their disposal. This money jump-started the movement for **European unity**. According to du Berrier, McCloy's handouts financed Common Market propaganda, a **European union** youth movement, establishment of schools and universities that would **promote European consolidation**, the Council of Europe's first meeting in 1949, and election campaigns of favored political candidates.⁸⁴

⁸² Walter Isaacson and Evan Thomas, *The Wise Men* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), 410.

⁸³ "2 International 'Think' Groups Weigh Merger," H du B Reports, March 1978, 2-3.

⁸⁴ "Reference File, For Those Studying the New World Order Europe," H du B Reports, November 1993, 4.

Journalist Richard Rovere called McCloy “Chairman of the Establishment.”⁸⁵ A true Insider’s Insider. According to Quigley, John McCloy was “closely allied with this Morgan influence.”⁸⁶ When he returned to the U.S. he became chairman of both the Council on Foreign Relations and the Rockefellers’ Chase Manhattan Bank. Global Banks McCloy was also second president of the UN World Bank, which, along with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) both got started at the Bretton Woods Conference.

(3) **The World Bank and IMF:** Although the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference officially created the World Bank and IMF, all the initial planning and groundwork were done by the Economic and Finance Group of the CFR’s War and Peace Studies Project. As with the Marshall Plan, the motive wasn’t charity. After World War II, the New York banks wanted to continue loaning money to governments. However, they worried that some war-torn nations might have difficulty repaying. What if an interest payment was missed? The fall guy to guarantee these loans were American taxpayers. An illustration on how this scheme would work. Chase Bank lends Poland \$ 50 million. The Poles start repaying the loan, but eventually can’t make an interest payment. So the IMF or World Bank bails them out with taxpayer money. Chase wins; Poland wins –only the taxpayer loses. The World Bank and IMF gave carte blanche to the New York banks. They could now make virtually any loan to foreign governments, no matter how foolish. If the transaction went sour, their profits were still guaranteed.

U.S. Senator Jesse Helms, once chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said in 1987:

“The New York banks have found important profit centers in lending to countries plunged into debt. This has been an essentially riskless game for the banks because the IMF and World Bank have stood ready to bail the banks out with our taxpayer’s money.”⁸⁷

Noted British author A. K. Chesterton declared:

“The World Bank and International Monetary Fund were not incubated by hard-pressed governments, but by a Supra-national Money Power which could afford to look ahead to the shaping of a postwar world that would serve its interest.”⁸⁸

Furthermore, the World Bank often attaches conditions to loans. It may demand a voice in government policy. For example, it might dictate that a country privatize part of its industry (to multinational corporations) before money comes through. Thus the World Bank and IMF are instruments of both profit and control. Incidentally, these loans do little to improve the lot of people in Third World nations –except for their corrupt leaders. As Hilaire du Berrier noted:

⁸⁵ Joseph Finder, “Ultimate Insider, Ultimate Outsider,” New York Times, April 12, 1982.

⁸⁶ Tragedy and Hope, pages 952

⁸⁷ Congressional Record, December 15, 1987, Vol. 133, S18148.

⁸⁸ A. K. Chesterton, The New Unhappy Lords (London: Candour, 1969), 156.

“It is misleading to call these handouts “loans.” There is nothing to show for them save a high level of inflation, lots of automobiles, luxury items and Swiss bank accounts for the families in power.”⁸⁹

The documented record contains many statements warning the country of the hidden power of the CFR, the following is just a sample:

Winston Lord, former US ambassador to China, Assistant Secretary of State, the U.S. State Department, President of the CFR declared

“The Trilateral Commission⁹⁰ doesn’t secretly run the world. The Council on Foreign Relations does that.”⁹¹

Former State District Court Judge and Congressman John Rarick, deeply concerned over the growing influence of the CFR, had made a concerted effort to expose the organization since 1971:

“The Council on Foreign Relations is “the establishment.” Not only does it have influence and power in key decision-making positions at the highest levels of government to apply pressure from above, but it also finances and uses individuals and groups to bring pressure from below, to justify the high-level decisions for **converting the U.S. from a sovereign Constitutional Republic into a servile member of a one-world dictatorship.**

The CFR, dedicated to one-world government, financed by a number of the largest tax-exempt foundations (Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundation), and wielding such power and influence over our lives in the areas of finance, business, labor, military, education and mass communication media, should be familiar to every American concerned with good government and with preserving and defending the U.S. Constitution and our free-enterprise system. Yet, the nation’s right to know machinery – the news media – usually so aggressive in exposures to inform our people, remain conspicuously silent when it comes to the CFR, its members and their activities.”

Senator Jesse Helms, before the Senate in December 1987, explained one of the fundamental tenets of the Council on Foreign Relation:

“The viewpoint of the Establishment today is called globalism. Not so long ago, this viewpoint was called the “one-world” view by its critics. The phrase is no longer fashionable among sophisticates; yet, the phrase “one-world” is still apt because nothing has changed in the minds and actions of those promoting policies consistent with its fundamental tenets.”

⁸⁹ “Drift to Tragedy,” H du B Reports, October 1977, 1.

⁹⁰ The Trilateral Commission is a secretive international organization that was set up by the Rockefeller family in 1973.

⁹¹ As quoted as saying in the August 1978 issue of W Magazine.

CFR whistleblower, Admiral Chester Ward, warned in 1975:

“The most powerful clique in these elitist groups have one objective in common – **they want to bring about the surrender of the sovereignty of the national independence of the United States.** A second clique of international members in the CFR comprises the Wall Street international bankers and their key agents. Primarily, they want the world banking monopoly from whatever power ends up in the control of **global government.** They would probably prefer that this be an all-powerful United Nations organization; but they are also prepared to deal with and for a One-World Government controlled by the Soviet communists if U.S. sovereignty is ever surrendered to them.”⁹²

Admiral Ward’s indictment of the group revealed their methods:

“Once the ruling members of CFR have decided that the U.S. Government should adopt a particular policy, the very substantial research facilities of CFR are put to work to develop arguments, intellectual and emotional, to support the new policy, and to confound and discredit, intellectually and politically, any opposition.”⁹³

As admitted in the Christian Science Monitor in 1961—which, as Quigley explained: was one of the American newspapers that the “American branch of this English Establishment exerted much influence through”:

“The directors of the CFR (Council on Foreign Relations) make up a sort of Presidium for that part of the Establishment **that guides our destiny as a nation.**”⁹⁴

Franklin D. Roosevelt’s son-in-law, Curtis Bean Dall, who was a prominent banker, vice-presidential candidate and author, admitted to the CFR’s extreme influence over FDR:

“For a long time I felt that FDR had developed many thoughts and ideas that were his own to benefit this country, the United States. But, he didn’t. Most of his thoughts, his political ammunition, as it were, were **carefully manufactured for him in advance by the Council on Foreign Relations–One World Money group.** Brilliantly, with great gusto, like a fine piece of artillery, he exploded that prepared “ammunition” in the middle of an unsuspecting target, the American people, and thus paid off and returned his internationalist political support.”⁹⁵

On December 23, 1961, columnist Edith Kermit Roosevelt (granddaughter of President Theodore Roosevelt) wrote in the Indianapolis News that CFR policies “favor ... **gradual**

⁹² Rear Admiral Chester Ward as quoted in Review of the News Apr. 9 1980 pg. 37

⁹³ Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward, Kissinger on the Couch (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1975), 144–50.

⁹⁴ Tragedy and Hope, page 953

⁹⁵ Curtis Bean Dall, FDR’s son-in-law as quoted in his book, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, My Exploited Father-in-Law, 1967

surrender of United States sovereignty to the United Nations.”

Researcher Dan Smoot, a former FBI agent, who has brought to light considerable details learned while working in the FBI's communist investigations branch, said the goal of the CFR is “to create a one- world socialist system and make the United States an official part of it.” Smoot also provides insight into its History:

“The Council [on Foreign Relations] did not amount to a great deal until 1927, when the Rockefeller family (through the various Rockefeller Foundations and Funds) began to pour money into it. Before long, the Carnegie Foundations (and later the Ford Foundation) began to finance the Council. In 1929, the Council (largely with Rockefeller gifts) acquired its present headquarters property: The Harold Pratt House, 58 East 68th Street, New York City.

In 1939, the Council began taking over the U.S. State Department. Shortly after the start of World War II, ... It was agreed that the Council would do research and make recommendations for the State Department, without formal assignment or responsibility. The Council formed groups to work in four general fields--Security and Armaments Problems, Economic and Financial Problems, Political Problems, and Territorial Problems. The Rockefeller Foundation agreed to finance, through grants, the operation of this plan.

...the Council on Foreign Relations, together with a great number of other associated tax-exempt organizations, constitutes the **invisible government** which sets the major policies of the federal government; exercises controlling influence on governmental officials who implement the policies; and, through massive and skillful propaganda, influences Congress and the public to support the policies....**The ultimate aim of the Council on Foreign Relations is the same as the ultimate aim of international communism: to create a one-world socialist system and make the United States an official part of it.”**⁹⁶

Harper's Magazine—which is the second-oldest continuously published monthly magazine in the U.S.—ran an expose in 1958 that explained the CFR's main objective:

“The most powerful clique in these (CFR) groups have one objective in common: **they want to bring about the surrender of the sovereignty and the national independence of the U.S.** They want to end national boundaries and racial and ethnic loyalties supposedly to increase business and ensure world peace. What they strive for would inevitably lead to dictatorship and loss of freedoms by the people. The CFR was founded for “the purpose of promoting disarmament and **submergence of U.S. sovereignty** and national independence into an **all-powerful one-world government.**”

On another occasion, Walt Rostow, chairman of the State Department's policy planning council from 1961 to 1966, and a CFR member explained the purpose to end U.S. nationhood, seems to much align with the assessment of Harper's Magazine.

“It is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations –

⁹⁶ Dan Smoot, The Invisible Government, 1962

including the United States – the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the root of national sovereignty and the basis for the existence of an international arena of power, it is, therefore, an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined.”⁹⁷

Even the CFR’s official publication seems to agree with the assessment of Harper’s Magazine. The Council on Foreign Relations’s 50th anniversary issue of their Foreign Affairs publication, article “Our National Purpose,” suggests that the U.S. purpose should be:

“To do away with our nationality,’ to ‘take some risks in order to invite others to pool their sovereignty with ours’... These ‘risks’ include disarming to the point where we would be helpless against the ‘peace-keeping’ forces of a global UN government. **We should happily surrender our sovereignty to the world government in the interests of the ‘world community.’**”⁹⁸

The CFR provides The Round Table with a mechanism for controlling the federal government and major corporations. Although the CFR definitely is not the center of the Round Table Groups, and although practically none of its members are aware of an inner control, nevertheless, it shuns publicity, and members are sworn not to disclose to the public the proceedings of its conferences and briefings.⁹⁹ They are considered a semi-secret organization whose 1966 Annual Report stated that members who do not adhere to its strict secrecy, can be dropped from their membership. Former FBI Agent Dan Smoot provided additional insight into varying rings of influence that the CFR has on its members:

“I do not mean to imply that all of these people are controlled by the Council on Foreign Relations, or that they uniformly support the total program of international socialism which the Council wants. The Council does not own its members: it merely has varying degrees of influence on each.”¹⁰⁰

Early CFR members included David Rockefeller— who became its youngest-ever director in 1949 and subsequently became chairman of the board from 1970 to 1985; who served as honorary chairman until his death in early 2017, Charles E. (Chip) Bohlen, first secretary to the American embassy in Moscow during World War II and President Franklin Roosevelt’s interpreter for his meeting with Josef Stalin at the Teheran conference; Frank Aydelotte, member of the Round Table, trustee of the Carnegie Foundation, president of Swarthmore College, American secretary to the (Cecil) Rhodes Trustees (of the Rhodes Scholarship Fund), and director of the Institute

⁹⁷As stated by Walt Rostow, chairman of the State Department’s policy planning council from 1961 to 1966, and a CFR member, in his book ‘The United States in the World Arena’, 1960

⁹⁸ As quoted in an article by CFR Member, Yale President, and former Ambassador to Britain, Kingman Brewster, Jr. entitled “Reflections on Our National Purpose, 50th anniversary issue of their Foreign Affairs, 1972

⁹⁹ On the national level, the secretive Business Advisory Council and Pilgrim Society are groups which form the inner circle of the CFR, while on the international level, it’s the secretive Bilderberger organization.

¹⁰⁰ Dan Smoot, The Invisible Government, 1962

for Advanced Study at Princeton; Secretary of War Henry Stimson, who initiated George Bush into the Yale “Skull and Bones” secret society and whose special consultant Bernadotte Schmitt had also been a special advisor to Alger Hiss when he had served as secretary-general of the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco in 1945; and William Paley, founder of the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) whose chief advisor was Edward Bernays, member of the Woodrow Wilson administration and Sigmund Freud’s nephew, who wrote the influential book Propaganda that explored the psychology behind manipulating society, in which Bernays reveals:

“Those who manipulate the organized habits and opinions of the masses constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of the country.... It remains a fact in almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by this relatively small number of persons.... As civilization has become more complex, and as the need for invisible government has been increasingly demonstrated, the technical means have been invented and developed by which opinion may be regimented.”

The CFR has only been investigated once, and that was in 1954, by the Special House Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (the Reece Committee), who said that the CFR was “in essence an agency of the United States Government.” The Committee discovered that their directives were aimed “overwhelmingly at promoting the globalistic one-world concept.” Rene A. Wormser, Chief Counsel to this Congressional investigation, further explained:

“The Council on Foreign Relations, another member of the international complex, financed by the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations, overwhelmingly propagandizes the globalist concept. This organization became virtually an agency of the government when World War II broke out. The Rockefeller Foundation had started and financed certain studies known as The War and Peace Studies, manned largely by associates of the Council; the State Department, in due course, took these Studies over, retaining the major personnel which the Council on Foreign Relations had supplied.”¹⁰¹

The Chicago Tribune printed an editorial on December 9, 1950 which described the CFR:

“The members of the Council are persons of much more than average influence in the community. They have used the prestige that their wealth, their social position, and their education have given them to lead their country towards bankruptcy and military debacle. They should look at their hands. There is blood on them- the dried blood of the last war and the fresh blood of the present one.”

¹⁰¹ As quoted by Rene A. Wormser, Chief Counsel to the Reece Committee, in Foundations: their power and influence, 1958

III

THE TAKEOVER OF THE U.S. MONETARY SYSTEM

“Give me control of a nation’s money supply, and I care not who makes its laws”

— Mayer Amschel Rothschild, Founder of Rothschild Banking Dynasty

Beginning on pages 50–51 of *Tragedy and Hope*, Quigley speaks of a group associated with the Secret Round Table Network that employs “financial capitalism” to monopolize business and control government. As experts in “financial manipulation,” these men “aspired to establish dynasties of international bankers” and, according to Quigley, they succeeded at a level that rivaled the political dynasties of past centuries. Centered in London, with offshoots in New York and Paris, the power of this group is described as overwhelming in significance and “occult” in nature. By 1850¹⁰² they could access the immense monetary power of “the Stock Exchange, the Bank of England, and the London money market.” But this was just the beginning.

“In time, they brought into their financial network the provincial banking centers...as well as insurance companies, to form all of these into a single financial system on an international scale which manipulated the quantity and flow of money so that they were able to influence, if not control, governments on one side and industries on the other. The men who did this, looking backward toward the period of dynastic monarchy in which they had their own roots, aspired to establish dynasties of international bankers and were at least as successful at this as were many of the dynastic political rulers.”¹⁰³

Just to clarify: these men did not own the money that citizens placed in commercial and savings banks. They did not own the money that citizens paid into retirement funds, insurance funds, or trust funds. However, as already mentioned, they didn’t need to own the money. All they needed was the power to control it, and that they had. As long as an institution within their “financial network” held the funds, they could direct those funds toward increasing their power. They, alone, determined how and where that enormous, international pool of money would be invested.

“Bankers, especially...international investment bankers, were able to dominate both business and government. They could dominate business...because investment bankers had the ability to supply, or refuse to supply, capital...they took seats on the boards of directors of industrial firms, as they had already done on commercial banks, saving banks, insurance firms and finance companies....**they funneled capital to enterprises which yielded control, and away from those who resisted.**”¹⁰⁴

The power of investment bankers over governments rests on a number of factors, of which the most significant, perhaps, is the need of governments to borrow money. Just as businessmen go to commercial banks for current capital advances...so a government has to go to merchant bankers to tide over the shallow places caused by irregular tax receipts. As experts in government bonds, the international bankers not only handled the necessary advances but

¹⁰² It’s worth noting that this period of “financial capitalism” clearly predates the Rhodes–created network that Quigley describes in both *The Anglo–American Establishment* and *Tragedy and Hope*. As such, it’s reasonable to suggest that the real roots of the Rhodes network (and the real power) existed long before Cecil Rhodes entered the picture. However, since this document focuses on the proven Secret Round Table Network (identified and exposed by Quigley), a detailed account of what existed before Rhodes will have to be told elsewhere.

¹⁰³ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 52

¹⁰⁴ *Tragedy and Hope*, pages 60 and 61

provided advice to government officials and, on many occasions, placed their own members in official posts...

In addition to their power over government based on government financing and personal influence, bankers could steer governments in ways they wished them to go by other pressures. Since most government officials felt ignorant of finance, they sought advice from bankers whom they considered to be experts in the field. **The history of the last century shows...that the advice given to governments by bankers, like the advice they gave to industrialists, was consistently good for bankers, but was often disastrous for governments, businessmen, and the people generally.** Such advice could be enforced if necessary by manipulation of exchanges, gold flows, discount rates, and even levels of business activity."¹⁰⁵

To summarize: using enormous amounts of other people's money, international bankers essentially purchased their way into powerful business and government positions. With each new position, they gained control of more money. With control of more money, they gained access to more positions (so on and so forth).

The key to the success of this Round Table Network has been to control and manipulate the money system of a nation, while letting it appear to be controlled by the government. The net effect is to create money out of nothing, lend it to the government, and then collect interest on it; a rather profitable transaction, to say the least.

For example, in 1694, international banker William Paterson obtained the charter of the Bank of England, and the power over England's money system fell into private hands. In a boastful mood, Paterson said: "The bank hath benefit of interest on all moneys which it creates out of nothing."

Turning to the United States, Dr. Quigley tells us:

"The structure of financial controls created by the tycoons of "Big Banking" and "Big Business" in the period 1880-1933 was of extraordinary complexity, one business fief being built on another, both being allied and semi-independent associates, the whole rearing upward into two pinnacles of economic and financial power, . . . One, centered in New York, was headed by J. P. Morgan and Company, and the other, in Ohio, was headed by the Rockefeller family. When these two cooperated, as they generally did, they could influence the economic life of the country to a large degree and could almost control its political life, at least on the Federal Level."

In the United States it was inevitable that the international banking interests would attempt to establish the same kind of private monopoly over the money system that they had achieved in England, France, Germany, Italy, and Switzerland. The same formula would be used. Make it look like a government operation, but keep the control in private hands.

¹⁰⁵ Tragedy and Hope, pages 61 and 62

John D. Rockefeller had purchased the Chase Bank, and his brother William bought the National City Bank of New York. The Rockefeller Chase Bank was later merged with the Warburg's Manhattan Bank to form the Chase-Manhattan, one of the most powerful financial combines in the world today. Acting in concert with the Morgan banking dynasty, they spent untold millions of dollars to promote legislation that would grant to them a private franchise over this nation's money system.

The participants designed America's central bank, crafting the name "Federal Reserve System" to deceive Americans. While "Federal" implied public control, it is in fact owned by private shareholders. "Reserve" suggested it would hold reserves to protect banks, but it does not. "System" implied its power would be diffuse (through regional Federal Reserve banks), whereas actual power would be centralized in the Board and the New York Fed.

Using government as its instrument, the Round Table Network granted itself the legal authority to both create and directly confiscate the money it needs to finance its global objectives. The enormity of this topic, especially regarding the legal right to create money, requires hundreds of pages to cover properly. This section will provide only a short introduction. To fully understand the power derived from creating money, I highly recommend further research into the Federal Reserve System.¹⁰⁶

"I am afraid the ordinary citizen will not like to be told that the banks can, and do, create money...And they who control the credit of the nation direct the policy of Governments and hold in the hollow of their hands the destiny of the people."—Reginald McKenna, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, as quoted in *Tragedy and Hope*¹⁰⁷

That statement is about as straightforward as it gets, and it comes from a man who had intimate knowledge of the topic. He worked at the highest levels within the system and is stating, unequivocally, exactly how it is. Those who create money and control the credit of the nation "direct the policy of governments and hold in the hollow of their hands the destiny of the people." So why is it, if creating money and controlling credit confer so much power, that so few people understand either of these topics? Shouldn't we all be taught the dangers of such power? Is it any surprise that we aren't?

John Kenneth Galbraith, Influential economist and professor of economics at Harvard, explained

"The study of money, above all other fields in economics, is one in which complexity is used to disguise truth or to evade truth, not to reveal it. The process by which banks create money is so simple the mind is repelled. With something so important, a deeper mystery seems only decent."

Again, Quigley provides some insight. He explains that, for the Secret Round Table to achieve its objectives, "it was necessary to **conceal**, or even to **mislead**, both

¹⁰⁶ For a good beginner's guide (under two hundred pages) read *Dishonest Money: Financing the Road to Ruin*, by Joseph Plummer. For a much more thorough account (six hundred pages), I highly recommend *The Creature from Jekyll Island*

¹⁰⁷ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 325

governments and people about the nature of money and its methods of operation.”¹⁰⁸ This practice of deceiving governments and people about money continues to this day because it’s the only way for the Network to maintain its current level of power. Rest assured, if the vast majority of people do not understand what central banks are or how they operate, it’s because they were not meant to. Our global monetary system was created by men who “conceal” and “mislead” as a matter of course. It’s not only how they conduct their business, it’s how they intend to secure their “far-reaching aim,” reiterated below.

“The powers of financial capitalism had a far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a **world system of financial control...able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole.** This system was to be controlled...by the **central banks** of the world acting in secret agreements...**Each central bank**, in the hands of men like Montagu Norman of the Bank of England [and] Benjamin Strong of the New York Federal Reserve... **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.**”¹⁰⁹

It was, for this purpose, that the Round Table Network created the Federal Reserve System.

The Round Table Network Creates the FED

The axis of Warburg, Rothschild, Morgan and Rockefeller, and their Wall Street confederates, all members of the Round Table Network, became known as “the Money Trust.” In 1922 New York City Mayor John F. Hylan declared of this destructive coalition:

“The real menace of our republic is the invisible government which, like a giant octopus, sprawls its slimy length over our city, state and nation. At the head is a small group of banking houses generally referred to as “international bankers.” This little coterie of powerful international bankers virtually run our government for their own selfish ends.”¹¹⁰

The Money Trust worked in unison to force a central bank on America. In 1907, J. P. Morgan, who controlled numerous newspapers, began a false rumor concerning the insolvency of a rival bank –the Trust Company of America. This led to a run on the bank that nearly destroyed it. [The term “run” would happen if a bank loaned out too much, and depositors panicked and simultaneously demanded their money, the bank could collapse. Runs are rarely seen today due to the advent of FDIC insurance.] The frenzy spread to other banks, and became what historians call the Panic of 1907. Subsequently, Morgan’s and Rockefeller’s newspapers clamored for a central bank to prevent further crises; Senator Aldrich echoed the call in Congress; and Paul Warburg

¹⁰⁸ Tragedy and Hope, page 53

¹⁰⁹ Tragedy and Hope, page 324

¹¹⁰ Don Bell, “Who Are Our Rulers?” American Mercury (September 1960): 136.

traveled the country lecturing on why the change was needed. Quigley even admits that J. P. Morgan did in fact precipitate the “panic of 1907.”¹¹¹

In short, the Network needed a central bank to “dominate the political system” of the United States, but it needed another crisis¹¹² to finally sell the scheme. With that perspective in mind, the panic of 1907 looks very different. First, J. P. Morgan causes the panic (which, to this day, is rarely mentioned), then he and Rockefeller halt the panic (for which, to this day, they’re still portrayed as saviors), and out of the suffering and chaos, “public demands” for legislative intervention finally reach critical mass. “The government” then forms a monetary commission to investigate and solve the problem (headed by none other than Network insider and US senator, Nelson Aldrich), and the commission decides that a central bank is needed to solve the nation’s woes. From there, it was simply a matter of writing the legislation and handing it off to the “right” politicians.

The legislation Aldrich introduced in the Senate, which became the basis of the modern Federal Reserve System, was not written by him. It was crafted by several of America’s richest bankers, at a secret nine-day meeting in 1910, at a private club on Jekyll Island off the Georgia coast. At that time, Jekyll Island was an exclusive retreat of the wealthy elite –the Rockefellers, Morgans, Vanderbilts and Astors.

You may not have heard of ‘Aldrich’, but you have probably heard of billionaire Nelson Rockefeller (CFR member), who was Gerald Ford’s (CFR member) Vice President, long New York’s governor, and one of America’s richest men. His full name: Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller –named for his grandfather, Nelson Aldrich. Aldrich’s daughter married John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his son Winthrop (CFR member), served as chairman of the Rockefellers’ Chase National Bank. When Nelson Aldrich spoke on Capitol Hill, insiders knew he was acting for the Rockefellers and their allies in high finance.

Attending this meeting were agents from the world’s three greatest banking houses: those of John D. Rockefeller, J. P. Morgan, and the Rothschilds. Together, they represented an estimated 25 percent of the world’s entire wealth. Acting for the Rockefellers were Senator Aldrich and Frank Vanderlip. Representing the Morgan interests were: Benjamin Strong (CFR member), head of J. P. Morgan’s Bankers Trust Company; Henry Davison, (CFR member), senior partner in J. P. Morgan Co.; and Charles Norton, (CFR member), head of Morgan’s First National Bank of New York. But the most important figure, who actually ran the meeting, was the Rothschilds’ agent, Paul Warburg (CFR member).

¹¹¹ Tragedy and Hope, page 72

¹¹² The panics of 1873 and 1893 caused widespread suffering and stirred demands for monetary reform. Public opinion was already leaning heavily toward the need for legislative intervention, and the panic of 1907 provided the final push. If the idea that bankers would actually create a panic to serve their interests seems like a stretch, consider the case of Nicholas Biddle. As President Andrew Jackson was trying to shut down Biddle’s 2nd Bank of the United States, the banker intentionally crashed the economy and blamed the ensuing financial crisis on Jackson. This served to turn public opinion against Jackson and in favor of the bank. Discussing the tactic, Biddle commented, “Nothing but widespread suffering will produce any effect on Congress...Our only safety is in pursuing a steady course of firm restriction...I have no doubt that such a course will ultimately lead to...recharter of the Bank.” Referring to Jackson, Biddle remarked, “This worthy President thinks that because he has scalped Indians and imprisoned Judges, he is to have his way with the Bank. He is mistaken.” (As quoted in *The Creature from Jekyll Island*, page 354)

Of course, the Network had to conceal the fact that it would be writing the legislation itself, and this presented some problems. The lengths it went to in order to hide its role reads like a scene out of a James Bond novel.

Unfortunately, the Jekyll Island story didn't leak until 1916¹¹³, years after the damage had already been done. And even after it was exposed, "educators, commentators, and historians" continued to deny that the meeting ever took place.¹¹⁴ Anyone who pointed out the nefarious origins and authors of the Federal Reserve Act was smeared and dismissed as a conspiracy theorist. Fortunately, the truth finally did come out, and the conspiracy theorists were vindicated. Perhaps the most definitive admission came from Frank A. Vanderlip, president of the most powerful New York bank at the time (National City Bank of New York, now Citibank¹¹⁵), whom later went on to reveal his role in the writing of the bill that created the Federal Reserve System. He wrote in the Saturday Evening Post:

"There was an occasion near the close of 1910, when I was as secretive—indeed as furtive—as any conspirator...I do not feel it is any exaggeration to speak of our secret expedition to Jekyll Island as the occasion of the actual conception of what eventually became the Federal Reserve System. We were told to leave our last names behind us. We were told further that we should avoid dining together on the night of our departure. We were instructed to come one at a time and as unobtrusively as possible to the terminal of the New Jersey littoral of the Hudson, where Senator Aldrich's private car would be in readiness, attached to the rear end of the train for the South. Once aboard the private car, we began to observe the taboo that had been fixed on last names. Discovery, we knew, simply must not happen, or else all our time and effort would be wasted. If it were to be exposed publicly that our particular group had got together and written a banking bill, that bill would have no chance whatever of passage by Congress...although the Aldrich Federal Reserve plan was defeated when it bore the name of Aldrich, nevertheless its essential points were all contained in the plan that finally was adopted."—Frank A. Vanderlip in the 1935 Saturday Evening Post article, "From Farm Boy to Financier"¹¹⁶

Despite this admission over seventy-five years ago, despite other participants and their biographers who've admitted the same, despite the fact that Federal Reserve Chairman (Ben Bernanke) returned to Jekyll Island in 2010 to commemorate the FED's founding one hundred years earlier;¹¹⁷ **still the vast majority of people have never heard of the trip to Jekyll Island and have no idea that "international bankers" created the system that was supposed to protect them from international bankers.**

¹¹³ Reported by B. C. Forbes, who went on to found Forbes magazine; reference Secrets of the Federal Reserve, page 2

¹¹⁴ The Creature from Jekyll Island

¹¹⁵ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citibank>

¹¹⁶ www.SaturdayEveningPost.com/2012/05/24/archives/banking.html

¹¹⁷ From the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta website, titled "A Return to Jekyll Island": "The conference was held to mark the centenary of the 1910 Jekyll Island meeting that resulted in draft legislation [the Aldrich Plan] for the creation of the U.S. central bank."http://www.frbatlanta.org/news/conferences/10jekyll_index.cfm

The Federal Reserve's origination at the Jekyll Island meeting is well-established. Today Jekyll Island is open to the public. You can visit the Jekyll Island Club Hotel, and sit in its "Federal Reserve Room" where the Fed was birthed. The first reporter to break the Jekyll Island story was B. C. Forbes, founder of Forbes magazine.

Sneaking the unconstitutional Federal Reserve System scheme into law

To sell this scheme to the voters, the Network created the propaganda line that the proposed banking law somehow would work against the monopolies. Politicians took up the cry "Banking Reform" and "Down with Wall Street." And then, to make it look convincing, the very same people who helped author the legislation on Jekyll Island began speaking out publicly against it.

As the Federal Reserve Act moved closer to its birth...both Aldrich and Vanderlip threw themselves into a great public display of opposition. No opportunity was overlooked to make a statement to the press—or anyone else of public prominence—expressing their eternal animosity to this monstrous legislation...Since Aldrich was recognized as associated with the Morgan interests and Vanderlip was President of Rockefeller's National City Bank, the public was skillfully led to believe that the [big bankers were] mortally afraid of the proposed Federal Reserve Act. The Nation was the only prominent publication to point out that every one of the horrors described by Aldrich and Vanderlip could have been equally ascribed to the Aldrich Bill as well. But this lone voice was easily drowned by the great cacophony of deception and propaganda.¹¹⁸

The newly packaged Glass-Owen Federal Reserve Act, which mirrored Aldrich's version in "all essential provisions,"¹¹⁹ was put forward by Democrats as being radically different; a bill written by selfless public servants to protect the citizenry from selfish, out-of-control banking interests. And as Vanderlip, Aldrich, and other "big-business Republicans" continued to attack the "new" legislation, more and more well-meaning Americans fell for the ruse.

Meanwhile, as the citizens were being guided to the desired opinion publicly, Col. Edward Mandell House¹²⁰ —who would later go on to create the Council on Foreign Relations—ensured that Wilson and Congress were being properly guided privately. Colonel House was the man who selected Woodrow Wilson as a presidential candidate, and later became his principle advisor. Wilson was totally dependent on House for all political decisions. He was his alter ego. The President himself had written:

¹¹⁸ The Creature from Jekyll Island, pages 463 and 464

¹¹⁹ The Creature from Jekyll Island, page 461

¹²⁰ House, President Wilson's most trusted advisor, founding member of the Council on Foreign Relations, who was an admirer of Karl Marx, in 1912, anonymously wrote the book Philip Dru: Administrator which was a novel that detailed the plans for the takeover of America, by establishing "socialism as dreamed by Karl Marx," and the creation of a one-world totalitarian government. This was to be done by electing an American President through "deception regarding his real opinions and intentions." The book also discussed the graduated income tax, and tax-free foundations. The novel became fact, and Philip Dru was actually House himself about which book Wilson's Secretary of the Interior Franklin Lane wrote to a personal friend: "All that book has said should be, comes about...The President comes to Philip Dru in the end."

"Mr. House is my second personality. He is my independent self. His thoughts and mine are one. If I were in his place, I would do just as he suggested."

The Intimate Papers of Col House leave little doubt that he acted as the direct liaison between the Round Table Network and relevant politicians during the creation of the central bank. (House directed the politicians while Paul Warburg, the primary author of the Jekyll Island legislation, directed House.) Author Ed Griffin summarizes House's role this way:

"As far as the banking issue was concerned, Colonel House was the President of the United States, and all interested parties knew it. Wilson made no pretense at knowledge of banking theory. He said:

The greatest embarrassment of my political career has been that active duties seem to deprive me of time for careful investigation. I seem almost obligated to form conclusions from impressions instead of from study...I wish that I had more knowledge, more thorough acquaintance, with the matters involved." To which Charles Seymour adds: "Colonel House was indefatigable in providing for the President the knowledge that he sought...The Colonel was the unseen guardian angel of the bill."¹²¹

In the waning hours of December 23, 1913—when most of Congress had already left for the holidays—the Federal Reserve Act finally was passed into law. Something known as the Federal Reserve System came into being, and, with it, total control of the nation's money fell into private hands.

President Wilson named Paul Warburg (CFR member), vice chairman of the Federal Reserve Board (a position from which national interest rates would be set). Benjamin Strong (CFR member), was appointed to run the New York Fed, the system's nucleus. **The very men who had secretly planned the bank now controlled it. The foxes were in charge of the henhouse.**

The Federal Reserve System solely is responsible for creating money in the United States. The Treasury prints only what the Federal Reserve tells it to print. The far greater amount of checkbook money is also determined by this group. Yet, is not a government agency, and is entirely beyond the reach of the American voter.

When the federal government goes into debt, it borrows that money from the Federal Reserve System. The national debt presently exceeds the 20 Trillion mark. Just to pay the interest back to these private bankers on this debt, taxpayers are forced to contribute over 300 billion dollars every year—and, remember, that is interest on money created out of nothing.

Technically, the stock of the Federal Reserve System is held by twelve privately owned National Banks that make up the system. These, in turn, are owned primarily by the Banks that make up the private banking dynasties that worked so hard to bring that system into being.


¹²¹ The Creature from Jekyll Island, page 459

By law, the seven members of the Federal Reserve Board are appointed by the President for a term of fourteen years each. In spite of the incredible length of these appointments, nevertheless, they are supposed to create the illusion that the people, acting through their elected leaders, have some voice in the nation's monetary policies. In practice, however, every president since the beginning of the Federal Reserve System has appointed only those men who were congenial to the financial interests of the international banking dynasties. There have been no exceptions.

Most people are familiar with Charles Lindbergh, Jr. – “Lucky Lindy” –who made the first solo nonstop transatlantic flight. Fewer people know that his father, Charles, Sr., was a distinguished member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Congressman Lindbergh helped lead the fight against the Federal Reserve Act. In December 1913 he declared on the floor of the House:

“This [Federal Reserve] act establishes the most gigantic trust on Earth. When the President signs this act the invisible government by the money power, proven to exist by the money trust investigation, will be legalized. By “the money power,” Lindbergh referred to the Rothschild–Rockefeller–Morgan alliance. Continuing the quote: The money power overawes the legislative and executive forces of the nation. I have seen these forces exerted during the different stages of this bill. From now on depressions will be scientifically created. The new law will create inflation whenever the trust wants inflation. If the trust can get a period of inflation, they figure they can unload stocks on the people at high prices during the excitement and then bring on a panic and buy them back at low prices. The people may not know it immediately, but the day of reckoning is only a few years removed.”¹²²

Lindbergh’s words were prophetic. Did inflation follow the Fed’s establishment? Yes, as the Figure below graphically proves:



¹²² Congressional Record, December 22, 1913, Vol. 51, 1446–47.

This figure depicts American price levels from 1665 to the present. Note there was no net inflation for the first 250 years. Little inflationary blips are on the graph, as during the American Revolution, War of 1812 and Civil War, when the United States printed large quantities of money to pay for those conflicts. Of course, increasing the supply of money diminishes its value, causing prices to rise. But notice that, after the wars, money always returned to its normal value. A dollar in 1900 was worth the same as in 1770: you could expect to pay the same for bread or shoes in 1900 as you did in George Washington's day. But look at the graph's right side. During World War I, our currency inflated, but instead of resuming its normal value afterwards, inflated out of sight. American money, stable for 250 years, began to rapidly and permanently lose its value. This did not happen by chance; every effect has a cause. Around the time of World War I, something significant happened to induce this transformation. The change came from a single factor: creation of the Federal Reserve Bank in 1913.

The Federal Reserve caused the Great Crash of 1929

The combination of higher interest rates, called loans and short-selling caused a plunge that snowballed into a complete panic. Afterwards, the Money Trust moved back into the market –exactly as Congressman Lindbergh had predicted. They bought up stocks that once sold for \$ 10 per share at \$ 1 per share, widening their ownership of corporate America.

Were stocks unloaded on the people at high prices, then bought back at low prices after a panic? Yes. The “day of reckoning” Lindbergh predicted came with “Black Thursday” and the Great Crash of 1929. The October 1929 stock market collapse wiped out millions of small investors –but not the Money Trust. Warburg, Rockefeller, Morgan, Bernard Baruch and other top insiders had exited the market. Friendly biographers attribute this to their fiscal “Brilliance.” But it was actually fiscal foreknowledge, of the Federal Reserve policy they were now controlling.

Congressman Louis McFadden, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency from 1920 to 1931, said of the crash:

“It was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence. The international bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they might emerge as rulers of us all.¹²³ McFadden stated further: When the Federal Reserve Act was passed, the people of the United States did not perceive that a world system was being set up here.... a superstrate controlled by international bankers and international industrialists acting together to enslave the world for their own pleasure.”¹²⁴

Senator Robert L. Owen, who co-sponsored the Federal Reserve Act (the Glass-Owen Bill), testified before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in 1938:

“The powerful money interests got control of the Federal Reserve Board through Mr. Paul Warburg [CFR member], Mr. Albert Strauss [CFR member], and Mr. Adolph C. Miller.... In 1920 that Reserve Board deliberately caused the Panic of

¹²³ Louis T. McFadden, On the Federal Reserve Corporation, remarks in Congress, 1934 (Boston: Forum Publication Co., 89)

¹²⁴ Congressional Record, June 10, 1932, 12603.

1921. The same people, unrestrained in the stock market, expanding credit to a great excess between 1926 and 1929, raised the price of stocks to a fantastic point where they could not possibly earn dividends, and when the people realized this, they tried to get out, resulting in the Crash of October 24, 1929.”¹²⁵

Several strategies were used to precipitate the 1929 crash. One was interest rates. The Federal Reserve increased the discount rate from 3.5 percent in January of that year to 6 percent in late August. Another tactic was calling loans used to purchase stock. In the relatively unregulated investing environment of 1929, one could heavily buy stocks “on margin” (with 90 percent borrowed money). But many of these were “24-hour call loans” -meaning the loan could be called at any time, requiring immediate repayment. For most investors, the only way to repay was to sell the stock. Simultaneously calling huge numbers of these loans would, of course, cave in the stock market. In *The United States’ Unresolved Monetary and Political Problems*, William Bryan reported:

“When everything was ready, the New York financiers started calling 24-hour broker call loans. This meant that the stock brokers and the customers had to dump their stock on the market in order to pay the loans. This naturally collapsed the stock market and brought a banking collapse all over the country because the banks not owned by the oligarchy were heavily involved in broker call claims at this time, and bank runs soon exhausted their coin and currency and they had to close. The Federal Reserve System would not come to their aid, although they were instructed under the law to maintain an elastic currency.”¹²⁶

Curtis Dall, son-in-law of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was the syndicate manager for Lehman Brothers. He was on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange on the day of the crash. He said of it:

“Actually, it was the calculated ‘shearing’ of the public by the World Money powers, triggered by the planned sudden shortage of call money in the New York money market.”¹²⁷

Milton Friedman, Nobel Prize winning economist, explained

“The Federal Reserve definitely caused the Great Depression by contracting Americas’ money supply by one third between 1929 and 1933.”

The Money Trust also helped stimulate the collapse by heavily short-selling the market, which pressured stocks downward. (In short-selling, you sell a stock you don’t own yet, pledging to purchase it later. This investment strategy will be profitable if one knows in advance that stock prices are going down.) William J. Gill highlights an example:

¹²⁵ Eustace Mullins, *Secrets of the Federal Reserve* (Staunton, Va.: Bankers Research Institute, 1991), 156.

¹²⁶ As quoted, Gary Allen and Larry Abraham, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* (Seattle: Double A Publications, 1983), 62-63.

¹²⁷ Curtis B. Dall, *FDR: My Exploited Father-In-Law* (Washington, D.C.: Action Associates, 1970), 49.

“Albert H. Wiggin [CFR founding member], chairman of the Chase National Bank, was unmasked as one of the premier villains when it was discovered he had sold short some 42,500 shares of Chase stock beginning a full month before Black Thursday, thus making a personal contribution to the crash. Using a “front” company, he had financed the deal with a \$ 6.5 million loan from his own bank. Wiggin picked up more than \$4 million in profits on this one transaction at a time when investors not plugged into Chase’s inside information were losing their shirts. Yet Wiggin was kept on as Chase chairman for an additional three years and the bank’s board, in gratitude for the splendid example he had set, voted him a lifetime salary of \$ 100,000 per year upon his retirement.”¹²⁸

Something from Nothing

But controlling the stock market was not the only purpose behind the Federal Reserve. Another was creating money from nothing. Outstanding books that explain this –and the Fed itself –is G. Edward Griffin’s *The Creature from Jekyll Island*, and Ellen Hodgson Brown’s *The Web of Debt*. As you’ve probably noticed, the U.S. government is very expensive. Its deficit for 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 was over \$ 1 trillion for each year. This means that every day, on average, the government spent over \$ 3 billion more than it took in. How does the government get money? Chiefly from taxes and sale of government bonds. (The latter is a poor funding method, since money from bonds must be repaid later with interest.) But these revenues never satisfy the federal budget’s demands. Still, despite insufficient income, the government always meets its obligations. It continues to pay federal employees, defense contractors, Social Security and Medicare recipients, etc. How does the government manage this?

It happens through a little-known mechanism. Let’s say for instance that, this week, the federal government is short one billion dollars needed to pay its employees. It sends a Treasury official to the Federal Reserve building, where a Fed officer literally writes out a check for \$ 1 billion to the Treasury, in exchange for government bonds that could not otherwise have been sold. This check, however, is not based on any assets the Fed actually holds. It is “fiat money” –created from nothing. Now, if you or I wrote a check, with no assets to back it up, we’d go to jail. But for the Federal Reserve, it’s perfectly legal.

The technical term the Fed uses for this is “monetizing the debt.” Warburg and his accomplices already had this figured out. Fiat money gave the government the potential to spend without limit. The banking cartel was intimately linked to corporations that did business with the U.S. government. This meant these could earn virtually unlimited revenues from government contracts. Wars could be financed without raising taxes. And the mechanism benefitted the bankers in other ways. In the example above, what do you suppose the federal employees will do with that billion dollars in salary? Deposit it in their banks. How does a bank make profits? By loaning out deposited money. The more money in, the more they can loan out. Thus, out of nothing, the Fed has created a billion loanable dollars for the banks. Furthermore, this billion automatically becomes nine billion, because under Federal Reserve rules, a bank need only keep 10 percent of deposits in reserve. For every dollar deposited, nine may be loaned. Thus the Fed’s creation of \$ 1 billion from nothing actually manufactures \$ 9 billion in loanable money for the banks.

¹²⁸ William J. Gill, *Trade Wars against America: A History of United States Trade and Monetary Policy* (New York: Praeger, 1990), 96.

For the banks, the system meant endless profits, but for the rest of us, endless inflation. Why? Because every time the Fed creates dollars from nothing, it increases the amount of money in America, thereby decreasing money's value. You probably haven't heard of the German inflation of the early 1920s—defeated in World War I—Germany was compelled to pay the Allies massive reparations. To meet this obligation, it printed huge quantities of money. This decreased the value of German currency so badly that by November 1923, a loaf of bread cost 80 billion marks. People carted paper money around in wheelbarrows; some used it as fuel for stoves.

Whenever the Fed “monetizes” the debt, it does the same thing as Germany, only on a smaller scale. In today's high-tech world, of course, printing money is no longer necessary; the Fed can simply create money electronically –but the inflationary result is the same. That is why, following 250 years of stable prices, we've had punishing inflation since the Fed's birth in 1913. Every effect has a cause.

Incidentally, Washington politicians love this system. By letting the Fed finance their expenditures with money made from nothing, politicians know they can spend without raising taxes. Tax increases are a “kiss of death” at reelection time (as President George Bush, Sr., (CFR member) learned in 1992 after voters rejected him for breaking his pledge of “Read my lips, no new taxes.”). When the Fed produces more currency, making prices rise, who do we blame? Not the Fed. Not politicians. Instead, we blame the local retail store. “Why are you guys jacking up your prices again?” Or we blame the candy company for making a smaller chocolate bar, or the cereal company for putting less corn flakes in the box. But these businesses are simply trying to cope with the same dilemma as us: inflation. The culprit is the Federal Reserve, and the problem is not that prices are going up, but that money's value is going down.

By the way, inflation is a tax –a hidden one the public generally doesn't perceive as such. And it is more unfair than conventional taxes, which are scaled by income. Inflation affects all equally, making no exceptions for the needy. For example, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were waged entirely without increasing taxes. How did our politicians accomplish this? Instead of raising taxes, they simply had the Fed finance the war with fiat currency. This caused massive U.S. inflation: the cost of housing, health care, food, energy, college tuition –everything soared.

Congressman Jerry Voorhis described the invisible tax this way:

“The banks — commercial banks and the Federal Reserve — create all the money of this nation and its people pay interest on every dollar of that newly created money. Which means that private banks exercise unconstitutionally, immorally, and ridiculously the power to tax the people. For every newly created dollar dilutes to some extent the value of every other dollar already in circulation.”

Congressman James Traficant, Jr. addressing the House, explained the invisible tax this way:

“Inflation is an invisible form of taxation that irresponsible governments inflict on their citizens. The Federal Reserve Bank who controls the supply and movement of Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs), has everybody fooled. They have

access to an unlimited supply of FRNs, paying only for the printing costs of what they need.”¹²⁹

After sneaking the Federal Reserve System scheme into law, the bankers still faced a problem. The billions deposited in their banks, which had been created from nothing, still belonged to depositors. To make it profitable, the bankers had to loan it to someone. Since individuals don't borrow that much, and if our businesses failed, we might not repay the loans. The bankers wanted to loan the money to one man in particular: Uncle Sam! Yes, right back to the government through which they had manufactured it. Why? Because Uncle Sam would borrow astronomically more than businesses or individuals, and unlike the latter two, could always guarantee repayment.

Part of the Federal Reserve System scheme is that the bankers loan the money, which has been created from nothing, right back to the government at interest. Government debt (borrowing) is generated through sale of bonds. The Federal Reserve was empowered to buy and sell U.S. government bonds, and the Round Table's own banks and investment firms could now buy these bonds, redeeming them at interest rates set by their associates in the U.S. Treasury Department. We thus see yet another motive for the Fed: interest on government loans. But the Jekyll Island bankers still had a problem. How would America pay back all the interest on those loans?

Sneaking the unconstitutional Federal Income Tax scheme into law

In 1913, the U.S. government had few revenue sources –its largest was tariffs collected on foreign imports. The bankers' solution? Income tax. Though now an accepted way of life, income tax was not always around. The original U.S. Constitution excluded it; in 1895 the Supreme Court ruled it would be unconstitutional. Therefore the only way the Money Trust could establish income tax was by legalizing it through a Constitutional Amendment. Which Senator introduced that Amendment in Congress? You get one guess. Nelson Aldrich –the same Senator who introduced the original Federal Reserve legislation.

Why did Americans accept income tax? Because it was originally only one percent of a person's income, for salaries under \$ 20,000 (the equivalent of about \$ 500,000 in today's dollars). Senator Aldrich and other supporters of the tax issued assurances it would never go up. So patriotic Americans said: "If Uncle Sam needs one percent of my salary, and I can always keep the rest, it's OK by me!" But you know what happened. Congress later dolefully informed Americans it needed to raise taxes a smidge. A few smidges later and, depending on bracket, we're losing 15, 25, 28 or 33 percent of our income to federal tax. It's said that if you want to boil a frog, you can't just toss him in boiling water. Instead, you put him in lukewarm water, and gradually turn up the heat. That way, the frog never realizes he's been boiled. This, in effect, is what the bankers did to Americans, knowing that once we became accustomed to taxes, the amounts could incrementally be turned up to "boil." It was a long-range plan.

¹²⁹ United States Congressional Record, March 17, 1993, Speaker-Rep. James Traficant, Jr. addressing the House. According to author Devvy Kidd, in her book *Why a Bankrupt America?* "The Federal Reserve pays the Bureau of Engraving and Printing approximately \$23 for each 1,000 notes printed. 10,000 \$100 notes (one million dollars) would thus cost the Federal Reserve \$230. They then secure a pledge of collateral equal to the face value from the U.S. government. The collateral is the land, labor, and assets of the United States. By authorizing the Fed to regulate and create money (and thus inflation), Congress gave private banks power to create profits at will."

It would logically follow that these rich bankers would never have wanted an income tax. After all, it “soaks the rich” –the wealthier you are, the more taxes you pay. It’s true that income tax is graduated. If an American today earns \$ 100,000 or \$ 200,000 per year, he or she usually owes lots of tax. But not the super-rich. The Warburg–Rockefeller–Morgan axis had no intention of paying substantial income tax. In 1970, someone who made a minimum wage of \$ 1.80 per hour paid more income tax that year than billionaire Nelson Rockefeller, who didn’t pay one cent. (We know this because when Rockefeller sought to become Gerald Ford’s Vice President, he had to disclose his tax returns.) Likewise, the Senate’s Pecora Hearings of 1933 discovered that none of the 17 partners of J. P. Morgan Co. had paid any income tax in 1931 and 1932. How did the Money Trust escape taxes? The means were numerous, but a major one was placing their assets in tax-free foundations. The Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations were already operational by the time income tax passed. The wealthy banking families’ foundations, while fronting as “charitable” organizations, use their grants to advance its agenda, as you will see in chapter VII.

Summing up the Money Scheme let’s review the scenario. In 1913, the bankers created the Federal Reserve, which not only gave them control over interest rates and thus the stock market, but empowered them to create billions of dollars from nothing, which they would then loan back to America. Also in 1913, the bankers installed income tax, enabling them to exact repayment on these interest-bearing loans to the government. Only one thing was still missing: a significant reason for America to borrow. In 1914, just six months after the Federal Reserve Act passed, Archduke Ferdinand was assassinated, triggering the start of World War I. America participated; as a result, our national debt grew from a manageable \$ 1 billion to \$ 25 billion. Ever since, America has been immersed in skyrocketing debt –now said, officially, to exceed \$ 20 trillion.

It’s particularly noteworthy that in Communist Manifesto, Karl Marx laid down tens steps he proclaimed necessary to establish a communist totalitarian state. Step 2 was: “A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.” Step 5 was: “Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.”

Thus, in 1913, the United States enacted two of Marx’s conditions for a communist dictatorship. Income tax and central banks have nothing to do with free enterprise or the American way of life. The original Constitution excluded an income tax, which the Founding Fathers opposed. Concerning money, the Constitution declares (Article 1, Sec. 8): “Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.” The Federal Reserve Act illegally transferred this authority from our elected representatives to private bankers.

In America today, many young couples work hard. Commonly, both spouses hold jobs and can barely pay the rent. When great-grandpa came to America, income tax didn’t exist. Today’s average workers lose about 50 percent of their pay to taxes: federal income tax, state income tax, social security tax, real estate tax, sales tax, excise tax, utilities tax, etc. (The American colonists went to war with Britain when tax levels reached only 21 percent.) If half a family’s wages go to taxes, won’t it need two jobs to maintain the same standard of living? Furthermore, great-grandpa had a stable dollar – it didn’t plummet in value every year like now.

The following quotes provide insight into the privately-owned power of the FED
As President Thomas Jefferson explained:

“I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies... If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation, then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around [the banks]... will deprive the people of all property until their children wake-up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered.”¹³⁰

Three years after the initiation of the Federal Reserve, Woodrow Wilson said:

“A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is privately concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men...[W]e have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated, governments in the civilized world—no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and the duress of small groups of dominant men.”¹³¹

According to Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, only Congress has the right to issue money and regulate its value, so it is illegal for private interests to do so. As Rep. Wright Patman, Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency warned:

“In the United States today, we have two governments. We have the duly constituted government and then we have an independent, uncontrolled and uncoordinated government in the Federal Reserve System operating the money powers which are reserved for Congress by the Constitution.”

The Federal Reserve is as “Federal” as “Federal Express, or as Eustace Mullins, author of *Secrets of the Federal Reserve*, described it: “The Federal Reserve System is not Federal; it has no reserves; and it is not a system at all, but rather, a criminal syndicate.” The Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Reserve Banks are private Corporations as stated in the congressional record.¹³² And as unfortunately found out by Mr. Lewis—who was injured by a Federal Reserve vehicle so he sued the government. The court ruled:

" ...that since the Federal Reserve System and its twelve branch banks are private corporations, the federal government could not be held responsible."
Lewis vs U.S., 608F 2d 1239 (1982).

Plain and simple, the Federal Reserve is not part of the Federal Government. It is a privately held corporation owned by stockholders. That is why the Federal Reserve

¹³⁰ Thomas Jefferson in the Debate Over The Re-charter Of The Bank Bill, 1809

¹³¹ Woodrow Wilson, *The New Freedom: A Call For The Emancipation Of The Generous Energies Of A People* (New York And Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1913)

¹³² As stated in the Congressional Record, June 10, 1932, P. 12595

Bank of New York (and all the others) is listed in the Dun and Bradstreet Reference Book of American Business (Northeast, Region 1, Manhattan/Bronx).

As observed by Congressman James Traficant, Jr. addressing the House and explaining the truth about the Federal Reserve:

"Their lust is for power and control. Since the inception of central banking, they have controlled the fates of nations....The Federal Reserve System is a **sovereign power structure separate and distinct from the federal United States government**.... Unwittingly, America has returned to its pre-American Revolution, feudal roots whereby all land is held by a sovereign and the common people had no rights to hold allodial title to property. Once again, We the People are the tenants and sharecroppers renting our own property from a Sovereign in the guise of the Federal Reserve Bank. We the people have exchanged one master for another. This has been going on for over eighty years without the "informed knowledge" of the American people, without a voice protesting loud enough. Now it's easy to grasp why America is fundamentally bankrupt...Our children will inherit this unpayable debt, and the tyranny to enforce paying it."

On December 15, 1931, Rep. Louis T. McFadden, who for more than ten years served as Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in the House of Representatives, said:

"The Federal Reserve Board and banks are the duly appointed agents of the foreign central banks of issue and they are more concerned with their foreign customers than they are with the people of the United States. The only thing that is American about the Federal Reserve Board and banks is the money they use..." On June 10, 1932, McFadden, said in an address to the Congress:

"We have in this country one of the most **corrupt institutions** the **world** has **ever known**. I refer to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Banks ... Some people think the Federal Reserve Banks are United States Government institutions. **They are not Government institutions**. They are **private credit monopolies** which prey upon the people of the United States for the benefit of themselves and their foreign customers ... The **Federal Reserve Banks** are the **agents** of the **foreign central banks** ... In that dark crew of **financial pirates**, there are those who would cut a man's throat to get a dollar out of his pocket ... Every effort has been made by the Federal Reserve Board to conceal its powers, but the truth is the FED has usurped the government. **It controls everything here (in Congress) and controls all our foreign relations. It makes and breaks governments at will** ...When the FED was passed, the people of the United States did not perceive that a **world system** was being set up here."

U.S. State Senator Jack Metcalf explained in 1962

"When the federal government needs more money, the Federal Reserve does not merely create and print it as it would do were it a government agency. No, the Federal Reserve creates it as a loan [out of thin air] and charges the government interest on it."

U.S. Senator George W. Malone, speaking before Congress about the Federal Reserve System said in 1962:

“I believe that if the people of this nation fully understood what Congress has done to them over the last 49 years, they would move on Washington; they would not wait for an election....It adds up to a preconceived plan to destroy the economic and social independence of the United States!”

Sen. Barry Goldwater wrote in his book *With No Apologies*:

“Does it not seem strange to you that these men just happened to be CFR (Council on Foreign Relations) and just happened to be on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, that absolutely controls the money and interest rates of this great country. A privately-owned organization ... which has absolutely nothing to do with the United States of America!”

Henry Ford, founder of the Ford Motor Company, said:

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

A look at the wealthy families who control the Federal Reserve System

Most people don't realize that only a small group of wealthy families in Europe and America are behind the Main Banking institutions of America: Bank of America, JP Morgan Chase, Citigroup and Wells Fargo, who also control the major Oil institutions (Exxon Mobil, Royal Dutch/Shell, BP Amoco and Chevron Texaco); in tandem with Deutsche Bank, BNP, Barclays and other European old money behemoths.

According to company 10K filings to the SEC, these four banks are among the top ten stock holders of virtually every Fortune 500 corporation.¹³³ Not only do they control the currency supply, they also control media, entertainment, education, science and technology, the so called elected and un-elected government and the dictators and main alphabet government organizations worldwide. So, who then are the stockholders in these money center banks?

This information is guarded much more closely. Queries by researchers to bank regulatory agencies regarding stock ownership in the top 25 US bank holding companies were given Freedom of Information Act status, before being denied on “national security” grounds. This is rather ironic, since many of the bank's stockholders reside in Europe.

Because of the way the Federal Reserve was organized, whoever controls the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, controls the system, about 90 of the 100 largest banks are in this district. Of the reportedly 203,053 shares of the New York bank: Rockefeller's National City Bank had 30,000 shares; Morgan's First National Bank had 15,000 shares; Chase National, 6,000 shares; and the National Bank of Commerce (Morgan Guaranty

¹³³ The Temple & the Lodge. Michael Bagent & Richard Leigh. Arcade Publishing. New York. 1989. p.259; also, *Four Horsemen, Eight Families & Their Global Intelligence, Narcotics & Terror Network*, Author Dean Henderson

Trust), 21,000 shares.

A June 15, 1978 Senate Report called “Interlocking Directorates Among the Major U.S. Corporations” revealed that five New York banks had 470 interlocking directorates with 130 major U.S. corporations: Citicorp (97), J. P. Morgan Co. (99), Chase Manhattan (89), Manufacturers Hanover (89), and Chemical Bank (96). According to researchers, these banks are major stock holders in the FED. (A May, 1976 report of the House Banking and Currency Committee further indicated: “The Rothschild banks are affiliated with Manufacturers Hanover of London in which they hold 20 percent ... and Manufacturers Hanover Trust of New York”).

J. W. McCallister, an oil industry insider with House of Saud connections, has written that information he acquired from Saudi bankers cited 80% ownership of the New York Federal Reserve Bank—by far the most powerful Fed branch—by just eight families, four of which reside in the US. They are the Goldman Sachs, Rockefellers, Lehmans and Kuhn Loeb of New York; the Rothschilds of Paris and London; the Warburgs of Hamburg; the Lazards of Paris; and the Israel Moses Seifs of Rome.

CPA, author and researcher Thomas D. Schauf corroborates what McCallister has written, adding that ten banks control all twelve Federal Reserve Bank branches: N.M. Rothschild of London, Rothschild Bank of Berlin, Warburg Bank of Hamburg, Warburg Bank of Amsterdam, Lehman Brothers of New York, Lazard Brothers of Paris, Kuhn Loeb Bank of New York, Israel Moses Seif Bank of Italy, Goldman Sachs of New York and JP Morgan Chase Bank of New York; and William Rockefeller, Paul Warburg, Jacob Schiff and James Stillman are listed as individuals who own large shares of the Fed.¹³⁴ The Schiffs are insiders at Kuhn Loeb. The Stillmans are Citigroup insiders, who married into the Rockefeller clan at the turn of the century. It is believed, that the Rothschilds hold 53% of the stock of the U.S. Federal Reserve. This information is also corroborated by FED researcher Dean Henderson.¹³⁵

Author Eustace Mullins came to the same conclusions in his book *The Secrets of the Federal Reserve*, in which he displays charts connecting the Fed and its member banks to the families of Rothschild, Warburg, Rockefeller and the others.¹³⁶ Author Peter Kershaw in his book *Economic Solutions* also lists these same families as the major shareholders of the Federal Reserve Bank System as found by his independent research.

Yet how many members of the of these families feature on the Forbes rich list, or on any other rich list for that matter?

Bill Gates is not the world’s richest person

Every year Forbes rich list—and similar lists published by other mainstream

¹³⁴ Ibid. p.253

¹³⁵ Prior to 9/11, there were only 8 countries in the world without a privately-owned Central Bank: Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, Libya, Cuba, North Korea, Iran and Syria. As of 2017 only four countries remain: Cuba, North Korea, Iran and Syria. With the exception of these four countries who still create its own money, every dollar of currency in the world is an IOU to these wealthy banking dynasties who control the central banks of the world.

¹³⁶ Ibid. p.233

publications—crowns billionaires and offers them the title of ‘world’s richest people,’ but names such as Rothschild and Rockefeller (along with heads of state and the royal families of the world) are excluded, although the wealth of these families are estimated to be well in the trillions.

And where are the Mellons, the Astors, the Vanderbelts, the Carnegies, the Cecils, the Cargills, the Bronfmans, the Du Ponts, the Harrimans, the Phipps, the Gettys, the Guggenheims, the Dawes, the Biddles, and dozens more in the US, Britain, Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy and so forth? And what is the true wealth of the ancient royal families of Europe, whose combined stock and real estate holdings are estimated to run into the trillions? The wealth of Bill Gates is virtually nothing compared to the wealth and economic power of these families. He is a shoeshine boy beside these families.

In fact, by the early 1900’s J.D. Rockefeller, individually, had already amassed the equivalent of \$663 billion in today’s dollars (and this was prior to gaining ownership and controlling interest in the U.S. Federal Reserve System) and the combined fortune of the Rockefeller family dynasty has only increased since.

Other emergent industrialists created great wealth for themselves with legendary names like J.P. Morgan, Carnegie, Mellon, Guggenheim, Vanderbilt, Peabody and Ford. In his official biography of the Rothschild family, Frederic Morton reckoned that their total wealth was over \$6 billion in 1850.¹³⁷ Given that this was an authorized biography of the secretive family, this figure is probably on the conservative side. If we increase this wealth at an annual real rate of between 5% and 6% – which is probably an underestimate, given their influence over the financial markets and central banks of the world – then their wealth today would be at least US30 trillion, or twice America’s annual GDP. It bears repeating that these estimates were made well before the Rothschilds and Rockefellers and their proxies gained ownership and controlling interest in the U.S. Federal Reserve System. The Rockefeller and Rothschild banking dynasties are owed a considerable amount of the 20 trillion dollar U.S. national debt; and this incredible amount obviously does not even include the debt that many other nations ultimately owe to their central banking network. Although the exact figures are difficult to determine, a good starting point is Robert Gaylon Ross, Sr., author of Who’s Who of the Global Elite, who estimated in 1998 that the combined wealth of the Rockefeller family was roughly US11 trillion and the combined wealth of the Rothschild family was estimated at US100 Trillion.

A Trillion dollars is so much money that it’s hard to grasp the idea. One way to better understand large numbers is to compare the heights of stacks of varying numbers of dollar bills. The thickness of a single one dollar bill measures .0043 inches or .0000000679 miles. The height of a stack of 1,000 one-dollar bills measures 4.3 inches. The height of a stack of 1,000,000 one dollar bills measures 4,300 inches or 358 feet—about the height of a 30 to 35 story building. The height of a stack of 100,000,000 (one hundred million) one dollar bills measures 35,851 feet or 6.79 miles. This would reach from the earth’s surface to the approximate altitude at which commercial jetliners fly. The height of a stack of 1,000,000,000 (one billion) one dollar bills measures 358,510 feet or 67.9 miles. This would reach from the earth’s surface

¹³⁷ The Rothschilds: Portrait of a Dynasty, 1962

into the lower portion of the troposphere –one of the major outer layers of earth’s atmosphere. The height of a stack of 1,000,000,000,000 (one trillion) one dollar bills measures 67,866 miles. This would reach more than one fourth the way from the earth to the moon.

The height of a stack of 11,000,000,000,000 (eleven trillion) one dollar bills—which is probably a conservative view of the combined Rockefeller fortune—measures 746,526 miles. This stack would reach from earth to the moon and then back to earth and then back to the moon.

The height of a stack of 100,000,000,000,000 (one hundred trillion) one dollar bills—which is probably an underestimate of the combined Rothschild wealth—measures 6,786,616 miles. This would reach from earth to the moon and back 14 times.

The incredible dominance of these economic giants

The Rockefellers and Rothschilds have been partners ever since the 1880’s, when Rockefeller was able to get a rebate on each barrel of oil he shipped over the Pennsylvania, Baltimore and Ohio railroads, which were owned by Kuhn, Loeb and Co. The Rockefellers, undeniably the richest family in America, increased their fortune by marrying into other wealthy and influential families.

The Rockefeller family went on to become one of the most ruthless and most successful monopolists of all time. It is important to emphasize that monopoly is not the product of free-enterprise capitalism, but the escape from it. But there was more to it than that. Biographer, John T. Flynn, in his book *God’s Gold; The Story of Rockefeller and His Times* explains:

“[John D. Rockefeller’s] entry into business and his career after that would be, in a large measure, the story of American economic development and the war on Laissez-faire....Rockefeller was definitely convinced that the competitive system under which the world had operated was a mistake. It was a crime against order, efficiency, economy. It could be eliminated only by abolishing all rivals. His plan, therefore, took a solid form. He would bring all his rivals in with him. The strong ones he would bring in as partners. The others would come in as stockholders ...Those who would not come in would be crushed.”¹³⁸

The ascendancy of the Rockefeller empire is proof of the success of that plan. John D., Sr., had a number of close business associates. Some originally were partners. Most were defeated rivals who had been brought into the structure. These men became multi-millionaires, and most of their descendants have remained closely linked with the Rockefeller family. Whether intermarriages were arranged as “unions of convenience,” as were common among the ruling classes of Europe, or were the result of romance, the result has been the same. The Rockefeller biological (and stockholder) strain has intermingled in an almost unbroken line through half of the nation’s wealthiest sixty families and back again. Throughout it all, the aggregate is controlled, economically at least, by the one family that is the descendant of John D. Rockefeller, Sr.

¹³⁸ Flynn, op. cit., pp. 23, 221.

Napoleon Bonaparte, Emperor of France, explained the dominance of these wealthy powers this way in 1815:

“When a government is dependent upon bankers for money, they and not the leaders of the government control the situation, since the hand that gives is above the hand that takes... Money has no motherland; financiers are without patriotism and without decency; their sole object is gain.”

In 1980, Journalist Bill Moyers (a CFR member), provided additional insight into the incredible influence of the Rockefeller family:

“David Rockefeller is the most conspicuous representative today of the **ruling class**, a multinational fraternity of men who **shape the global economy and manage the flow of its capital ... Private citizen David Rockefeller is accorded privileges of a head of state ... He is untouched by customs or passport offices and hardly pauses for traffic lights.**” In his 1979 book *Who’s Running America?*, Thomas Dye said that **Rockefeller was the most powerful man in America.** David Rockefeller’s simple statement “**God gave me my money** sums up how he views wielding his divine power and wealth.”¹³⁹ David Rockefeller once said: “So it may come to pass that someday ... **no one will speak of ‘my country,’ but all will speak of ‘our world’.**”

Quigley provided additional insight into the power of these economic giants who remain largely behind the scenes:

“It must not be felt that these heads of the world’s chief central banks were themselves substantive powers in world finance. They were not. Rather, they were the technicians and agents of the dominant investment bankers of their own countries, who had raised them up and were perfectly capable of throwing them down. The substantive financial powers of the world were in the hands of the investment bankers...who remained largely behind the scenes in their own unincorporated private banks. **These formed a system of international cooperation and national dominance which was more private, more powerful, and more secret than that of their agents in the central banks... They could dominate the financial and industrial systems of their own countries...; they could dominate governments...**In this system Rothschilds had been preeminent during much of the nineteenth century, but , at the end of that century, they were being replaced by J.P. Morgan whose central office was in New York, although it was always operated as if it were in London.”¹⁴⁰

The official version of the reason that these wealthy banking dynasties remain generally obscure to the public is because virtually all of their assets are privately-owned; their wealth has been distributed amongst hundreds of descendants throughout the years, and the level of secrecy which surrounds these families and the scale of their operations have carefully protected public scrutiny by various ways and means. In reality though, the published lists of the world’s richest people are designed

¹³⁹ As quoted in Ferdinand, Lundberg, *America's 60 Families* (1937)

¹⁴⁰ *Tragedy and Hope*, page 326

to conceal the identities of the truly wealthy, the all-powerful elite behind the central banks of the world.

The Federal Income Tax

Outrageous as it may sound, there is not a single cent of all the federal income taxes collected from U.S. citizens that goes towards a single service or benefit the U.S. Government provides. The Grace Commission confirmed this in a 1984 report which concluded:

“100 percent of what is collected [in income taxes] is absorbed solely by interest on the Federal debt and by Federal Government contributions to transfer payments. In other words, all individual income tax revenues are gone before one nickel is spent on the services taxpayers expect from government.”

That means much of the money you earn working roughly 4 months out of each year goes into the pockets of these international banker families who own the privately-owned Federal Reserve Banking system. There was never any need for a federal debt. Our wise forefathers who set up the United States and drafted the constitution delegated the power to issue coin and currency solely to Congress, as can be seen in Article 1, Section 8.

There is no doubt to the fraudulence of what happened; just take another look at Frank Vanderlip’s confession—one of the men who helped in the secret hijacking of the American monetary system, planning the Federal Reserve, without the knowledge or consent of the people or Congress, which placed control into the hands of the same banking circles he represented:

“There was an occasion near the close of 1910, when I was as secretive—indeed as furtive—as any conspirator...I do not feel it is any exaggeration to speak of our secret expedition to Jekyll Island as the occasion of the actual conception of what eventually became the Federal Reserve System...Discovery, we knew, simply must not happen...”¹⁴¹

Tax-Exempt Foundations

To add insult, the wealthy powerful families responsible for the Federal Reserve and income tax scam do not pay taxes like we the people are required to do. As already mentioned, the system for these wealthy families was to create for themselves, with the help of bought politicians, tax-exempt non-profit organizations. In 1900, there were 21 corporate NGO’s and today, some 1.5 million has spawned.

The scheme, and scam, is a brilliant one, for it allows the elite financial powers to achieve through the control what they could not achieve through the ownership of their own wealth, for now, tax-free, it is allowed to grow and grow in escrow accounts, and to be used to influence federal, state and local politicians and the public at large for their own wishes, desires and needs, all with government exemptions and protections. This gives the “philanthropic” foundations an incredible amount of power and influence exceeding at times that even of the government, as further explained by Quigley:

¹⁴¹ Frank A. Vanderlip in the 1935 Saturday Evening Post article, “From Farm Boy to Financier.” See also his memoirs.

"[Because] ... of the great influence of this "Wall Street" alignment, an influence great enough to merit the name of the "American Establishment," this group... had to adjust to a good many government actions ... [which they had secretly supported]. 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."¹⁴²

Each year the Rockefellers can dump up to half their incomes into their pet foundations and deduct the "donations" from their income tax. Nelson Rockefeller admitted at his confirmation hearings:

" . . the foundation pays no capital gains tax and no income tax so those funds can continue to multiply. They not only can, they do."

David Rockefeller, before a Congressional committee once stated:

"You know, gentlemen, that I do not owe any personal income tax. But nevertheless, I send a small check, now and then, to the Internal Revenue Service out of the kindness of my heart."

Having the foundations as a tax-free piggy bank is only one of the advantages they provide the family. As Business Week has observed: – "The real motive behind most private foundations is **keeping control of wealth.**" In the foundation world, where "**not for profit**" really means **not-for- taxation**, – one exchanges ownership for control.

Historian Ferdinand Lundberg in his book "The Rich And The Super-Rich" explained:

"What the income tax became, finally, was a siphon gradually inserted into the pocketbooks of the general public. Imposed to popular huzzas as a class tax, the income tax was gradually turned into a mass tax in a jiu-jitsu turnaround.... The escape hatch for the insiders to avoid paying tax was ready. By the time the income tax Amendment had been approved by the states, the Rockefellers and Carnegie foundations were in full operation... These monopolists could now compound their wealth tax-free while competitors had to face a graduated income tax which made it difficult to amass capital.... The conspirators now had created the mechanisms to run up the debt, to collect the debt, and to avoid the taxes required to pay the yearly interest on the debt. Then all that was needed was a reason to escalate the debt. Nothing runs up a national debt like a war. And World War I was being brewed in Europe."

The total number of tax-exempt foundations owned by the Rockefeller's has been estimated to exceed more than 200. One of the greatest tricks perpetrated on the public, since the creation of the Federal Reserve, has been the turning these robber barons /elites into philanthropists. Through these mechanisms they have managed to

¹⁴² Tragedy and Hope, page 938

convince the public that they gave up their power in the interests of society, gave their money to foundations and other philanthropic organizations and faded into the pages of history. They still exist and exercise their power through their control on the monetary system and their control of the foundations and their ability to fund their desired outcomes (as examined in chapter VII). Rene A. Wormser, Chief Counsel to the 1954 congressional investigation into Tax-Exempt Foundations provides further insight:

“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.”¹⁴³

“Who controls the money, controls the world”

There are 4 main areas that have been secretly consolidated into the hands of these wealthy families; the control of money, the control of resources, the control of the worlds political systems and the control of information. Through their control of the ability to create money out of nothing, they have been able to exercise control over all the power centers of society including the corporations, the media, culture creation, the educational system, the historical societies, the political system, education, the military, religion, foundations and other NGOs, medicine, and law (as will be covered in detail in following chapters). The 1913 creation of the Fed fused the power of the financial oligarchy comprised of these wealthy families to the military and diplomatic might of the U.S. Government. If their overseas loans went unpaid, they could now deploy US Marines to collect the debts.

Even before they hijacked the economic system in America these wealthy banking dynasties were already substantive powers in America, as the Pujo Committee – House Committee on Banking and Currency, warned in 1912:

"There is an established and well-defined identity and community of interest between a few leaders of finance, created and held together through stock ownership, interlocking directorates, partnership and joint account transactions, and other forms of domination over banks, trust companies, railroads, and public-service and industrial corporations, which has resulted in great and rapidly growing concentration of the control of money and credit in the hands of these few men....The dominant element in our financial oligarchy is the investment banker. Associated banks, trust companies and life insurance companies are his tools. The development of **our financial oligarchy** followed lines with which the history of political despotism has familiarized us: usurpation, proceeding by **gradual encroachment** rather than violent acts, subtle and often long-**concealed concentration** of distinct functions. It was by processes such as these that Caesar Augustus became master of Rome."

This congressional finding regarding the immense concentration of control of these banking families was made one year before the Federal Reserve Act was passed. As of 1941, these financial powers had secretly achieved complete dominance over America as described by US Senator George Norris in a congressional speech on November 30,

¹⁴³ As quoted by Rene A. Wormser, Chief Counsel to the Reece Committee, in Foundations: their power and influence, 1958

1941:

"J. P. Morgan, with the assistance and cooperation of a few of **the interlocking corporations** which reach all over the United States in their influence, **controls every railroad in the United States**. They **control practically every public utility**, they **control literally thousands of corporations**, they **control all of the large insurance companies**. Mr. President, we are gradually reaching a time, if we have not already reached that point, when **the business of the country is controlled by men who can be named on the fingers of one hand**, because **those men control the money of the Nation**, and that **control is growing at a rapid rate**."

This warning by Senator Norris reveals that by 1941, the covert takeover of many key functional areas of American society had already occurred—this was over 75 years ago—with control of our nation’s “money, credit, banks, trust companies, insurance companies, railroads, public-service and industrial corporations, public utilities, and thousands of corporations and businesses” already consolidated into the hands of the “few men who control the money of the nation” (i.e. the Federal Reserve System)—and that their control over the Country was continuing to “grow at a rapid rate”!



Prince Charles

Evelyn De Rothschild

If you can poke ultra-wealthy royalty in the chest then you surly have power and control like no other.

To conclude this chapter on the covert financial takeover of our country, let us take another look at what the Secret Round Table Network’s intent was when it created the FED according to Quigley:

“...a world system of financial control in private hands able to **dominate the political system of each country**...The apex of the system was to be...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.”¹⁴⁴

As a quick reminder, this isn't a case of Quigley guessing at the Network's intentions. He speaks with the authority of a man who, in his own words, knows “of the operations of this network” because he “studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records.”¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁴ Tragedy and Hope, page 324

¹⁴⁵ Tragedy and Hope, page 950

IV

THE TAKEOVER OF THE MEDIA AND FREE PRESS

"The people will believe what the media tells them they believe." -George Orwell

During the Cold War, one news commentator ironically noted that the Soviet people were actually less brainwashed than Westerners. In the USSR, people would receive Pravda and immediately toss it in the trash, saying “Ah! Party propaganda!” But in America, people would get the New York Times and believe every word, under the illusion that “we have a free press, so we can’t possibly be brainwashed.”

Dr. Mark Crispin Miller, Professor of Media Studies at NYU echoed these same sentiments:

“Media manipulation in the U.S. today is more efficient than it was in Nazi Germany, because here we have the pretense that we are getting all the information we want. That misconception prevents people from even looking for the truth.”

Although America has a free press in principle, it doesn’t actually have one in fact.

“There is no such thing, at this date of the world’s history, in America, as an independent press. You know it and I know it. There is not one of you who dares to write your honest opinions, and if you did, you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid weekly for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for similar things, and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the streets looking for another job. If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone. The business of the journalists is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of mammon, and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread. You know it and I know it, and what folly is this toasting an independent press? We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping jacks, they pull the strings and we dance.”¹⁴⁶

The hidden power structure has exerted tremendous influence over public opinion in this country through its virtual control of major segments of mass communications. Quigley explained that The Round Table Groups believed that the key to controlling the world lies in the application of “**secret** political and economic influence” and **secret control** of “journalistic, educational, and propaganda agencies.”¹⁴⁷

Ownership and control of the media

Quigley explains that the Network initially had secret control over five American newspapers:

“The American branch of this “English Establishment” exerted much of its influence through five American newspapers (The New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Christian Science Monitor, the Washington Post, and the lamented Boston Evening Transcript).”¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶ John Swinton, preeminent New York journalist, chief-of-staff, New York Times, NY Press Club 1880

¹⁴⁷ The Anglo-American Establishment, page 42

¹⁴⁸ Tragedy and Hope, page 953


The following statement entered into the Congressional Record by Congressman Oscar Callaway provides a summary of how the “free press” was hijacked:

“In March, 1915, the J. P. Morgan interests, the steel, shipbuilding, and powder interests, and their subsidiary organizations, got together 12 men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States and sufficient number of them **to control generally the policy of the daily press of the United States.** These 12 men worked the problem out by selecting 179 newspapers, and then began, by an elimination process, to retain only those necessary for the purpose of controlling the general policy of the daily press throughout the country. They found it was only necessary to purchase the control of 25 of the greatest papers. The 25 papers were agreed upon; emissaries were sent to purchase the policy, national and international, of these papers; an agreement was reached; the policy of the papers was bought, to be paid for by the month; an editor was furnished for each paper to properly supervise and edit information regarding the questions of preparedness, militarism, financial policies, and other things of national and international nature considered vital to the interests of the purchasers **This policy also included the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served.**”

Former New York City Mayor John Haylan was quoted in the March 27, 1927 issue of the New York Times:

“These **international bankers and Rockefeller–Standard Oil interests control the majority of the newspapers and magazines in this country.** They use the columns of these papers to club into submission or drive out of office public officials who refuse to do the bidding of the powerful corrupt cliques which compose **the invisible government.** It operates under cover of a self-created screen [and] seizes our executive officers, legislative bodies, schools, courts, newspapers and every agency created for the public protection.”

Today, there are reportedly: 1,500 newspapers 1,100 magazines 9,000 radio stations 2,400 publishers. **All of these are owned and operated by only 6 corporations.**



Filmmaker Michael Moore summed this media monopoly up fittingly:

“By the end of the millennium five men controlled the world's media. And the people rejoiced, because their TVs told them to.”

Quigley explained that **“one of the chief methods by which this Group works has been through propaganda.”**¹⁴⁹ To accomplish this, The Round Table Groups always knew it needed to control the media –the primary molder of public opinion, as explained by Edward Bernays, pioneer in the field of public relations and propaganda:

“With printing press and newspaper, the telephone, telegraph, radio, and airplanes, ideas can be spread rapidly, and even instantaneously, across the whole of America. The conscious and intelligent manipulation of organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in a democratic society. **Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power in our country.** We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of. Whatever attitude one chooses to take toward this condition, it remains a fact that in almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by a relatively small number of persons, a trifling fraction of our hundred and twenty million, who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses. **It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind, and who harness old social forces and contrive new ways to bind and guide the world.**”¹⁵⁰

Quigley provides further insight on the unseen mechanism that molds minds and helps guide the world:

“[By 1931] The methods of mass propaganda offered by the press and the radio provided the means by which [the average man] could be reached and mobilized; the determination of the militarists, landlords, and industrialists **to expand their own power and extend their own interests even to the destruction of society itself provided the motive...**”¹⁵¹

A closer look at the New York Times

In the 19th century August Belmont (real family name: Schoenburg) served as a Rothschild financial agent in the United States. He reportedly offered Abraham Lincoln a Rothschild loan to finance the War Between the States –at 27.5 percent interest. According to the story, possibly mythical, Lincoln had Belmont literally thrown out of the White House. But not everyone was so discriminating. Later, with J. P. Morgan, Belmont helped finance Adolph Ochs, who purchased the New York Times –then a tiny newspaper with a circulation of 9,000. International banking’s might behind him, Ochs

¹⁴⁹ The Anglo–American Establishment, page 4

¹⁵⁰ Edward Bernays, Austrian–born pioneer in the field of public relations and propaganda, member of the Woodrow Wilson administration, nephew of Dr. Sigmund Freud, in his book– Propaganda published 1928

¹⁵¹ Tragedy and Hope, page 560

transformed the Times into the world's most powerful newspaper. The Times was built on money, not journalistic integrity.

Ownership passed from Ochs to his son-in-law Arthur Hays Sulzberger (1935–61), then Orvil Dryfoos (1961–63), and Arthur Ochs Sulzberger (1963–1992), the latter three all CFR members. The New York Times' editorial policy has consistently paralleled the Establishment's agenda. Eugene Meyer, a CFR member, bought the Washington Post in 1933. It was subsequently run by his daughter, Katherine Graham, also a member of the CFR.

When members of Congress opposed Paul Warburg's (CFR member), nomination to the Federal Reserve Board, the Times' editorial page lobbied on his behalf. When communist Fidel Castro was trying to seize Cuba in 1959, a series of articles by New York Times reporter Herbert L. Matthews –CFR member –persuaded Americans that Castro was simply the George Washington of Cuba.

During the Vietnam War, the Times demoralized the public by publishing an alleged exposé of the war's origins –the Pentagon Papers, a leaked Defense Department study. Leslie Gelb, who oversaw the study, went on to be a Times correspondent and editor. So, one might ask, will Gelb do an exposé of the CFR too? Not likely. He was the CFR's President for ten years (1993–2003) and remains its President Emeritus.

Many Times' executives, editors and reporters have been CFR members. Some current ones include director Robert E. Denham, editorial page editor Andrew Rosenthal, assistant managing editor Susan Chira, business columnist Andrew Sorkin, foreign affairs columnist Thomas L. Friedman, and op–ed columnist Nicholas Kristof. The role of media members who become members of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) was explained by Washington Post ombudsman Richard Harwood:

“Their membership is an acknowledgment of their ascension into the American ruling class [where] they do not merely analyze and interpret foreign policy for the United States; they help make it.”¹⁵²

The Times will never expose the CFR because they both belong to the same hierarchy. A similar picture can be sketched of the other major news organs. The media's “diversity” is illusory. For instance, if one were to confirm an AOL news story's accuracy by checking it against CNN and Time, well, the problem: AOL, CNN and Time are owned by the same corporation –Time Warner, Inc., which also owns Warner Brothers Studios, HBO, New Line Cinema, Sports Illustrated, People, Fortune, Money, and scores of other media organs. The New York Times Company owns the Boston Globe; The Washington Post Co. owns Newsweek; Disney owns ABC; CBS owns Simon Schuster. Most of America's major media –TV and radio networks, movie studios, newspapers, magazines and publishing houses –are owned by about a half dozen large corporations; and these, in turn, have directors that interlock through membership in the CFR.

Some other examples of major newspapers, news services and media groups that are controlled or influenced by the CFR: Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, Baltimore

¹⁵² Washington Post ombudsman Richard Harwood in an op–ed piece about the role of the media members who become members of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR): October 30, 1993.

Sun, Chicago Sun–Times, L.A. Times Syndicate, Houston Post, Minneapolis Star–Tribune, Arkansas Gazette, Des Moines Register Tribune, Louisville Courier, Associated Press, United Press International, Reuters News Service, and Gannett Co. (publisher of USA Today, and 90 other daily papers, plus 40 weeklies; and also owns 15 radio stations, 8 TV stations, and 40,000 billboards). Some of the magazines controlled or influenced by the CFR: Time (founded by CFR member Henry Luce, who also published Fortune, Life, Money, People, Entertainment Weekly, and Sports Illustrated; and CFR member Hedley Donovan), Newsweek (owned by the Washington Post, CFR member W. Averell Harriman, CFR member Roland Harriman, and CFR member Lewis W. Douglas), Business Week, U.S. News World Report, Saturday Review, National Review, Reader’s Digest, Atlantic Monthly, McCall’s, Forbes, Look, and Harper’s Magazine.

The Trilateral Commission—a secretive international organization that was set up by the Rockefeller family in 1973—has some of its members in other branches of the global media as: Los Angeles Times, Chicago Sun Times, Kyodo News Service, Japan Times, La Stampa, Die Ziet, Financial Times, Columbia Broadcasting (CBS–TV), The Economist, Japan Broadcasting Corp., Time, Associated Press, and United Press International.

Thus, The Round Table Groups can guarantee the public receives a uniform viewpoint. At the height of the Vietnam War, Congressman John Rarick declared:

“There are many attempts to shift all the blame to the military in the eyes of the people. But no one identifies the Council on Foreign Relations, a group of some 1400 Americans which includes almost every top–level decision and policy maker in the Vietnam War. CBS tells the people it wants them to know what is going on and who is to blame. Why doesn't CBS tell the American people about the CFR and let the people decide whom to blame for the Vietnam fiasco? . . . Who will tell the people the truth if those who control “the right to know machinery” also control the government?”¹⁵³

Author Noam Chomsky provided insight into how the game is played:

“The media want to maintain their intimate relation to state power. They want to get leaks, they want to get invited to the press conferences. They want to rub shoulders with the Secretary of State, all that kind of business. To do that, you've got to play the game, and playing the game means telling their lies, serving as their disinformation apparatus.”

In their historical Reece Committee Hearings that occurred during the 1950s—which will be covered in detail in chapter VII) that exposed how the Secret Round Table Network’s major tax–exempt foundations has worked to destroy the fundamental principles on which this nation was founded and which have made it great—congressional investigators explained the remarkable influence these organizations have over the media:

“The far–reaching power of the large foundations and of the interlock, has so

¹⁵³ “You’ve a Right to Know,” circular of Congressman John R. Rarick, July 15, 1971.

influenced the press, the radio, and even the government that it has become extremely difficult for objective criticism of foundation practices to get into news channels without having first been distorted, slanted, discredited, and at times ridiculed. ... the major foundations and their associated intermediary organizations have entrenched themselves behind a totality of power which presumes to place them beyond serious criticism and attack.”

Let’s look at how Quigley described the Establishment–directed media cover up of this Senate investigation:

“It soon became clear that people of immense wealth would be unhappy if the investigation went too far and that the “most respected” newspapers in the country, closely allied with these men of wealth, would not get excited enough about any [revelations] to make the publicity worthwhile, in terms of votes or campaign contributions.”¹⁵⁴

As this demonstrates, this Secret Network fully understands the importance of controlling public opinion. This also provides a glimpse into how it can do so. (If a disturbing truth isn’t reported on by a “respected” news outlet, it might as well not exist. The vast majority of citizens will remain forever oblivious.) Additionally, in this particular case, any senator that insisted on taking the investigation “too far” would surely face a smear campaign by the same press that was ignoring the story. Shortly thereafter, the “people of immense wealth” who ordered the smear campaign could be counted on to retaliate financially as well; by shifting all future campaign contributions to a more obedient candidate.

Needless to say, this type of influence can drastically affect how much attention an issue receives in the media. The merit and importance of a story will often take a backseat to the wishes of those who have the power to keep it quiet. More importantly, similar tactics of control can be applied in other areas as well. A perfect example is the stunning media silence surrounding gross fraud in vaccine research by the CDC (as covered in–depth in Appendix II).

Lastly, here’s a quick illustration of how the Round Table Network of organizations can subtly influence the media, and mold perceptions: this example shows the influence of the secretive Trilateral Commission, as seen in the January 15, 1981 episode of the ABC–TV show “Barney Miller”:

A man was arrested for breaking into the offices of the Commission, and when he was taken to the 12th Precinct, he began ranting and raving about how the Trilateral Commission was attempting to set up an “international community” and how they eventually wanted to take over the world. The character, William Klein (played by Jeffrey Tambor) was made to look like a fool, and upon leaving the squad room, Detective Sgt. Arthur Dietrich (played by Steve Landesberg) said: “Well, I think you have some very valid criticisms of the Commission, and I’m certainly gonna bring them up at the next meeting.” After Dietrich tells the man he was a member of the Trilateral Commission, which he wasn’t, the man reacted: “Oh God, no...The character was made to look like a paranoid maniac,

¹⁵⁴ Tragedy and Hope, page 955

reminiscent of the McCarthy era.

This was only one of the many propaganda pieces that was used to make the Trilateral Commission look just like any other unimportant organization. This is the principle that the Secret Network has used for years to slant the news, so that the public will accept their views.

Comedian George Carlin sums up the Establishment–Network controlled media—by depriving the masses of independent thought, it is much easier to subject them to the will of their rulers:

“[They] don't want well–informed, well–educated people capable of critical thinking that is against their interests. They want obedient workers, people who are just smart enough to run the machines and do the paperwork, and just dumb enough to passively accept it.”

V
THE PROFOUND IMPACT ON AMERICA

Dr Quigley admits that the Secret Round Table Groups have “played a very significant role in the history of the United States in the last generation.”¹⁵⁵ Before we look at the historical record to attempt to grasp the enormous impact that it has had on our country and society, let us quickly summarize some of the things that Dr. Quigley documented with considerable detail to the world:

At the turn of the 20th Century, “a secret society was established” with purposes “centered on [the] desire to federate the English–speaking peoples and to bring all the habitable portions of the world under [its] control.”¹⁵⁶

“At the end of World War I, it became clear that the organization of this system had to be greatly extended” so “a front organization to the existing local Round Table Group” was established in America¹⁵⁷

This front organization in America was “known as the Council on Foreign Relations, and was a front for J. P. Morgan and Company in association with the very small American Round Table Group.”¹⁵⁸ And “throughout its history the [CFR] has been associated with the American Round Tables.” And the early members of this Secret Society included individuals by the names of “Thomas W. Lamont of J.P. Morgan, Walter Lippmann, Frank Aydelotte, Whitney Shepardson, and Jerome D. Greene” **who were all founding members of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR).**¹⁵⁹

Quigley identified the close affiliation of these individuals to the Rockefellers to include being “general manager of the Rockefeller Institute, assistant to John D. Rockefeller in philanthropic work, trustee to the Rockefeller Institute, to the Rockefeller foundation, and to the Rockefeller General Education Board.”¹⁶⁰ And because of its dominant position in Wall Street “The Morgan firm” was in close alliance with Rockefeller.”¹⁶¹

Quigley also acknowledged that organizations associated with J.P. Morgan and Rockefeller were central to the American branch of this Round Table Network and since “1925 that the Network has been financed largely by foundations and firms associated with the international banking fraternity” “and other organizations associated with J. P. Morgan [and], the Rockefeller famil[y]”¹⁶²

That this “power structure” has “penetrated deeply into university life, the press,

¹⁵⁵ Tragedy and Hope, pages 950

¹⁵⁶ Tragedy and Hope, pages 131

¹⁵⁷ Tragedy and Hope, pages 951

¹⁵⁸ Tragedy and Hope, pages 952

¹⁵⁹ Tragedy and Hope, pages 950

¹⁶⁰ Tragedy and Hope, pages 955

¹⁶¹ Tragedy and Hope, page 938

¹⁶² Tragedy and Hope, pages 951

and the practice of foreign policy...” and “The American branch of this [Round Table Group] exerted much of its influence through” “American newspapers” and that “It might be mentioned that the existence of this Wall Street, Anglo-American axis is quite obvious once it is pointed out”.¹⁶³

“That 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.”¹⁶⁴

That this Round Table Group formed the Institute for Pacific Relations (IPR) which was “a third network in 1925, organized by the same people for the same motives” of which “were funded by the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation” “which were themselves interlocking groups controlled by an alliance of Morgan and Rockefeller interests.”¹⁶⁵ And “the influence of the Communists in” this “elaborate, semisecret [IPR] organization is well established, but the patronage of Wall Street is less well known.”¹⁶⁶ **And that** “the chief aims of [the IPR] were ...to coordinate the international activities and outlooks of all the English-speaking world into **one** [i.e. No independent nations just one-world under the control of the members of this secret organization]”¹⁶⁷

A closer look at the organizational structure of this Round Table Network

The structure of this secret organization was outwardly modeled after the Society of Jesus (Jesuit Order). Cecil Rhodes was an admirer of the organizational structure of the Jesuit Order and, although he didn't take it straight across, he took many elements from it. At the deeper level, though, it is instructive to note that Rhodes borrowed the structure of organizational control directly from Adam Weishaupt. (Weishaupt was the founder of the original Illuminati secret society which was disbanded in Bavaria shortly after it was formed, and their secret records and notebooks and so forth were seized and placed into the public records, so it is possible to go to a library today and read verbatim the organizational structure of the original Illuminati). This organizational structure is what is referred to as rings within rings within rings.

What that means is this: at the center of Weishaupt's Illuminati organization, there would be a controlling group of maybe three or four people — just a small number. These in turn would create a membership ring around them of a larger number of perhaps 20 or 30 or something like, and the members of that ring would not be aware that they were being dominated and controlled by the inner circle. Now that outer ring, in turn, thinking that they were the whole enchilada, would then create a larger ring around it comprising of hundreds or perhaps thousands of people, and those people would not suspect that they were being dominated and directed by an inner ring. And then finally that last ring would create still another one that would reach out to mass organizations — reach out to the masses. And in that fashion, an organization with

¹⁶³ Tragedy and Hope, pages 953

¹⁶⁴ Tragedy and Hope, pages 950

¹⁶⁵ Tragedy and Hope, pages 946

¹⁶⁶ Tragedy and Hope, pages 946

¹⁶⁷ Tragedy and Hope, pages 954

just a few people in the center through this carefully controlled structure of rings within rings can control the world, and the people being controlled would never know that that's how it worked. Now that's the structure that Weishaupt created and described at some length and it's interesting that Cecil Rhodes selected that very structure for his secret society.

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

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

And then regarding the conspiratorial structure of this group, Quigley tells us this:

“In the secret society Rhodes was to be leader Stead, Brett, Lord Dasher, and Milner were to form an executive committee called “The Society of the Elect.” Arthur, Lord Balfour, Sir Harry Johnston, Lord Rothschild, Albert Lord Grey and others, were listed as potential members of a “circle of initiates”. While there was to be an outer circle known as the “association of helpers”.” [Those underlined phrases, are lifted from Adam Weishaupt — those are his phrases that he used for his secret Illuminati organization!] This was later organized by Milner as the roundtable organizations.

After the death of Cecil Rhodes, his secret society fell under the control of Lord Alfred Milner who recruited young men from the upper class of society to become part of the “association of helpers” [which has been mentioned became later known as the roundtables].

This group of young men recruited from the higher levels of British society was unofficially called at that time Milner's Kindergarten—which were young men coming up in politics and in banking and they came from the most elite families—but they called them Milner's Kindergarten because they worked very closely together and they tutored them and helped them get into positions of authority, especially in government. They were placed into the power centers of society and eventually they became the roundtable organizations in each of those countries, and so they were the inner-circle of a larger circle around them.

But the result of all this is that it remains invisible to the average person. It remains invisible not only because of its structure and because of its secrecy, but also because it has had the foresight of not having a name. Now just think about that for a minute. If you say that you have an organization or you create an organization and somebody says, well what are we going to call ourselves, and the answer is we're not going to call ourselves anything. We're not going to have a name. That way, nobody can talk about us. Brilliant! And that's what they decided to do. Dr. Quigley himself doesn't know how to describe it. At some places in his books he calls it the “Eastern Establishment” or the

“Anglo–American Establishment.” He also refers to it as the “Rhodes Group” or the “Network.” In other places he calls it the “Round Table Groups.” In other places he just calls it the “Group.” It has no name. Therefore, it’s another reason that it’s invisible to the average person today.

As explained by Dr. Quigley:

“I know of the operation of this network because I have studied it for 20 years and was permitted for two years during the 1960s to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have for much of my life been close to it and too many of the instruments. In general, my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown.”

In *The Anglo–American Establishment*, Quigley says this:

“[A]nd what does not seem to be known to anyone is that this secret society continues to exist to this day. To be sure it is not a childish thing like the Ku Klux Klan, and it does not have any secret robes, secret hand clasps, or secret passwords. It does not need any of these since its members know each other intimately. It probably has neither oaths of secrecy nor any formal procedure of initiation. It does however exist and holds secret meetings. This group as I shall show is one of the most important historical facts of the 20th Century.”

One of the original leaders of this Round Table Network was a fellow by the name of William Stead. William Stead was so important that he was the executor of Cecil Rhodes’ Will, so he should know what he’s talking about. He wrote a book entitled *The Last Will and Testament of C. J. Rhodes*, and in that book William Stead said this:

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

So, they looked at this Network like an Order. It’s not just a group or an organization; It’s a Chivalry Order—an Order like the Knights Templar. In Cecil Rhodes hand–written manuscript we find this coming directly from Cecil Rhodes’ own pen. He said:

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

So there you have it from the mind of the founder.

How this Secret Society Evolved

This Secret Round Table Network evolved not too long after the organization was put into motion it changed. The goal changed. World domination didn't change. After Rhodes' death it didn't take long before the center of gravity shifted away to the Rockefeller group which was very quick to move into that circle and now we can see that there are centers or secondary centers of influence within the Rockefeller group and centers within such organizations as the semi-secret CFR, and secretive CFR affiliates like the Bilderberg Group (which is an annual gathering of the some of the world's most powerful figures) and the Trilateral Commission (a secretive international elite organization founded by David Rockefeller centered around the three major economic regions in the world) to name just a few. Control from behind the scenes by a very small elect group didn't change. But what did change is that the focal point for this was no longer the British or England, but it was to be a New World Order, international in scope and to be housed through an international organization of some kind. Initially they had hoped that it would be the League of Nations and all of their members worked very hard to create the League of Nations for that purpose. When that failed, then they set their sights on the United Nations, which finally was put into action and now is on a fast track to becoming the very one-world structure which they had projected as their goal. The goal shifted away from creating a world empire based in England to a world empire centered around the United Nations called the New World Order but based on the model of collectivism—a totalitarian form of world government where they have complete control and authority over all people on earth.

Back to Quigley: In his own words, he says that the goal of the secret society was:

“nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands, able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. The system was to be controlled in a feudalist fashion by the central banks of the world, acting in concert by secret agreements arrived at in frequent private meetings and conferences.”

The CFR, Trilateral Commission, and the mysterious Bilderberg meetings begin to take on more significance when one realizes that that's really part of this plan. To the unsuspecting public, these people deny their plans and their goals, obviously, because the public for the large part would not necessarily understand them in an approving way. So they lie a lot, but when they speak to themselves in their own private papers, and before conclaves which are expected to remain confidential, they often tell the whole unvarnished truth like the following quote written by one of a group of Britons who served in the South African Civil Service under High Commissioner Alfred, Lord Milner. His name was Arnold Toynbee. He was a renowned historian, he was a Professor at the London School of Economics, he was a director of studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs which was Britain's version of the Council on Foreign Relations, and is a front for the Secret Roundtable Network, he was a British Intelligence Agent and the author of a very famous, 12-volume history of the world called *A Study of History*, which extols the virtue of world government and

collectivism.¹⁶⁸ And so he's a big guy. In November of 1931, in that issue of International Affairs which was published as an insider publication just for members of that Roundtable, this is what Toynebee said which bears repeating:

"I will hereby repeat that we are at present working discretely but with all our might to rest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of the world. At all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands."

And that, of course, makes sense. World government doesn't just happen by writing some articles or books. Only when people are in control of power centers of society can they bring about massive changes like this. Not scholarship but power. Not public opinion but power. Power is the key and the power centers of society are what join together and give these people power over their citizens.

Sometimes these people of this Secret Organization do actually admit publically what their true intentions are like the following statement to Congress in 1950 by international banker James Warburg. Warburg (CFR member) was from the prominent Warburg banking dynasty and close advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt who helped FDR enact fifteen major laws during his first one hundred days in office. His father was banker Paul Warburg—one of the architects of both the CFR and Federal Reserve System: On February 17, 1950 Warburg confidently declared to the United States Senate:

"The past 15 years of my life have been devoted almost exclusively to studying the problem of world peace and, especially, the relation of the United States to these problems. These studies led me, 10 years ago, to the conclusion that the great question of our time is not whether one world can be achieved, but whether or not one world can be achieved by peaceful means. **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."¹⁶⁹

To put it more bluntly, a bureaucratic authoritarian one-world government ruled by a secretive power elite "**whether or not we like it.**" One regime ruling the planet: national boundary lines obliterated; with a single government under their control; taking authority over the Earth; "**achieved by consent or by conquest.**" This Round Table Group that Warburg represents adheres to the philosophy of "The end justifies the means" and as Quigley points out will exploit the rhetoric of any movement or ideology, prop up any dictator or tyrant, and support any economic or political model, provided it serves their one overarching aim. That aim, to bring "all the habitable

¹⁶⁸ Collectivism is a system of government that ultimately results in the government having complete control and authority over the people. More broadly, it is a totalitarian idea where all things belong to and are done to serve the greater good of those wielding the power of the centralized government (regardless of how ambiguous, harsh, arbitrary or incompetent it may seem). Fascism and Communism are merely different forms of collectivism. Collectivism is a desirable situation for those in charge. The "people" are never the benefactors of this type of system.

¹⁶⁹This was a statement to Congress, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: Revision of the United Nations Charter: Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, February 17th, 1950. Father was banker Paul Warburg, who was instrumental in the creation of the Council on Foreign Relations and Federal Reserve System).

portions of the world under their control,” is as old as the lust for power itself.¹⁷⁰

The Rockefeller’s ‘one-world’ agenda as explained by the Rockefellers themselves

Let us look further at what the Rockefellers themselves have said about their “one-world” superstate agenda:

On June 5, 1991, speaking before the secretive Bilderberger Group (a CFR affiliate), CFR Chairman David Rockefeller described the mainstream media–policymaker marriage as exposed by the French Press:

“Mr. Rockefeller’s opening speech should give Americans a jolt. He told his listeners:

‘We are grateful to The Washington Post, The New York Times, Time Magazine, and other great publications whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their **promises of discretion** for almost forty years.’ It would have been impossible for us to develop **our plan for the world** if we had been subject to the bright lights of publicity during these years. But the world is now more sophisticated and prepared to **march towards a world government** which will never again know war but only peace and prosperity. **The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national autodetermination practiced in the past centuries.** It is also our duty to inform the press of our convictions as to the historic future of the century.’¹⁷¹

Put in plain English: if we had told the American people what we were doing, without first conditioning them, we could never have gotten away with it. Now there is nothing they can do about it. Note how far-reaching his ambitions are – the imposition of world government and the replacement of “auto-determination” (democracy) by an elite group of intellectuals. He even admits to being part of a secret cabal to bring this about.

The French news magazine Lectures Francaises further commented on Rockefeller’s Speech:

“It took forty years for this politico–financial secret society which we exposed almost twenty years ago to admit what we have never ceased writing.” The magazine added: “on the eve of the opening session of the 24-nation Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris (which was five days before the Bilderbergers met in Germany), Mr. Bush’s Secretary of State proposed the creation of a Euro–Atlantic Community from Vancouver to Vladivostok. This is to say, Mr. James Baker [CFR member], speaking in the name

¹⁷⁰ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

¹⁷¹ David Rockefeller, Honorary Chairman of the CFR, in an address to a meeting of the Bilderberg Group, Baden–Baden, Germany, June 5, 1991 As quoted in “The Masks Are Coming Off,” H du B Reports, Volume 34, Letter 5, Sept 1991, 1–2. Rockefeller’s speech to the 1991 meeting of the Bilderbergers was leaked to the French press; it first appeared in the June 19, 1991 issue of the French weekly Minute and the July–August 1991 issue of Lectures Francaises. Also quoted in Programming, Pitfalls and Puppy–Dog Tales (1993) by Gyeorgos C. Hatonn, p. 65.

of the President of the United States, expects Europeans to guarantee the Bush-Gorbachev entente, the **new Holy Alliance of capitalists and communists, which will lead to world government.** It is no longer writers and journalists who are telling you this, but the actors, the plotters themselves who inform you.”¹⁷²

In his autobiography David Rockefeller makes no attempt to hide his one-world agenda or his evident willingness to destroy the sovereignty of the United States:

“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 I am proud of it.**”¹⁷³

Dr. David Funderburk, Fulbright Scholar, former congressman, and U.S. Ambassador to Romania, provided clear warning in 1991 of what was going on behind the scenes:

“George Bush has been surrounding himself with people who believe in **one-world government. They believe that the Soviet system and the American system are converging.**” The vehicle to bring this about, said Funderburk, is the United Nations, “the majority of whose 166 member states are socialist, atheist, and anti-American.”¹⁷⁴

Dr. Johannes Koepl, PHD, Former German Ministry for Defense official and advisor to NATO secretary General Manfred Werner in an FTW interview in 2003 expressed similar sentiments:

“The interests behind the Bush administration, such as the CFR, the Trilateral Commission – founded by Brzezinski for David Rockefeller – and the Bilderberg Group have prepared for and are now **moving to implement open world dictatorship** within the next five years.... In 1983/4 **I warned of a takeover of world governments being orchestrated by these people.** There was an obvious plan to subvert true democracies and selected leaders were not being chosen based upon character but upon their loyalty to an economic system run by the elites and dedicate to preserving their power.”

Here’s a candid statement by Strobe Talbott (CFR Director, Trilateral Commission member, Rhodes Scholar), and roommate of former president Bill Clinton (member of

¹⁷² Ibid, p. 2.

¹⁷³ – David Rockefeller from his autobiography entitled “Memoirs” pgs. 404 & 405.

¹⁷⁴ As quoted in a speech to a North Carolina audience, October 29, 1991. Funderburk, a former congressman, served as ambassador in Bucharest from 1981 to 1985, when he resigned in frustration over U.S. support of the oppressive regime of the late Rumanian dictator, Nicolae Ceausescu.

the Trilateral Commission and Bilderberg Group) at Oxford University (later Clinton's Deputy Secretary of State), as quoted in Time magazine on July 20, 1992, in an article called "The Birth of the Global Nation":

"All countries are basically social arrangements... No matter how permanent or even sacred they may seem at any one time, in fact they are all artificial and temporary... In the next century, **nations** as we know it will be **obsolete**; all states will recognize a **single, global authority**....Perhaps **national sovereignty wasn't such a great idea after all**... But it has taken the events in our own wondrous and terrible century **to clinch the case for world government.**"¹⁷⁵

Here's a boast by Madeleine Albright [CFR member] at a major public function in 1997, when she was serving as US Secretary of State:

"Today, there is no Stalin to give orders. If a nation is isolated from the international community now, it is either because the country is simply too weak to meet international standards, or because its leaders have chosen willfully to disregard those standards. Last week in the Netherlands, President Clinton [CFR member] said that no democratic nation in Europe would be left out of the transatlantic community. Today I say that no nation in the world need be left out of **the global system we are constructing.**"¹⁷⁶

Vladimir Putin disclosed in December, 2016 of an ongoing international effort to do away with sovereign states and create a global totalitarian state:

"At the same time as this process at a national level in the West, we observe on an international level the attempts to create a unipolar, unified model of the world, to relativize and remove institutions of international right and national sovereignty....In such a unified, unipolar world there is no place for sovereign states. Such a world needs merely vassals....From a historical perspective, such a unipolar world would mean the surrender of one's own identity and of God-created diversity."¹⁷⁷

Some courageous attempts to sound a warning

A few elected representatives have tried to warn of this secret movement to destroy our Constitution and national sovereignty. In the 1964 book *With No Apologies*, by Sen. Barry M. Goldwater, he said:

¹⁷⁵ Strobe Talbott received the World Federalist Association (WFA) Norman Cousins Global Governance Award for his 1992 Time Magazine article, 'The Birth of the Global Nation' and in appreciation for what he has done "for the cause of global governance." President Clinton writes a letter of congratulation which states: "Norman Cousins worked for world peace and world government.... Strobe Talbott's lifetime achievements as a voice for global harmony have earned him this recognition... He will be a worthy recipient of the Norman Cousins Global Governance Award. Best wishes... for future success." Not only does President Clinton use the specific term, "world government," but he also expressly wishes the WFA "future success" in pursuing world federal government. Talbott proudly accepts the award, but says the WFA should have given it to the other nominee, Mikhail Gorbachev.

¹⁷⁶ Madeleine Albright, U.S. Secretary of State, Harvard University Commencement Address, Massachusetts, June 5, 1997

¹⁷⁷ Vladimir Putin, press conference, 12-25-2016, <http://yournewswire.com/putin-new-world-order-philosophy-west/>

“[The Trilateral Commission] is intended to be the vehicle for multinational consolidation of the commercial and banking interests by seizing control of the political government of the United States. The Trilateral Commission represents a skillful, coordinated effort to seize control and consolidate the four centers of power political, monetary, intellectual and ecclesiastical. What the Trilateral Commission intends is to create a worldwide economic power superior to the political governments of the nationstates involved. As managers and creators of the system, they will rule the future.”¹⁷⁸

Congressman Ron Paul, at an event near Austin Texas, on August 30th, 2003 stated in an answer to a question from an audience member:

“I think there are 25,000 individuals that have used offices of powers, and they are in our Universities and they are in our Congresses, and they believe in One World Government. And if you believe in One World Government, then you are talking about undermining National Sovereignty and you are talking about setting up something that you could well call a Dictatorship – and those plans are there... “

A notable member of this group was Congressman Larry McDonald, a very vocal critic of the Network and their disturbing agenda:

“And to my knowledge, not one has dared reveal the most vital part of the Rockefeller story: that the Rockefellers and their allies have, for at least fifty years, **been carefully following a plan to use their economic power to gain political control of first America, and then the rest of the world.** The drive of the Rockefellers and their allies is to create a **one-world government** combining supercapitalism and communism under the same tent, **all under their control....**”

Do I mean conspiracy? Yes, I do. I am convinced there is **such a plot, international in scope, generations old in planning, and incredibly evil in intent.** You will find the truth—often surprising, sometimes unpleasant...why the Rockefellers follow the policies they do, what their goals are, where they intend to take America...and why it is essential they be stopped.” ¹⁷⁹

Congressman McDonald was killed when the Soviet Union inexplicably shot down the large passenger plane in which he was travelling on September 1, 1983.

“There is a real question in my mind that the Soviets may have actually murdered 269 passengers and crew on the Korean Air Lines Flight 007 in order to kill Larry McDonald.”¹⁸⁰

Secret Roundtable member, British writer, Fabian Society member, Herbert George Wells makes it quite clear that all such resistance to the New World Order must be

¹⁷⁸ Senator Barry Goldwater in his 1979 book, With No Apologies

¹⁷⁹ Congressman Lawrence P McDonald, from his Introduction to The Rockefeller File by Gary Allen, 1976

¹⁸⁰ Jerry Falwell, The Washington Post, September 2, 1983

dealt with in summary fashion:

“...when the struggle seems to be drifting definitely towards a **world social democracy**, there may still be very great delays and disappointments before it becomes an efficient and beneficent **world system**. **Countless people...will hate the new world order...and will die protesting against it**. When we attempt to evaluate its promise, we have to bear in mind the distress of a generation or so of malcontents, many of them quite gallant and graceful-looking people.”¹⁸¹

Prominent Historian, Political Speechwriter, and CFR member Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. echoed similar sentiments:

“We are not going to achieve a new world order without paying for it in blood as well as in words and money.”¹⁸²

In a statement to the United Nations Business Council in 1994, Director of the CFR and Trilateral Commission, David Rockefeller said:

“We are on the verge of a global transformation. All we need is the right major crisis and the **nations will accept the New World Order.**”

The history of this term ‘New World Order’

Since the Persian Gulf War, the term ‘New World Order’ has become well known. However, there has never really been an explanation as to what the term actually meant, only that it seemed to somehow represent a new spirit of cooperation among the nations of the world, in order to further the cause of peace. And peace is good, so therefore the New World Order is good and should be accepted. But in reality the term “New World Order” is frequently used by proponents in high places of an all-powerful One-World Government. In regard to the origins of the term itself, many people first attributed the term ‘New World Order’ to Adolph Hitler when he called for its creation prior to the onset of World War II: “National Socialism will use its own revolution for the establishing of a new world order.”

The term ‘New World Order’ was actually first used back in 1915. In an address delivered to the Union League of Philadelphia on November 27, 1915, Nicholas Murray Butler, Carnegie Foundation trustee and member of the Secret Roundtable Network:

“The old world order changed when this war-storm broke. The old international order passed away as suddenly, as unexpectedly, and as completely as if it had been wiped out by a gigantic flood, by a great tempest, or by a volcanic eruption. The old world order died with the setting of that day’s sun and a new world order is being born while I speak, with birth pangs so terrible that it seems almost incredible that life could come out of such fearful suffering and such overwhelming sorrow.”

¹⁸¹ Herbert G Wells, *The New World Order* (1939), see also, *The Anglo-American Establishment* p. 55 and p. 116 for Round Tabler.

¹⁸² Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., CFR member, in the CFR publication, *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 1995).

In the December, 1922 edition of Foreign Affairs, CFR Member Philip Kerr wrote:

“Obviously there is going to be no peace or prosperity for mankind as long as (the earth) remains divided into 50 or 60 independent states until some kind of international system is created ... **The real problem today is that of the world government.**”

Naturally, everyone would like to see peace and prosperity for mankind. But if the United States traded its sovereignty for membership in an all-powerful one-world government, what would become of our freedoms, as expressed in the Bill of Rights? How would the rulers of this world government be selected? And how could a single, central authority equitably govern a planet that is so diversified?

The Secret Round Table Network’s version of one-world government

What is certain is that this particular version of world government secretly and gradually being organized by the Rockefellers and other members of the Secret Round Table is not based out of love and goodness for humanity. The Network’s method of “establishing peace” through the “creation of war” so that all humankind is forced to live under one common political authority does not result in peace and prosperity for mankind. Their version of world government to be “achieved by consent or by conquest”¹⁸³ is not being taken out of concern for all human kind —rather it is all grounded on the lust for power and control.

The "old world order" is one based on independent nation-states. The "new world order" that is gradually being organized, step by step, with few people even realizing involves covertly replacing sovereignty and independence of nation-states with an undemocratic world government “whether or not we like it”— with the conversion of the United Nations and its agencies to an all-powerful world authority, complete with a world parliament, world currency, world religion, global taxation, and numerous other agencies to control every aspect of human life. This means the end of the United States of America, the U.S. Constitution, and the Bill of Rights as we now know them. ¹⁸⁴

As it was discovered in the 1950's congressional investigations (which will be covered in-depth in chapter VII), the purpose of the Round Table Network’s "great foundations" was to merge capitalism and communism into a system of global control. Accordingly, this new one-world system would be built upon that framework (economically—it would be privately owned by the ruling elite; and socially it would be dictatorially run by the same ruling elite)¹⁸⁵ where all laws will be uniform under a legal system of world courts practicing the same unified code of laws, backed up by a One World Government police force and a One World unified military to enforce laws in all former countries where no national boundaries shall exist.

¹⁸³“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.” This statement to Congress from member of the Secret Network, James P. Warburg, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: Revision of the United Nations Charter: Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, February 17th, 1950.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid

¹⁸⁵ As Norman Dodd discovered in the 1950's congressional investigations, the purpose of the "great foundations" was to merge capitalism and communism into a system of global control.

Conservatives will call it communism, Liberals will call it Fascism. The label makes little difference. The system will be on the basis of a global totalitarian state. Communism or Fascism, in practice, is a system where government has total power – not only political power, but power over the economy, education, communications, where you live, where you work, what you are paid, what you think, how your children are educated, what you may not and must read and write. Everything.

The reasonable question to ask at this point undoubtedly is what could motivate the Rockefellers and other members of this Secret Round Table Group to create a world collectivist system which seem so totally at odds with their own interests? One would assume that, since they are thought of as rich capitalists, they would have used their fortune to foster the philosophy of individual liberty. But, just the opposite is true; these men are not really capitalists in the classical sense; they are merely rich socialists. They have gained vast wealth, not through honest competition and free enterprise, but by political influence and favoritism, the granting of government protection to eliminate competition, and by gigantic fraud of the money system backed by government force. John D. Rockefeller Sr. was one of the most ruthless and most successful monopolists of all time. One of his favorite expressions was "Competition is a sin."¹⁸⁶ He learned early on that the easiest way to control or eliminate competitors is not to best them in the marketplace, but to use the power of government to exclude them from the marketplace, so he went into the politics business. Once he controlled the purse strings of enough captive Congressmen, he could get them to pull strings to promote his own interests and to hinder his competitors. In other words, he sought national control to protect his national monopoly.

Collectivism offers the Round Table Group the greatest vehicle for concentrating and controlling the wealth. This is the ultimate goal of these planners: power over not only the wealth of the world, but also the producers of that wealth, the people themselves. So this Network uses government to get control of the government, and total government control is their goal.

The American free enterprise system, as originally set up, was much the opposite of collectivism. The Constitution forced the government to remain "laissez faire"; it could exert virtually no influence on business, education, religion, and most other features of national life. These were left in the private hands of the people. But free enterprise means competition: it means, in its purest form, that everyone has an equal opportunity to make it in the marketplace.

This connection between the monopolists and government was correctly discerned by Frederick Clemson Howe, PhD., an economist, lawyer, and a special assistant to Henry Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture and Vice-President to Franklin Roosevelt. He wrote:

"These are the rules of big business: Get a monopoly! Let society work for you, and remember that the best business is politics, for a legislative grant, franchise, subsidy, or tax exemption is worth more than a Kimberly or Comstock Lode, since it does not require any labor either mental or physical, for its exploitation."

¹⁸⁶ Hoffman, op. cit., p. 29.

Another who wrote of this connection was Dr. Antony Sutton, who wrote in his book *Wall Street and FDR*:

“Old John Rockefeller and his 19th century fellow capitalists were convinced of an absolute truth: that no great monetary wealth could be accumulated under the impartial rules of competitive laissez-faire society (the free-enterprise system) society. The only sure road to the acquisition of massive wealth was monopoly: drive out your competitors, reduce competition, eliminate laissez-faire and above all get state protection for your industry through compliant politicians and government regulation. The last avenue yields a huge monopoly and a legal monopoly always leads to wealth.”

Their coziness with collectivism becomes clear when we realize that communism and fascism are themselves forms of monopoly. The only difference is that in this case, the monopoly is operated by the government. If you wish to control commerce, banking, transportation, and natural resources on a national level, you must control the federal government. If you and your clique wish to establish worldwide monopolies, you must control World Government. If this Round Table Network, through loans to the state, manipulation of a central bank, campaign contributions, or bribes, is able to achieve dominion over a government, in that case, he would find communism or fascism welcome, for it would serve him as an instrument to control society. There is nothing on earth more powerful than government, a fact long ago recognized by these international bankers. Regulation, fascism, and communism are simply different gradations of monopoly. Who cares if the government is running things, if you run the government. It makes no difference which party is in power; whether a Democrat or Republican Administration, the Rockefellers and fellow kingpins hold the key positions, especially in the fields of foreign policy and finance.

Similarly, If you go across the Atlantic to the roots of the Round Table Network in Britain, you'll find that the Rhodes and the Milner Group were monopolists just like Rockefeller. Their power and influence derived from gold and diamond deposits which they exploited through their mining operations. Gold produced by the Milner Group's South African mining companies amounted to half of the world's newly mined gold. A similar monopoly was held on diamonds, all South African diamond mines being owned by the Milner Group's company De Beers. Another key resource controlled by the Milner Group and its associates was oil which it monopolized through operations like British Petroleum (BP), and Royal Dutch Shell, in addition to important industries such as steel which it controlled through various outfits from the U.S. to the British Steel Corporation. The same interests also controlled banking and finance. The Round Table Group's sponsorship of political systems like Socialism which promoted centralization of finance, economy, and politics; revolutions such as those of Russia and China; military conflicts from the Boer to the two World Wars; world organizations from the League of Nations to the United Nations and the European Union, etc., has been motivated solely by a relentless and almost pathological drive for financial profit and world control. These people are not humanitarians; they are power-seeking Machiavellians. And as has been simply and profoundly stated many times throughout history “power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.”¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁷ Lord John Emerich Edward Dalberg Acton, (1834–1902), British historian and philosopher

Curtis Bean Dall, Wall Street and political insider, and FDR's son-in-law, provided further confirmation to the true agenda of the Secret Round Table Network's version of one-world government:

"The UN is but a long-range, international banking apparatus clearly set up for financial and economic profit by a small group of powerful One-World revolutionaries, **hungry for profit and power.**"¹⁸⁸

The New World Order has gradually been organized, step by step, with few people even realizing it

In fact, much of the actual superstructure and infrastructure for the physical edifice of a world government already have been built. The United Nations' official organizational chart and world map give an ominous inkling of the global leviathan that is already in place. But only an inkling; it actually vastly understates the magnitude of the organizational sprawl of the UN worldwide, since it merely shows the locations of the headquarters offices of the main UN agencies and only a few of the many regional offices or field operations of these agencies. Take, for instance, the UN's World Health Organization (WHO). In addition to its mammoth Geneva headquarters, it also has six huge regional offices: Africa HQ (Brazzaville, Congo); the Americas HQ (Washington, D.C.); Europe HQ (Copenhagen, Denmark); Eastern Mediterranean HQ (Cairo, Egypt); Southeast Asia HQ (Delhi, India); Western Pacific HQ (Manila, Philippines).

Likewise, the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization is located in a huge gleaming palace of glass and marble a short walk from the Coliseum in Rome. But it also has regional offices in Ghana, Chile, Thailand, Egypt, and Hungary, as well as subregional offices in Samoa, Barbados, Tunisia, Turkey, Ethiopia, Gabon, and Panama; and liaison offices in Geneva; Washington, D.C.; New York; Brussels; and Yokohama. The story is similar at UNESCO, which, besides boasting a palatial edifice in Paris, called the World Heritage Center, has field offices, cluster offices, national offices, regional bureaus, and liaison offices in more than 50 countries throughout the world. This same pattern is repeated for many other UN agencies.

Besides putting in place a vast civil service of administrators and bureaucrats to run the planned world government, the ever-expanding UN system has created a huge global constituency of local and national politicians, corporations, and NGOs that benefits from the UN's presence and can be counted on to lobby for its continued expansion.

The UN's rapidly growing organizational footprint is most jarringly visible throughout the Third World, where offices of UN agencies, the IMF, and World Bank dominate the political and economic landscape, and UN trucks, UN tent cities, blue-helmeted UN peacekeepers, and UN civilian staff are ubiquitous.

The head of the UN admits that the true purpose of the UN is to become the world government. In a speech at the University of California, the Secretary-General of the UN said:

¹⁸⁸ Curtis Bean Dall, FDR's son-in-law as quoted in his book, *Franklin Delano Roosevelt, My Exploited Father-in-Law*, 1967.

“Even the Governments of the world, associated in the United Nations, must realize the ideals which were...reaffirmed in 1945 in the Charter of the United Nations. We can thus see how far the world has actually come...in making the ideas and ideals of the Covenant of the League of Nations into acceptable reality, **if we are to make the next step toward world authority and then onward to a world government**, it will "be by the growth in authority and prestige of the institutions and agencies of the United Nations, and by the development of the provisions of the Charter and the Statute of the International Court. If we can make those documents accepted as binding law, as every Government in the United Nations is pledged to accept, then **we are on the right path to world authority.**"¹⁸⁹

The gradual development of the UN from an international organization into world government was planned from the world body's beginning in 1945. One of the UN architects at the UN founding conference in San Francisco was CFR member John Foster Dulles, who served as U.S. secretary of state from 1953 to 1959. In his 1950 book, *War or Peace*, Dulles, a committed globalist and a founding member of the CFR, wrote of the then-five-year-old UN:

“The United Nations represents not a final stage in the development of world order, but only a primitive stage. Therefore its primary task is to create the conditions which will make possible a more highly developed organization.”

Later in the same book, Dulles stated:

“I have never seen any proposal made for collective security with ‘teeth in it, or for ‘world government’ or for ‘world federation,’ which could not be carried out either by the United Nations or under the United Nations Charter.”

Britain's Sir Harold Butler, member of the Secret Roundtable Network, described his vision of world government taking shape in 1948 as a part of the United Nations:

“How far can the **life of nations**, which for centuries have thought of themselves as distinct and unique, **be merged with the life of other nations?** How far are they prepared to **sacrifice a part of their sovereignty** without which there can be no effective economic or political union?... Out of the prevailing confusion a **new world is taking shape... which may point the way toward the new order... That will be the beginning of a real United Nations**, no longer crippled by a split personality, but held together by a common faith.”¹⁹⁰

In 1980, Willy Brandt, Former West German Chancellor and Chairman of the Brandt Commission provided further insight into this vision for a New World Order:

“The New World Order is a world that has a **super-national authority to regulate the world** commerce and industry; an international organization that would control the production and consumption of oil; an **international currency**

¹⁸⁹ Address by the United Nations Secretary-General, U Thant, at the University of California, Berkley, 2 April, 1964.

¹⁹⁰ Britain's Sir Harold Butler, CFR member, as stated in the CFR's Foreign Affairs publication, July, 1948.

that would **replace** the **dollar**; a World Development Fund that would make funds available to free and communist nations alike; and an **international police force to enforce the edicts of the New World Order.**"

During his presidency, President George H.W. Bush (CFR member) described the vision for the New World Order, a "quite different world" under the authority of the UN:

"We are moving to a new age and a New World Order! With a New World Order struggling to be born... Out of these troubled times, our... objective, a New World Order, can emerge... **a world quite different from the one we have known...** we are now in sight of a **United Nations** that performs as envisioned by its founders."¹⁹¹

"We have before us the opportunity to **forge**, for ourselves and for future generations, a **New World Order**. A world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, **rules all nations**. When we are successful—and we will be—we have a real chance at this New World Order. **An order** in which a credible **United Nations can use its peacekeeping forces to fulfill the promise and vision of its founders.**"¹⁹²

"It is the sacred principles enshrined in the **U.N. Charter** to which we will **henceforth pledge our allegiance.**"¹⁹³

"What is at stake is more than one small country, it is a big idea— a New World Order, where diverse nations are drawn together in a common cause **the emerging New World Order** we now see, **this long dreamed-of vision we've all worked toward for so long.**"¹⁹⁴

"Now, we can see a **new world coming into view**. A world in which there is a very real prospect of a **New World Order.... A world where the United Nations**, freed from cold war stalemate, is **poised to fulfill the historic vision of its founders....**"¹⁹⁵

President Gorbachev stated in 1991 less than 2 months before the fall of the Soviet Union.

"We are beginning to see practical support. And this is a very significant sign of the movement towards a **new era, a new age...** We see both in our country and elsewhere... ghosts of the old thinking... When we rid ourselves of their presence, we will be better able to move **toward a New World Order...** relying

¹⁹¹ George Bush Sept 11, 1990, Joint Session of Congress.

¹⁹² George H.W. Bush, March 21, 1991

¹⁹³ President George Bush addressing the General Assembly of the U.N., February 1, 1992

¹⁹⁴ Prior to the Gulf War, on January 29, 1991, Bush told the nation in his State of the Union address.

¹⁹⁵ Bush said in a speech to the Congress on March 6, 1991

on the relevant **mechanisms of the United Nations.**"¹⁹⁶

Jeanne Kirkpatrick (CFR member), former U.S. Ambassador to the UN, said that one of the purposes for the Desert Storm operation, was to show to the world how a "reinvigorated United Nations could serve as a global policeman in the New World Order."

On January 25, 1993, Clinton's Secretary of State, Warren Christopher (CFR member), said in a CNN interview: "We must get the New World Order on track and bring the UN into its correct role in regards to the United States."

Henry Kissinger, CFR member and Trilateralist left little doubt that there is a major transformation underway:

"[The New World Order] cannot happen without U.S. participation, as we are the most significant single component. **Yes, there will be a New World Order**, and it will force the United States to change its perceptions."¹⁹⁷

Somehow, the implications from all these quotes, lends a sinister overtone to this New World Order that has gradually been organized behind the scenes with few people even realizing it.

¹⁹⁶ President Gorbachev at the Middle East Peace Talks in Madrid, October 30, 1991, less than 2 months before the fall of the Soviet Union.

¹⁹⁷ Former Secretary of State and National Security Advisor to two U.S. Presidents, As quoted in comments at World Affairs Council Press Conference, Regent Beverly Wilshire Hotel, April 19th 1994

VI

THE TAKEOVER OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

During the height of the Cold War there was a steady stream of defectors from the Communist apparatus and, through their testimony, we now have a clear idea of how that communist conspiracy is organized and operated. But one large piece of the puzzle always has been missing. It is a matter of record that some of the greatest help to world Communism often has come from prominent and respectable leaders within the United States. Obviously, these men are not Communists. As a matter of fact, most of them are extremely wealthy and are thought of as rich capitalists who, supposedly, would have the most to lose under socialism and Communism. And yet the record is disturbingly consistent, the Americans repeatedly have asked why? Why have some of the richest people in the United States—both in and outside of government—aligned themselves with collectivist policies would appear to be the path to their own destruction?

For example, in chapter VII, we will cover the 1950s-era investigations into large, tax-exempt foundations; this Committee (known as the Reece Committee) was instructed to determine whether or not any of the foundations had been: "using their resources for un-American and subversive activities or for purposes not in the interests of the United States." Many were shocked when it was discovered that the capitalist foundations—such as the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford Foundations—were using their money to support Communism. Congressman B. Carrol Reece, a member of that Committee, has stated:

"The evidence that has been gathered by the staff pointed to one simple underlying situation, namely that the major foundations by subsidizing collectivistic-minded educators, **had financed a socialist trend in American government.**"

The Reece Committee came to this conclusion:

"The weight of evidence before this Committee, which the foundations have made no serious effort to rebut, indicates that **the form of globalism which the foundations have so actively promoted and from which our foreign policy has suffered seriously, relates definitely to a collectivist point of view.** Despite vehement disclaimers of bias, despite platitudinous affirmations of loyalty to American traditions, the statements filed by those foundations whose operations touch on foreign policy have produced no rebuttal to the evidence of support of collectivism."¹⁹⁸

Quigley provides many other examples of Secret Round Table infiltration and manipulation. For instance, on pages 132 and 953 of *Tragedy and Hope*, he exposes yet another "front group" of this Organization called the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). Because the IPR provides priceless insight into the deceptive nature and true power of the Round Table Network, we'll briefly cover it here. Let's begin with the final report of a US Senate investigation of the IPR. It stated, in part:

"The IPR has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence. The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information

¹⁹⁸Rene Wormser, Counsel for the Reece Committee of Congress

including information originating from Soviet and Communist sources...**The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orient American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives.**"¹⁹⁹

The IPR was led by CFR member, Professor Owen Lattimore, head of Johns Hopkins University School of Diplomacy, who, during a 1951–52 investigation of the IPR, was identified as a Soviet operative. The Senate found the group to be “a vehicle toward Communist objectives.” Men from the IPR (who were all communist or pro-communist) were placed in important teaching positions, and dominated the Asian Affairs section of the State Department. After a four-year battle, their tax-exempt status was revoked from 1955–1960.

Their publications were used by the armed forces, colleges, and close to 1,300 public school systems. They published a magazine called Amerasia, whose offices had been raided by the FBI, who found 1,700 secret documents from various government agencies, including the Army and Navy, that were either stolen, or given to them by traitors within the State Department. The Senate Internal Subcommittee concluded that the American policy decision which helped establish Communist control in China (by threatening to cut-off aid to Chiang Kai-shek unless he went communist), was made by IPR officials acting on behalf of the Soviet Union. Besides Lattimore, they also named CFR member Lauchlin Currie (an Administrative Assistant to the President, who was identified as a Soviet agent by J. Edgar Hoover), CFR member Alger Hiss, CFR member Joseph Barnes, CFR member Philip Jessup, and Harry Dexter White, as Communist sympathizers. While he was Assistant Secretary of Treasury, Harry Dexter White provided Russia with the means of printing currency. He became Director of the UN International Monetary Fund in 1946, but resigned in 1947, when Whittaker Chambers accused him of being pro-communist, which he denied. In November, 1948, after White's death, Whittaker produced five rolls of microfilmed documents, which included eight pages of U.S. military secrets which had been written by White.

According to the Reece Congressional Committee report, in 1954:

“The Institute of Pacific Relations was one of the "clearing house" organizations, supported to the extent of millions of dollars by the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations and others. It came under the control of Communists and their sympathizers, with the result that it had tragically much to do with the loss of China to the Communists.”

To the average person, it sounds crazy to suggest that a network of super-wealthy capitalists is secretly conspiring to gain control of the world. But it sounds even crazier to accuse these same super-wealthy capitalists of using their tremendous wealth and power to popularize a system of government (Communism) that would, in theory anyway, lead to the destruction of all their wealth and power. (Keep in mind how the Establishment Network-directed media can easily cover up a Senate investigation and control public opinion as you read the following short summary of the IPR's activities because the blueprint for directing perception and policies hasn't changed):

As documented by Dr. Quigley:

¹⁹⁹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institute_of_Pacific_Relations

"In 1951 the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the so-called McCarran Committee, sought to show that China had been lost to the Communists by the deliberate actions of a group of academic experts on the Far East and Communist fellow travelers whose work in that direction was controlled and coordinated by the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). **The influence of the Communists in IPR is well established, but the patronage of Wall Street is less well known.**

The headquarters of the IPR and of the American Council of IPR were both in New York and were closely associated on an interlocking basis. Each spent about \$2.5 million dollars [nearly \$30 million when adjusted for inflation] over the quarter-century from 1925 to 1950, of which **about half, in each case, came from the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation** (which were themselves interlocking groups controlled by an alliance of Morgan and Rockefeller interests in Wall Street). Much of the rest...came from firms closely allied to these two Wall Street interests, such as Standard Oil, International Telephone and Telegraph, International General Electric, the National City Bank, and the Chase National Bank."²⁰⁰

This was confirmed by Senate Judiciary Committee report in 1952 which found:

"The Institute of Pacific Relations (funded by the Establishment with the **Council on Foreign Relations [CFR] as parent organization** and was largely responsible for China's fall to Communism) was a vehicle used by the Communists to orient American Far Eastern policies toward Communist objectives."

Quigley's characterization on the Network's influence over Far East Policy:

"There is considerable truth in the...contention that the American experts on China were organized into a single interlocking group which had a general consensus of a Leftish character. It is also true that this group, from its control of funds, academic recommendations, and research or publication opportunities, **could favor persons who accepted the established consensus and could injure, financially or in professional advancement, persons who did not accept it.** It is also true that the established group, by its influence on book reviewing in The New York Times, the Herald Tribune, the Saturday Review, a few magazines, including the "liberal weeklies," and in the professional journals, **could advance or hamper any specialist's career. It is also true that these things were done in the United States in regard to the Far East by the Institute of Pacific Relations, that this organization had been infiltrated by Communists, and by Communist sympathizers, and that much of this group's influence arose from its access to and control over the flow of funds from financial foundations to scholarly activities.**"²⁰¹

Awards for work in the Far Eastern area required approval or recommendation from members of IPR. Moreover, access to publication and

²⁰⁰ Tragedy and Hope, page 946

²⁰¹ Tragedy and Hope, page 935

recommendations to academic positions in the handful of great American universities concerned with the Far East required similar sponsorship. And, finally, **there can be little doubt that consultant jobs on Far Eastern matters in the State Department or other government agencies were largely restricted to IPR-approved people. The individuals who published, who had money, found jobs, were consulted, and who were appointed intermittently to government missions were those who were tolerant of the IPR line.**"²⁰²

Rather, according to Quigley himself, the group was controlled by this secret Roundtable network of individuals who "have no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other groups, and frequently does so."²⁰³

There has always been a covert but powerful alliance between communists and the CFR (And as already covered in chapter II, the CFR sets the major policies of the Federal Government, and exercises controlling influence on governmental officials who implement the policies).

During World War II, Germany and her European allies invaded the USSR. Under CFR direction, the United States rescued the Soviets with Lend-Lease: 15,000 aircraft, 7,000 tanks, 51,000 jeeps, 375,000 trucks, 130,000 machine guns, 2,000 locomotives, 11,000 freight cars, 200 torpedo boats, 350,000 tons of explosives, 4.5 million tons of food, and 15 million pairs of boots, among many other things.²⁰⁴ Even Stalin admitted Russia would have lost the war without American help. Likewise, communist victory in China would have been impossible without Establishment intervention.

John Lehman, Ronald Reagan's Secretary of the Navy, told the 1983 Annapolis graduating class:

"Within weeks, many of you will be looking across just hundreds of feet of water at some of the most modern technology ever invented in America. Unfortunately, it is on Soviet ships."²⁰⁵

How did the USSR acquire American technology? Not just from spying; most came through CFR-engineered trade agreements. Ironically, America built the nation long regarded as its greatest enemy.

The American Ambassador to Cuba during the Communist Revolution, Earl E. T. Smith, had this to say about U.S. State Department help and support towards the communist revolution:

²⁰² Tragedy and Hope, page 947

²⁰³ Tragedy and Hope, page 950

²⁰⁴ See, for example, Martin Folly, *The United States and World War II: The Awakening Giant* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 137.

²⁰⁵ U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings (August 1983): 73-74, as quoted in Antony Sutton, *The Best Enemy Money Can Buy*, online edition http://www.reformed-theology.org/html/books/best_enemy/chapter_08.htm

"To the contrary, **Castro could not have seized power in Cuba without the aid of the United States. American government agencies and the United States press played a major role in bringing Castro to power.** As the U.S. Ambassador to Cuba during the Castro–Communist revolution of 1957–59, I had first-hand knowledge of the facts which brought about the rise of Fidel Castro. **The State Department consistently intervened —positively, negatively, and by innuendo —to bring about the downfall of [democratically elected] President Fulgencio Batista, thereby making it possible for [communist] Fidel Castro to take over the government of Cuba.**"²⁰⁶

Congressman Larry McDonald, on September 17, 1980, laid the blame for the fall of the democratically elected Nicaraguan government on U.S. Government policy:

"The policies of the United States of America, the policies of this Administration, were deliberately and calculatingly designed to **destroy the elected government of the people** of Nicaragua and **to bring the Cuban-dominated [communist] Sandinistas to power.**"

Nicaragua President Anastasio Somoza [who spent most of his early life in America, was a graduate of the United States Military Academy (West Point) in New York, and loved the United States and structured his government to be a constitutional republic similar to that of the U.S.]— just weeks before he met with violent death declared:

"With my many years in government, with my military training and background, with my close association with governmental leaders throughout the world, and the intelligence information, I come to one startling conclusion: **There is a planned and deliberate conspiracy in the United States of America to destroy that Republican form of government.** I know that this is being done in the name of peace. Peace to me, the good people of Nicaragua, that solid American citizen and freedom-loving people everywhere, means the absence of armed hostility. To the dedicated Communist, peace has a diametrically opposite meaning. To the Communists, peace clearly means that point in time or space when and there will be no opposition to Communism. So if a Communist shoots you with a high-powered rifle, don't worry about it. It was done in the name of peace with a peaceful rifle. If you are shipped off to a slave labor camp in the cold of Siberia, don't be too concerned, because it's all in the name of peace. Or, if you happen to be one of those in a barbed wire compound in Nicaragua, exposed to the elements and slowly starving, just remember that you are there to further the cause of peace.²⁰⁷ To the average American businessman, the dutiful homemaker in Mexico City, or the serious student at the University of Madrid, the foregoing may appear to be an overstatement.

²⁰⁶ U.S. Ambassador to Cuba Earl E.T. Smith in New York Times 1979

²⁰⁷ This distinction between western and communist ideals of "peace" as noted by President Somoza can be further summed up by American religious leader and educator, David O. McKay, in a speech in 1960: "When you speak of peace, the Communists mean the cessation of all opposition of communism, the acceptance of a communist world. Then, and only then, can there be peace. This alone is what peace means in Communist language. Once this is understood the utter falsity and hypocrisy of Communist references to peace becomes at once obvious. When Marx was asked one time what was his objective, he answered, 'To dethrone God'."

Sadly, though, it is true. This is the underlying theme of **the worldwide Communist effort**....President Carter [CFR member] has put Nicaragua in the hands of the Communists. The betrayal of steadfast anti-Communist allies places Mr. Carter in the company of evil worldwide conspiratorial forces. I repeat, the treacherous course charted by Mr. Carter was not through ignorance, but **by design** when the United States assumes leadership in a conspiratorial fashion to **annihilate anti-communist nations**, I believe it is my duty to speak out. When I have factual evidence that the United States has actually aided and abetted the evil forces of Communism, I believe the people of the United States should share in such facts and incontrovertible manifestations.”²⁰⁸

The Communist movement, not only in the United States, but around the world always has been financed and supported by the international banking Establishment

The reams of aid Wall Street bankers provided the Soviets were documented by Professor Antony Sutton, former research fellow at Stanford's Hoover Institution, in Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution and The Best Enemy Money Can Buy; and by Joseph Finder in Red Carpet. Of course, the Establishment press ignored these books. In the 1920s, the Rockefellers built the Soviets an oil refinery and sold bonds for them through their Chase Bank. Finder writes:

“The [Rockefeller's] Chase National Bank was the Soviet government's leading lender almost from the time of the Revolution. During the twenties, it financed Soviet imports of American cotton. When Amtorg [the Soviet trade mission in the U.S.] was established in 1924, Chase agreed to handle its promissory notes and letters of credit to aid the import from Russia of fur, timber, and precious metals. In 1926 Chase advanced the Soviet government revolving credit of thirty million dollars.”²⁰⁹

One cannot argue that profit alone motivated these bankers. Most of their “deals” with the Communist movements lost them money. Rockefeller's Chase Bank even made a number of loans to the Soviets below cost –i.e., the loans were guaranteed to lose money. What American bank customer gets a bargain like that?

During that same decade, the Ford Motor Company supplied the Bolsheviks with 24,000 trucks, and trained Russian mechanics.²¹⁰ Later Ford helped the Soviets build their huge Gorki motor vehicle plant –which produced trucks that rolled down Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh Trail, loaded with supplies to kill American GIs.

In the 1970s, Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan financed construction of the Kama River plant –the world's largest truck factory –which the Soviets promptly converted to building vehicles for their invasion of Afghanistan.

²⁰⁸ Nicarágua President Somoza, as quoted in Nicaragua Betrayed, 1980

²⁰⁹ Joseph Finder, Red Carpet (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983), 177–78.

²¹⁰ Ibid.,

The communists awarded David Rockefeller's private plane landing rights in Moscow, and gave Chase Manhattan space for its Russian headquarters at 1 Karl Marx Square.²¹¹

Averell Harriman, (CFR member), former New York governor and U.S. Ambassador, founder of Brown Brothers Harriman, was a prototypical Wall Streeter. Yet the Soviets granted him a 20-year monopoly on mining their manganese; he formed a joint shipping firm with them and arranged to sell their government bonds.

Armand Hammer, CFR member and chairman of Occidental Petroleum, made a fortune mining Russian asbestos, built factories for the Soviets, shipped them wheat, laundered their money, and organized numerous joint ventures. The Soviets gratefully gave him Czarist art treasures. Like David Rockefeller, he was permitted to land his private jet in Moscow.²¹²

American industrialist Cyrus Eaton (CFR member), who started out working for John D. Rockefeller, supplied the Russians with textiles, leather goods, and pharmaceuticals. The Soviets ultimately awarded him the Lenin Peace Prize.²¹³

In fact, as far back as 1907, Trotsky was financed by British bankers. By 1917, the major financing for the Communist revolution in Russia was coming through Lord Alfred Milner, the leader of that inner core within the Secret Round Table Groups and the CFR.²¹⁴ In America, Banker Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb and Company gave twenty million dollars to Trotsky. From Germany, millions more came from Banker Max Warburg. The New York Journal-American of Feb 3, 1949 reported:

"Today it is estimated even by Jacob's grandson, John Schiff [CFR member], that the old man sank about \$20,000,000 for the final triumph of Bolshevism in Russia. Other New York banking firms also contributed. This \$20 million -given in gold -was in addition to another \$ 50 million which, according to contemporary U.S. and British intelligence reports, Kuhn, Loeb placed in the Bank of Sweden for the revolution's leaders, Lenin and Trotsky."²¹⁵

William E. Dodd, U.S. Ambassador to Germany provided further insight in 1937:

"A clique of U.S. industrialists is hell-bent to bring a fascist state to supplant our democratic government and is working closely with the fascist regime in Germany and Italy. I have had plenty of opportunity in my post in Berlin to witness how close some of our American ruling families are to the Nazi regime... Certain American industrialists had a great deal to do with bringing fascist regimes into being in both Germany and Italy. They extended aid to help Fascism occupy the seat of power, and they are helping to keep it there."

²¹¹ Ibid.,

²¹² Ibid.,

²¹³ Ibid.,

²¹⁴ Gary Allen and Larry Abraham, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* (Seattle: Double A Publications, 1983), 82.

²¹⁵ William Guy Carr, *Pawns in the Game* (1955, reprint; Boring, Oreg.: CPA Book Publisher, 2005), 92.

Foreign policy specialist Hilaire du Berrier adds additional insight into some of their activities:

“For over a decade [the] vice-president of NBC and chairman of NBC International was Alfred R. Stern, whose grandfather, [CFR member] Julius Rosenwald, is estimated to have donated over \$ 18 million to Joseph Stalin. Rosenwald, like the Sterns and the Rockefellers, set up a tax-free foundation to finance communists, according to Congressman Eugene Cox’s insertion in the Congressional Record of August 1, 1951. Alfred R. Stern was still chairman of NBC International in 1957 when his father, Alfred K. Stern, fled to Cuba with his second wife, the former Martha Dodd, to escape arrest as Soviet spies.”²¹⁶

To gain insight on why these international bankers and wealthy powerful families chose to finance and support communist revolutions, we can look at a statement by Winston Churchill, warning of an ongoing “worldwide conspiracy to overthrow civilization” and “reconstitute society”:

“From the days of Spartacus, Wieskhopf, Karl Marx, Trotsky, Rosa Luxemburg, and Emma Goldman... This conspiracy played a definite recognizable role in the tragedy of the French revolution...**this worldwide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstitution of society...has been steadily growing. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the 19th century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America** have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and **have become the undisputed masters of that enormous empire.**”²¹⁷

Again, Dr. Quigley explains who was really behind the worldwide Communist effort:

“It must be recognized that the power that these energetic left-wingers exercised was never their own power or Communist power but was “ultimately **the power of the international financial coterie....**””

Quigley provides further insight into this international financial coterie²¹⁸:

“**The financial circles** of London and those of the eastern United States... reflects **one of the most powerful influences in the twentieth-century American and world history.** The two ends of this English-speaking axis have sometimes been called...the English and American Establishments... which reflects a **very real power structure...** which the Radical Right in the United States has been attacking for years in the belief that they are attacking the Communists.”²¹⁹

²¹⁶ “Thoughts as Crisis Clouds Hang over the World,” H du B Reports, July 1983, 3.

²¹⁷ As quoted in an article written by Winston Churchill for the February 1920, British Illustrated Sunday Herald.

²¹⁸ Coterie is defined as a small exclusive group.

²¹⁹ Tragedy and Hope, page 956

Their **purpose for creating and financing the communist menace** was succinctly encapsulated in 1937 by Nicholas Murray Butler (Carnegie Foundation trustee and member of the Round Table Network):

“Communism is the instrument with which the financial world can topple national governments and then erect a world government with a world police and a world money.”²²⁰

As further explained by Lincoln P. Bloomfield, recently Assistant Secretary of State for Political–Military Affairs in 2005 from a State Department paper he wrote in 1962:

“...if the communist dynamic were greatly abated, the West might lose whatever incentive it has for world government ... if there was no communist menace, would anyone be worrying about the need for such a revolution in political arrangements?”

The following warnings become ominously clear once the reader realizes that this Secret Round Table Network of organizations operate behind the scenes and has “no aversion to cooperating with the Communists and frequently does so:”²²¹

President John F Kennedy, 1961:

“The very word “secrecy” is repugnant in a free and open society; and we are as a people inherently and historically opposed to secret societies, to secret oaths and to secret proceedings...Our way of life is under attack. Those who make themselves our enemy are advancing around the globe... no war ever posed a greater threat to our security. If you are awaiting a finding of “clear and present danger,” then I can only say that the danger has never been more clear and its presence has never been more imminent...For we are opposed around the world by a monolithic and ruthless conspiracy that relies primarily on covert means for expanding its sphere of influence—on infiltration instead of invasion, on subversion instead of elections, on intimidation instead of free choice, on guerrillas by night instead of armies by day. It is a system which has conscripted vast human and material resources into the building of a tightly knit, highly efficient machine that combines military, diplomatic, intelligence, economic, scientific and political operations. Its preparations are concealed, not published. Its mistakes are buried, not headlined. Its dissenters are silenced, not praised. No expenditure is questioned, no rumor is printed, no secret is revealed.”²²²

Indeed, the true meaning of these words by JFK becomes much clearer once it is realized that the communist movement was merely a tool used by the Round Table Network to achieve its purpose:

Daniel K. Inouye, US Senator from Hawaii, in testimony at the Iran Contra Hearings in

²²⁰ As quoted in “A Month to Be Remembered,” H du B Reports, July–August 1989, 5.

²²¹ Tragedy and Hope, page 950

²²² John F Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, from a speech delivered to the American Newspaper Publishers Association on April 27, 1961

1986 provided further insight into the immense power and capability of this secret shadowy power-seeking organization that JFK described:

“There exists a shadowy government with its own Air Force, its own Navy, its own fundraising mechanism, and the ability to pursue its own ideas of national interest, free from all checks and balances, and free from the law itself.”²²³

The evil described by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover is much more menacing once it is realized that the Round Table Network and communists were working in unity to destroy all that is good and decent in America:

“The menace of communism in this country will remain a menace until the American people make themselves aware of the techniques of communism. No one who truly understands what it really is can be taken in by it. Yet **the individual is handicapped by coming face to face with a conspiracy so monstrous he cannot believe it exists. The American mind simply has not come to a realization of the evil which has been introduced into our midst. It rejects even the assumption that human creatures could espouse a philosophy which must ultimately destroy all that is good and decent.**”²²⁴

It's particular noteworthy of David Rockefeller's approval and admiration of the communist revolution in China:

“One is impressed immediately by the sense of national harmony...there is [a] very real and pervasive dedication to Chairman Mao and Maoist principles. Whatever the price of the Chinese Revolution, it has obviously succeeded not only in producing more efficient and dedicated administration, but also in fostering high morale and community of purpose...The enormous social advances of China have benefited greatly from the singleness of ideology and purpose...The social experiment in China under Chairman Mao's leadership is one of the most important and successful in human history.”²²⁵

By the way that ‘social experiment’ that Mr. Rockefeller admires killed as many as 65 Million innocent Chinese men, woman, and children in peacetime. According to the authoritative “Black Book of Communism,” an estimated 65 million Chinese died as a result of Chairman Mao's repeated, merciless, attempts to create a new “socialist” China. Anyone who got in his way was done away with—by execution, imprisonment or forced famine.

The death and suffering that their policies have caused in pursuit of their aim are incalculable

Although communism was packaged as a movement of “the people,” it was actually their butcher and jailer. From Russia to Cambodia, genocide marked its arrival; then

²²³ See videotaped statement, Daniel Inouye on the Shadow Government, <https://youtu.be/EbFphX5zb8w>

²²⁴J. Edgar Hoover, 1st Director of the FBI The Elks Magazine, August 1956

²²⁵ David Rockefeller, from an article in the New York Times, August 10th, 1973, entitled, From a China Traveler (at which time Rockefeller was chairman of the board of Chase Manhattan Bank, and also chairman of the Board of the Council on Foreign Relations).

barbed wire and watchtowers ensured no one could escape the “workers’ paradise.” **Communism was totalitarianism: complete government control.** It was George Orwell’s 1984 come true. To put it into perspective, **the communist conquest has claimed well over 145,300,000 innocent lives:** Soviet Union (1917–59), 66,700,000; Soviet Union (1959–78), 5,000,000; Red China, 65,000,000; Katyn Massacre, 14,242; expelled Germans (1945–46), 2,923,700; Cambodia (1975–78), 2,500,000; repression in eastern Europe, 500,000; Malaya, Burma, Philippines, Cuba, Black Africa, Latin and Central America, 3,600,000.

In reality, communists were the Establishment’s hired thugs. They swept aside kings, noblemen, landowners and merchants who stood in its way. Although Marx proclaimed “capitalists” as the enemy, communists did not go after the cartel’s bankers. For example, in the 1871 Paris Commune, the Reds burned down the city’s most important buildings, but the House of Rothschild –France’s highest emblem of capitalism –went untouched.²²⁶

Marxist governments nationalized industries, appearing to put them in the “people’s” hands. But since communism doesn’t work as an economic system, communist countries eventually went bankrupt. Then –in exchange for UN World Bank loans –they agreed to “privatize” those industries, not to the original owners, but to the Establishment’s multinational corporations. Thus one object of communism was to seize the world’s productive industries and ultimately transfer them to the capitalist clique that had funded the revolutions.²²⁷

As W. Cleon Skousen states in *The Naked Capitalist*:

“As I see it, the great contribution which Dr. Carroll Quigley unintentionally made by writing *Tragedy and Hope* was to help the ordinary American realize the utter contempt which the network leaders have for ordinary people. Human beings are treated en masse as helpless puppets on an international chess board where giants of economic and political power subject them to wars, revolution, civil strife, confiscation, subversion, indoctrination, manipulation and deception.”

Skousen hit the nail on the head. *Tragedy and Hope* revealed something even more important than “one of the most powerful influences in the twentieth-century American and world history.” It inadvertently revealed the mind-set of those who wield such power. It exposed the astonishing arrogance and hypocrisy of those who feel they have the right to rule billions of other human beings. If there is one goal for writing this book, it is to expose the attitude, methodology, and their contempt for humanity of those who seek to dominate others.

²²⁶ John Coleman, *The Rothschild Dynasty* (white paper) (Las Vegas: Global Review Publications, 2006), 51.

²²⁷ This concept is further described in the published *Congressional Record* Dec. 15, 1987 Vol.133, pg. S18148

VII
**THE DESTRUCTION OF THE FUNDAMENTAL
PRINCIPLES ON WHICH AMERICA WAS FOUNDED**

One of the keys to understanding why things are the way they are in America is the tax-exempt foundation. The scope of this study does not permit more than a cursory review of the origins and early history of such foundations, but the salient points are these:

The Federal Reserve System, the income tax, and the tax-exempt foundation all were conceived and foisted onto the American people by the same members of the Secret Round Table Network whose story has been traced in the preceding pages. As a quick review, the Federal Reserve System was first introduced as legislation in 1913 by Senator Nelson Aldrich, and was known as the "Aldrich Plan." Aldrich was brought into the inner circle when his daughter married John D. Rockefeller, Jr. The senator's son, Winthrop Aldrich (CFR member), became chairman of the Chase National Bank. Senator Aldrich was widely recognized as Rockefeller's personal representative in the Senate and, as a result, he wielded far more power and influence in Washington than any other senator of the era. One thing is certain. He would not have introduced income tax legislation if there were even the remotest chance that it would apply to such fortunes as those held by the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the Carnegies, or the Mellons.

The plan was both simple and ingenious. They would transfer the bulk of their visible assets to something called foundations. They would appoint hand-picked and loyal underlings to administer these foundations. They would require that a portion of their assets be dispersed under the appearance of charity or philanthropy. They would design most of those gifts, however, to benefit themselves, their business enterprises, or to further their political objectives. They would retain full control of their assets and use them just as freely as if they remained directly in their name. They would avoid the payment of any significant inheritance tax upon the death of the "donor," thus insuring that the fortune remained intact and in the hands of family or corporate control in perpetuity. And they would use the supposedly charitable nature of the foundation as a means of avoiding the payment of most, if not all, of the income tax they then were advocating to be paid by everyone else.

Once again it must be noted that the "socialist" or "communist" nostrums allegedly designed to pull down the rich and elevate the poor—such as the progressive income tax²²⁸—always work to eliminate the middle class and, ultimately, to produce just the opposite of their advertised objective. That this has been true in the United States is obvious.

The progressive income tax has not hurt the Round Table Network one bit. Their wealth expands at an increasing rate each year. The business and professional people who fall into the middle class, however, now are increasingly blocked from rising into the selected ranks of the super-rich. With each passing decade since the enactment of the income tax the gap widens between the top and the bottom. Again, government becomes the instrument for preventing competition and for preserving monopoly.

The following pages takes a closer look at the historical congressional Reece Committee Hearings that occurred during the 1950s which exposed America's major tax-exempt foundations (Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, and Carnegie Endowment) control of the educational system of United States, and

²²⁸ The progressive income tax was specifically called for in The Communist Manifesto.

their agenda to undermine America’s moral fabric in their quest to move it toward World Government.

Background on the federal congressional investigations

These tax-exempt entities became a focus of federal congressional investigations after the end of World War II, to include the short-lived and stonewalled Cox Committee, and its successor, the 1954 Reece Committee, in the U.S. House of Representatives, which investigated the interlocking web of tax-exempt foundations to see what impact their grants were having on the American people. The Reece Committee, as it became known, stumbled onto the fact that some of these foundations had embarked upon a gigantic project to rewrite American history and incorporate it into new school text books.

The Cox Committee, named for its chairman, Congressman E.E. Cox, a Democrat of Georgia, was formed by a resolution of the U.S. House of Representatives on March 10, 1952, by a vote of 194 (100 Democrats, 94 Republicans) to 158 (88 Democrats, 69 Republicans, 1 Independent).²²⁹ The committee that resulted was composed of four Democrats, including Cox himself, and three Republicans, including Congressman B. Carroll Reece from Tennessee, whose Reece Committee would continue the investigation that the Cox Committee had begun.²³⁰ Two of the majority Democratic members, Donald O’Toole of New York, and Alme J. Forand of Rhode Island, did not. The other Democrat members of the Cox Committee were Cox himself, and Brooks Hays of Arkansas. The Republican members, besides B. Carroll Reece, were Richard Simpson of Pennsylvania, and Angier Goodwin of Massachusetts.

The committee, during its short existence from March 1952 until the issuance of its final report in January 1953, struggled with a low budget, lack of an adequate investigation staff, and from significant opposition to its investigations from non-committee members from both parties. Nonetheless, in that final report, the Committee had concluded something profoundly disturbing:

“There can be no reasonable doubt concerning the efforts of the Communist Party both to infiltrate the foundations and to make use, so far as it was possible, of foundation grants to finance Communist causes and Communist sympathizers. The committee is satisfied that as long as 20 years ago Moscow decided upon a program of infiltrating cultural and educational groups and organizations in this country including the foundations.”²³¹

In support of these assertions, the Cox Committee pointed to the “ugly unalterable fact” that Alger Hiss had been president of one such large foundation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Additionally, it briefly mentioned the role of the Carnegie Corporation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Rockefeller Foundation in funding the notorious Institute for Pacific Relations, which had been under constant fire in the postwar era from other committees such as the

²²⁹ René A. Wormser, *Foundations: The Power and Influence* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1958), p. 329.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 329.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 330. Final Report of the Cox Committee, January 1, 1953, No 2514, 82nd Congress, 2nds Session, cited in Wormser, *op. cit.*, p. 331, emphasis added.

McCarran and McCarthy committees, for the role of many of its most famous members in the fall of Chiang Kai-Shek's Nationalist China, and the beginning of Communist China.²³²

At the end of the Cox Committee's short duration, minority member Carroll Reece of Tennessee appended an endorsement of his own, pointing out the committee's inadequate budget and short duration, calling for a new committee to continue its work. After the Republican congressional sweep of 1952, the Reece Committee was passed by House resolution and given until January 1955 to complete its work.²³³

The Reece Committee found something very different than the pattern of "Communist subversion" alluded to by the Cox Committee, or rather, it discovered something very complementary to it. This, in part, was due to the somewhat more comprehensive brief it had been given in its enabling resolution:

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation to determine if any foundations and organizations are using their resources for purposes other than the purposes for which they were established, and especially to determine which such foundations and organizations are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities; for political purposes; propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation."²³⁴

The scope of this resolution meant that the findings of the Reece Committee were inevitably broader than those of its predecessor, and thus also inevitably much more thought-provoking.

Norman Dodd, a Yale graduate, intellectual and New York City investment banker, was appointed as the research director of a Special Congressional Committee in 1953 to Investigate America's large Tax-Exempt Foundations.

Dodd sent committee questionnaires to numerous foundations, and as a result of one such request, Joseph E. Johnson (CFR member), president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, invited Dodd to send a committee staffer to Carnegie headquarters in New York City to examine the minutes of the meetings of the foundation's trustees. These minutes had long since been stored away in a warehouse. Obviously, Johnson, who was a close friend of former Carnegie Endowment's president and Soviet spy Alger Hiss (CFR member), had no idea what was in them.²³⁵

²³² Ibid., 332

²³³ Ibid., pp. 335-337. b.

²³⁴ Ibid., p. 337,

²³⁵ Interview with congressional investigator Norman Dodd, 1980 (a few years before his death). Norman Dodd had powerful connections with banks and the elite of the United States. This interview was conducted a few weeks before his death. Tape recording is available from Radio Liberty, P.O. Box 13, Santa Cruz, Calif, 95063. Interview can also be viewed on Youtube: Norman Dodd On Tax Exempt Foundations <https://youtu.be/YUYCBfmIcHM>

Dodd examined minutes of the Board of Trustees, and found that in 1910 the Carnegie Endowment's trustees concentrated on:

“Is there any way known to man more effective than war, to so alter the life of an entire people?” For a year the trustees sought an effective “peaceful” method to “alter the life of an entire people.” Ultimately, they concluded that **war** was the most effective way to change people. Consequently, the trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace next asked themselves: **“How do we involve the United States in a war?”** And they answered, “We must control the diplomatic machinery of the United States by first gaining control of the State Department.” Dodd discovered that all high-level appointments in the State Department took place only after they had been cleared through a group called the Council of Learned Societies, which was established by the Carnegie Endowment. Norman Dodd stated that the trustees’ minutes reinforced what the Reece Committee had uncovered elsewhere about the Carnegie Endowment: “It had already become a powerful policy-making force inside the State Department.”²³⁶

During those early years of the Carnegie Endowment, war clouds were already forming over Europe and the opportunity of enactment of their plan was drawing near. History proved that World War I did indeed have an enormous impact on the American people. For the first time in our history, large numbers of wives and mothers had to leave their homes to work in war factories, thus effectively eroding woman’s historic role as the “heart” of the family. The sanctity of the family itself was placed in jeopardy. Life in America was so thoroughly changed that, according to Dodd’s findings,

“[T]he trustees had the brashness to congratulate themselves on the wisdom and validity of their original decision. **They sent a confidential message to President Woodrow Wilson, insisting that the war not be ended too quickly.**”²³⁷

Syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft, writing in Harper’s in July, 1958, said that records indicated that the Carnegie trustees hoped to involve the U.S. in a world war to set the stage for world government. Dodd said they wanted “to bring the idea of ‘one-world’ (government) to the point where it is acceptable to the people of this country. That is the primary aim, and everything that has happened since then is a means to that one end.” Their memos indicated that they believed their efforts were successful, because the war “had brought about a change in the American psyche.”

After the war, the Carnegie Endowment trustees reasoned that **if they could get control of education in the United States they would be able to prevent a return to the way of life as it had been prior to the war.** They recruited the Rockefeller Foundation to assist in such a monumental task. According to Dodd’s Reece Committee report:

²³⁶ Source: Interview of congressional investigator Norman Dodd, 1980 <https://youtu.be/YUYCBfmIcHM>; (I would encourage the reader to watch the full videotaped Interview of congressional investigator Norman Dodd, in 1980—so the reader can see for themselves the sincerity and credibility of this witness, Norman Dodd).

²³⁷ Ibid.

"They divided the task in parts, giving to the Rockefeller Foundation the responsibility of altering education as it pertains to domestic subjects, but Carnegie retained the task of altering our education in foreign affairs and about international relations. These two foundations ran along in tandem that way, disciplined by a decision – namely, that **the answer lies entirely in the changing of the teaching of the history of the United States**. They then approached the five of the then most prominent historians in this country with the proposition that they alter the manner of the teaching of the subject, and they get turned down flatly; so they realized then they must build their own stable of historians, so to speak."²³⁸

They approached the Guggenheim Foundation, which specialized in Fellowships, and suggest to them that when they locate a relatively young potential historian, will the Guggenheim Foundation give that person a Fellowship, merely on their say-so... and the answer is, they would. Ultimately, a group of twenty are so assembled, and that becomes the nuclei of the policies which emanate to the American Historical Association. Subsequently, around 1928, the Carnegie Endowment granted to the American Historical Association \$400,000 in order to make a study of what the future of this country will probably turn out to be and should be. They came up with a seven-volume set of books, the last volume being a summary and digest of the other six. In the last volume, the answer is as follows:

"The future belongs to the United States..... the future in the United States belongs to **collectivism**²³⁹ administered with characteristic American efficiency."²⁴⁰

Although the Reece Committee did publish its findings, it never completely finished its work of investigating and receiving testimony in open hearings involving the representatives of the major tax-exempt foundations. The process was completely disrupted and finally derailed by the deliberately disruptive activity of one of its members, Congressman Wayne Hays of Ohio.

According to general counsel for the Reece Committee, Renee A. Wormser:

"The Reece Committee had perhaps the most hazardous career of any committee in the history of Congress. It survived its many perils, however, to bring to the attention of Congress and the people grave dangers to our society."²⁴¹

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Again, collectivism is a system of government that ultimately results in the government having complete control and authority over the people. More broadly, it is a totalitarian idea where all things belong to and are done to serve the greater good of those wielding the power of the centralized government (regardless of how ambiguous, harsh, arbitrary or incompetent it may be). Fascism and Communism are merely different forms of collectivism. Collectivism is a desirable situation for those in charge. The "people" are never the benefactors of this type of system.

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

²⁴¹ Rene Wormser, Counsel for the Reece Committee of Congress."

The following are excerpts from the Report by the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House of Representatives, Eighty-Third Congress, Second Session on H. Res. 217, Part 1, Pages 1-943. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954:

Undermining America's founding principles

"[S]ome of the larger foundations have directly supported "subversion" in the true meaning of that term, namely, the process of undermining some of our vitally protective concepts and principles. They have actively supported attacks upon our social and governmental system and financed the promotion of socialism and collectivist ideas."

"The weight of evidence before this Committee, which the foundations have made no serious effort to rebut, indicates that the form of globalism which the foundations have so actively promoted and from which our foreign policy has suffered seriously, relates definitely to a collectivist [communist] point of view."

"We cannot understand how a foundation, Carnegie in this instance, administering funds dedicated to a public trust and made free of taxation by the grace of the people, could justify itself in having supported...that our American way of life was a failure; that it must give way to a collectivist society; that educators must now prepare the public for a New Order; and traditional American principles must be abandoned."

"Example after example can be given of the widespread expression, by persons connected with or financed by foundations, of approving conviction that free enterprise was dead and a new order must be ushered in, an order of collectivism."

"Can it be mere chance or accident that foundations like The Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation have so frequently supported the radical thinkers in the United States?"

"[T]he foundations have often, in the social sciences, lent themselves to the support of efforts and causes which weaken our society and create factors of dissidence and disorganization of which the Communists are alert to take advantage....much of this leftist trend of the foundations in the social sciences has been "subversive", in so far as it has worked to undermine some of our precious institutions, and some of our basic moral and religious and political principles."

“What does the term "subversion" mean? In contemporary usage and practice, ... to a promotion of tendencies which lead, in their inevitable consequences, to the destruction of principles through perversion or alienation. Subversion, in modern society, is not a sudden, cataclysmic explosion, but a gradual undermining, a persistent chipping away at foundations upon which beliefs rest. Numerous examples of such foundation-sponsored projects, subversive of American moral, political and economic principles, were offered in testimony.... the weight of influence of foundation tax-exempt funds applied in the social sciences has been on the side of subversion.”²⁴²

“Moreover, the subversive projects have been offered with spurious claims to "science." With this false label they have been awarded a privileged status. They have been offered as "scientific" and, therefore, beyond rebuttal. The impact of these subversive works has been intensified manifold by the sponsorship of foundations....some of the larger foundations have directly supported "subversion" in the true meaning of that term, namely, the process of undermining some of our vitally protective concepts and principles. They have actively supported attacks upon our social and governmental system and financed the promotion of socialism and collectivist ideas.”

Control over information and public opinion

“The fact is that the intellectual cartel which they have created itself suppresses freedom of thought by expending vast millions of foundation money under their control to determine opinion, academic and public, in the leftist directions they favor.”

“The cumulative evidence indicates that the Carnegie Endowment created something of a Frankenstein in building up its vast propaganda machine...The extent to which this machine has been responsible for indoctrinating our students with radical internationalism needs careful inquiry.”

“By its own admission, a prime purpose of the [Carnegie] Endowment was to "educate" the public so that it would be conditioned to the points of view which the Endowment favored....should vast aggregations of public money in the control of a handful of men...have the power and the right

²⁴² Gradualism or Incrementalism is a process whereby society is slowly engineered and our rights and freedoms are slowly eroded over time so that we don't notice it's happening and are led to believe change is necessary on only one item and this change is not related to other changes. In the short term the changes are almost imperceptible, but are nevertheless part of a long term campaign to gain control of us all.

to condition public opinion!”

“The Rockefeller Foundation minced no words in its 1946 Foundation Report “The challenge of the future is to make this world one world...Communists recognize that a breakdown of nationalism is a prerequisite to the introduction of Communism....The Endowment started early to organize media for widespread propaganda efforts to educate the American public...An extremely powerful propaganda machine was created. It spent many millions of dollars in: The production of masses of material for distribution; The collaboration with agents of publicity, such as newspaper editors; The preparation of material to be used in school text books, and cooperation with publishers of text books to incorporate this material; The establishing of professorships at the colleges and the training and indoctrination of teachers; The financing of lecturers and the importation of foreign lecturers and exchange professors; The support of outside agencies touching the international field...”

“In the international field, foundations, and an interlock among some of them and certain intermediary organizations, have exercised a strong effect upon our foreign policy and upon public education in things international. This has been accomplished by vast propaganda, by supplying executives and advisers to government and by controlling much research in this area through the power of the purse. The net result of these combined efforts has been to promote "internationalism" in a particular sense — a form directed toward "world government" and a derogation of American "nationalism." Foundations have supported a conscious distortion of history, propagandized blindly for the United Nations as the hope of the world, supported that organization's agencies to an extent beyond general public acceptance, and leaned toward a generally "leftist" approach to international problems.”

“...The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace created powerful propaganda mechanisms and was, indeed, quite frank about it. There was no hesitation in its minutes, for example, at using the term "propaganda."²⁴³ Its eventual Division of Intercourse and Education was originally referred to as the "Division of Propaganda.”

²⁴³ Propaganda is neutrally defined as a systematic form of purposeful persuasion that attempts to influence the emotions, attitudes, opinions, and actions of specified target audiences for ideological, political or commercial purposes through the controlled transmission of one-sided messages (which may or may not be factual) via mass and direct media channels.

"The danger of misuse is all the more serious in the light of the Endowment's own estimate of the effectiveness of its propaganda. Its yearbook of 1945 states: "every part of the United States and every element in its population have been reached by the Endowment's work. The result may be seen in the recorded attitude of public opinion which makes it certain that the American government will be strongly supported in the accomplishment of its effort to offer guidance and commanding influence to the establishment of a world organization."

"It must be kept in mind that the evils attendant on permitting propaganda by any individual foundation multiply geometrically when there is unified or combined or similar action by a group of foundations. We have seen that The Carnegie Endowment financed the production of text book material approved by its elite. The Rockefeller Foundation and some of its associates also entered this field of propaganda."

"Massive evidence gathered by committee investigators showed that the major foundations by subsidizing collectivistic - minded educators, had financed a socialist trend in American government. The fact is that the intellectual cartel which they have created itself suppresses freedom of thought by expending vast millions of foundation money under the control to determine opinion, academic and public, in the leftist directions they favor."

"From the very start the special House committee created to investigate our Nation's multibillion tax-exempt foundations faced an almost impossible task. This was to tell the taxpayers that the incredible was, in fact, the truth. The incredible fact was that the huge fortunes piled up by such industrial giants as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford, etc., were today being used to discredit the free-enterprise system which gave them birth."

"Realizing the impossibility of controverting the massive evidence which we produced, [the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations] have resorted to smear and slander. They cannot disprove the existence of the intellectual cartel which we so clearly disclosed—a cartel which, using public money, has so effectively influenced academic and public opinion both, in the domestic and international fields."

"The impact of foundation money upon education has been very heavy, largely tending to promote uniformity in approach and method, tending to induce the educator to become an agent for social change and a propagandist for

the development of our society in the direction of some form of collectivism.²⁴⁴ Foundations have supported text books (and books intended for inclusion in collateral reading lists) which are destructive of our basic governmental and social principles and highly critical of some of our cherished institutions.”

“Education is the recommended road to "social and political organization and control" and education is described "as a force for conditioning the will of a people. It utilizes old techniques and mass media such as the printed word, the cinema, the radio, and now television." If we read these terms correctly they seem to mean to us that the educators are to use all the techniques of propaganda in order to condition our children to the particular variety of "world – mindedness" which these educators have adopted.”

“The foundations have placed great stress upon the fact that the amount of money actually spent in the social sciences is not enough to finance an intellectual revolution. But the fact remains that, working at the fountainhead, it does not take much money to exercise virtual control over the relatively small number of people and institutions who in turn can control huge areas of policy and public opinion.” This power to impose brainwashing at the key points is against everything America stands for.”

“[I]t is of particular interest, because by exercising power over research in this way, you see, by insisting on the integration of research activity, anybody who wants to, can control the results of research in American universities....this is a very questionable business that the public ought to look at very, very closely, and see whether they want a few monopolies of the money, like, for instance, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corp....to emphasize narrow concentration to the extent that they have. Intellectually speaking, this country has a great danger of intellectually trying to imitate the totalitarian approach, in allowing people at centers of financial power — they aren't political powers in this sense — to tell the public what to study and what to work on, and to set up a framework. Foundations, 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

²⁴⁴Fascism and Communism are merely different forms of collectivism. In a collectivist society, individuals are subordinate to the dictatorship of some greater good of the group. This so-called “greater good” is almost always ambiguous and dictated by tyrants. Once again, collectivism is a desirable situation for those in charge. The “people” are never the benefactors of this type of system.

been felt deeply in education and in the political scene."²⁴⁵

"The general tone [of the volumes of books funded by these foundations] is that we must sacrifice a considerable part of our national independence in order to create a stable and peaceful world...to train our children into the desirability of becoming internationalists at a time when world society is characterized by the most intense kind of selfish nationalism seems both unrealistic and dangerous. Again, we say that someday a world state may be desirable and possible. However, we are living in a very realistic era in which "one world" could only be accomplished by succumbing to Communism. The program suggested contains this specific identification of the "world-minded American": "The world-minded American knows that unlimited national sovereignty is a threat to world peace and that nations must cooperate to achieve peace and human progress."

"There has been a singular lack of objectivity and a decided bias toward a socialized welfare state in the proposals of these organizations, and every effort has been made by them to advance the philosophy of "one world" to the complete disregard of comparable effort on behalf of a more "nationalistic" viewpoint."

Rewriting history and hiding historical facts from the public

"The Council on Foreign Relations, an organization supported by The Rockefeller Foundation, The Carnegie Corporation and others, made up its mind that no "revisionism" was to be encouraged after World War II. The following is an extract from the 1946 Report of The Rockefeller Foundation, referring to the Council [on Foreign Relations'] work:"

"The Committee on Studies of the Council on Foreign Relations is concerned that the debunking journalistic campaign following World War I should not be repeated and believes that the American public deserves a clear and competent statement of our basic aims and activities during the second World War."

²⁴⁵Control of Academia: most grants to scientists and other academics at the university level come from the elite through their control of their foundations. Because of this, the Foundations steer the direction of research by giving money for certain projects while not funding other avenues of research. All academics are dependent on these grants and are thus controlled lackeys. In order to understand the present, one needs to know the past. If you can control how the public perceive their past you can control their perception of the present. To that end the Foundations took control of historical societies and actively promoted professors who would promote the view of history the elite wanted promulgated and eliminate inconvenient nasty episodes from history.

“Accordingly, a three volume history of the War was to be prepared under the direction of Professor William Langer [CFR Member] of Harvard, in which (one must gather this from the use of the term “debunking”) no revisionism was to appear. In other words, the official propaganda of World War II was to be perpetuated and the public was to be protected against learning the truth. As Professor Charles Austin Beard put it:”

“In short, they hope that, among other things, the policies and measures of Franklin D. Roosevelt will escape in the coming years the critical analysis evaluation and exposition that befell the policies and measures of Woodrow Wilson and the Entente Allies after World War I.”

“Do foundations have the right, using public funds, to support measures calculated to hide historical facts from the public and to perpetuate those contortions of history which war propaganda imposes on us!”

“A reading of Dr. Barnes' Historical Blackout is rewarding. He sets forth in detail what verges on a veritable conspiracy to prevent the people from learning the historical truth. Parties to this conspiracy are a good many of the professors of history with notable names; the State Department of former years; publishers who, under some misapprehension of their duty to the public, refuse to publish critical books; and newspapers which attempt to suppress such books either by ignoring them or giving them for review to rabidly antagonistic “hatchet-men”. But what is most shocking in the story he tells is the part played knowingly or unknowingly by foundations in trying, to suppress the truth. The Rockefeller Foundation, in 1946, allotted \$139,000 to the support of the three volume history which was to be produced as described above.”

“The [textbooks funded by these foundations] emphasizes the responsibility of teachers for “contributing to the maintenance of enduring peace”. This is to be accomplished by indoctrinating our children with the desirability of full cooperation with the UN and all its works. This will certainly involve curriculum revision and the recasting of many time-honored educational policies and practices. The goal is set as producing citizens who might be called “world-minded Americans”. We cannot escape the conclusion that what is meant is the production of advocates of a world state.”

“Of all the many media of propaganda used by the Endowment, perhaps the most reprehensible was its attempt to control or, at least, deeply influence text book material. It engaged in close and intensive collaboration with publishers with the objective of making sure that the historical material used in text books suited its own positions. ...one thing seems utterly clear; no private group should have the power or the right to dictate what should be read and taught in our schools and colleges....it is quite shocking to learn that public funds are being used to distribute this literature.”²⁴⁶

“There is the further risk that a few of the major foundations, those which contribute the principal support of the intermediary organizations through which the concentration, the intellectual cartel, largely operates, could come to exercise direct and complete control over the combine through the power of the purse, with all the far-reaching consequences of such control. The aggregate power, for example, of the Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie funds, coming into the managerial hands of like-minded persons, might result in the complete domination of the intellectual life of the country.”

“Aside from this direct menace, the dangers of so close an interlock, so high a degree of concentration of power in intellectual fields, tends to violate an essential of the American system, competition....This Committee is highly critical of the system of concentration under discussion for the very reason that it promotes conformity, acts in effect as a censor of ideas and projects, and produces a tendency toward uniformity of ideas...There is the further danger that an elite group tends to perpetuate itself, both as to personnel and as to opinion and direction. It is only through competition in the intellectual fields, just as in business, that progress can safely be accomplished. Anything which tends to prevent or restrict competition seems to this Committee fraught with frightening danger to our society.”

Control over governmental policy

“It is quite astounding to this Committee that the trustees of a public trust could possibly conceive of having the right to use public funds for the purpose of putting pressure on the government to adopt the ideas the trustees happened to favor.”

“The Endowment in its 1934 Yearbook proudly asserts that it “is becoming an unofficial instrument of international

²⁴⁶ "Let me control the textbooks and I will control the state." Adolph Hitler TIME Magazine's Man of the Year in 1938 (Hitler)

policy, taking up here and there the ends and threads of international problems and questions which the governments find it difficult to handle, and through private initiative reaching conclusions which are not of a formal nature but which unofficially find their way into the policies of governments.” (Congressman Note, moreover, that the term used is "governments", the plural.)”

“The Council on Foreign Relations is another organization dealing with internationalism which has the substantial financial support of both the Carnegie Endowment and the Rockefeller Foundation. And, as in the case of the Foreign Policy Association, its productions are not objective but are directed overwhelmingly at promoting the globalism concept....There can be no doubt that much of the thinking in the State Department and much of the background "of" direction of its policies came from the Carnegie Endowment and The Council on Foreign Relations. In considering the propriety of this, it must be kept in mind that these organizations promoted only the internationalist point of view, rejecting and failing to support the contrary position that our foreign policy should be based primarily on our own national interest.”

“Miss Casey's report shows clearly the interlock between The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and some of its associated organizations, such as the Council on Foreign Relations, and other foundations with the State Department. Indeed, these foundations and organizations would not dream of denying this interlock. They proudly note it in reports. They have undertaken vital research projects for the Department; virtually created minor departments or groups within the Department for it; supplied advisors and executives from their ranks; fed a constant stream of personnel into the State Department trained by themselves or under programs which they have financed; and have had much to do with the formulation of foreign policy both in principle and detail.”

“They have, to a marked degree, acted as direct agents of the State Department. And they have engaged actively, and with the expenditure of enormous sums, in propagandizing ("educating" — 'public opinion) in support of the policies which they have helped to formulate.”

“What we see here is a number of large foundations, primarily The Rockefeller Foundation, The Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, using their enormous public funds to finance a one-sided approach to foreign policy and to

promote it actively, among the public by propaganda, and in the Government through infiltration. The power to do this comes out of the power of the vast funds employed.”

“It is our conclusion, from the evidence, that the foundation supported activities which relate to foreign policy have been turned consciously and expressly in the direction of propagandizing for one point of view.”

“The 1947 Year Book of The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace...recites that the most significant special circumstances favorable to an expansion of the Endowment's own direct activities is the establishment of the United Nations with its headquarters in New York, and with the United States as its leading and most influential member....The Carnegie Endowment has justified its ardent support of the United Nations on the ground that support of UN is an official part of United States policy. We are not convinced that this is the basic reason for the Endowment's support. It gave equally fervent support to the old League of Nations, after that organization had been repudiated by our Senate. The fact is that the Endowment has consistently advocated and propagandized for an international organization.”

Control over the communist movement

“The Institute of Pacific Relations. The most tragic example...is to be found in the long continued support of The Institute of Pacific Relations by both The Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller Foundation, as well as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace... The subcommittee concludes that the IPR has been in general, neither objective nor nonpartisan; and concludes further that, at least since the mid- 1930's, the net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been pro-communist and pro-Soviet, and has frequently and repeatedly been such as to serve international Communist, and Soviet interests, and to subvert the interests of the United States.”

“Note that the Committee held that IPR had become a propaganda vehicle for the Communists as early as the mid-1930's. We have, then, the astounding picture of great foundations, presuming to have the right to expend public trust funds in the public interest...that they permitted, year after year, Communist propaganda to be produced and circulated with funds supplied by these foundations. The contributions of The Carnegie Corporation, The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and The Rockefeller Foundation to the IPR, (the Pacific and American groups

taken together for this purpose) ran into the millions.”

“In addition to these grants, both the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations made individual grants to some of the most reprehensible characters associated with IPR, these contributions to the Communist cause running into very substantial sums of public money.”

“The story of the suborning of our foreign policy through the activities of IPR and persons associated with it, including the sad story of infiltration into our State Department, has been told. Nor does the point need to be labored that the loss of China to the Communists may have been the most tragic event in our history, and one to which the foundation-supported Institute of Pacific Relations heavily contributed.”

“Are these "officers" of a foundation who characterize a Russian-Communist armed and financed coup in China as a revolutionary movement similar to our War of Independence qualified to expend huge sums of money belonging in equity to the American people! Can a foundation be trusted to administer a half billion dollars of public funds in an area having to do with foreign affairs and international relations when its trustees...draw an analogy between a Communist conquest and the American Revolution!”

“We have seen many Communists recommended by foundation executives for government posts. In the case of the recommendations to the government made by the Institute of Pacific Relations and the American Council of Learned Societies for experts to be used by our occupation forces in Germany and Japan, the lists were heavily salted with Communists and their supporters.”

“Professor Colegrove testified concerning the appointment of political advisors to the occupation forces at the end of the second World War. In 1945, as Secretary of the American Political Science Association he submitted a list of names of experts for the Army of Occupation in Japan and for that in Germany — a list of political scientists who would be helpful to the government. While he did not put his own name on the list, he was asked to become an adviser to General MacArthur, and did subsequently occupy that position. What became of the list which Professor Colegrove had provided? It was not accepted by the Pentagon. Another list was accepted and, as Professor Colegrove testified: ‘I was shocked when I saw the list, because there were none of the recommendations that we had made. I took that list over to an old friend of mine who had served as Chief of the Far

Eastern Division in OSS (Office of Strategic Services). His name is Charles Burton Fahs, a very outstanding specialist in Japan and a man of great integrity. And I remember that Charles Burton Fahs was astonished by the character of the names that had been recommended. We checked those names off. Some of them were known to us to be Communists, many of them pro-Communists or fellow travelers. They were extremely leftist. I went back to the Pentagon to protest against a number of these people, and to my amazement I found that they had all been invited, and they had all accepted, and some of them were already on their way to Japan. I wanted to find out where the list came from, and was told that the list had come from the Institute of Pacific Relations.' 'And so', said Professor Colegrove, 'General MacArthur, who had very little control over the personnel that was sent to Japan at this time for civil affairs, practically no control, had to receive a large group of very leftist and some of them communist advisers in the field of political science.'"

"Indeed, it is a conclusion of this Committee that the trustees of some of the major foundations have on numerous important occasions been beguiled by truly subversive influences....these foundations have frequently been put substantially to uses which have adversely affected the best interests of the United States. It is our opinion that the concentration of power has taken away much of the safety which independent foundation operation should provide; that this concentration has been used to undermine many of our most precious institutions, and to promote radical change in the form of our government and our society....the danger of its occurrence is far greater when there exists a complex of interrelated and interlocked organization."

The social-engineering of American society²⁴⁷

"[The large tax-exempt foundations] have already come to exercise a very extensive, practical control over most research in the social sciences, much of our educational process, and a good part of government administration in these and related fields. The aggregate thought-control power of this foundation and foundation-supported bureaucracy can hardly be exaggerated. A system has thus arisen which gives enormous power to a relatively small group of individuals, having at their virtual command, huge

²⁴⁷ Programs of social engineering designed to acclimate the people to globalist policy and goals have been pushed on the American people for over 100 years. One of the predominant themes found by the Congressional Committee's findings was the use of propaganda and social engineering as a means to achieve the goal of world governance. In 1932, the president of the Rockefeller Foundation, Max Mason, stated that "The social sciences... will concern themselves with the rationalization of social control..."

sums in public trust funds. It is a system which is antithetical to American principles.”

“Research in the social sciences plays a key part in the evolution of our society. Such research is now almost wholly in the control of the professional employees of the large foundations and their obedient satellites. Even the great sums allotted by the Federal Government for social science research have come into the virtual control of this professional group...Associated with the excessive support of the empirical method, the concentration of power has tended to support the dangerous "cultural lag" theory and to promote "moral relativity", to the detriment of our basic moral, religious, and governmental principles. It has tended to support the concept of "social engineering" — that "social scientists" and they alone are capable of guiding us into better ways of living and improved or substituted fundamental principles of action.”

“[I]t must be kept in mind that the theory of social engineering is closely related to the notion of the elite which we find dominant in Marxism, the notion that a few people are those who hold the tradition and who have the expertness and that these people can engineer the people as a whole into a better way of living, whether they like it or want it or not. It is their duty to lead them forcibly so to speak in this direction. This is one of the main tenets of Marxism, that they have a social science which is perfect; it not only explains all the past history, but it will lead to the complete victory of the socialist state on a worldwide basis.”

“The Committee cited a report in its findings from the President’s Commission on Higher Education, published in 1947, which outlines the goals of social engineering programs; The realization on part of the people of the necessity of world government ‘...psychologically, socially and... politically’.”

“The people are no longer to direct their own welfare. "Scientists" must be trained to lead us, to "engineer" us into that better world, domestic and international, which only these experts are capable of determining....the concept of an elite group determining what is good for the people; it smacks so closely of the fascist principle of a guiding party that we find it distasteful and indigestible. That the governing party might be composed of presumed scientists does not make it a more palatable dish. Moreover, there is evidence enough in the record that the "social sciences" are not sciences and the "social scientists" cannot fairly compare themselves with the experts in physics, chemistry,

medicine, and other sciences. There is something completely false, as well as highly dangerous, in the entire concept of "social engineering."

"There is a justified suspicion that the "social engineers" who so strongly advocate "planning" are often motivated by an urge to usher in a quite radical form of society. The very concept of "planning" has connotations of what maybe, moderately, called "collectivism."²⁴⁸

"Putting the evidence together, we conclude that the National Education Association has been an important element in the tax-exempt world used to indoctrinate American youth with "internationalism", the particular variety which Professor Colgrove referred to as "globalism." This point of view is closely related to the "new era" which so many social scientists have envisioned as the ultimate goal of our society when they have gotten through "engineering" us into it."

"In this area of discussion it becomes most important to realize that government-financed research in the social sciences is virtually under the direction of the very same persons and organizations who dominate the foundation concentration of power. Thus, not only are great parts of the vast public funds which the foundations represent used in largely coordinated fashion by the concentration, but even larger sums of public money directly provided by government are, to all practical purposes, employed by the same groups."

"[The Social Engineering by these tax-exempt foundations] is "subversive" because it seeks to introduce Fabian socialism into the United States. The word "subversion" connotes a process of undermining; and these planners, these "social engineers" as they call themselves, who deem themselves entitled to lead us common people into better pastures, seek to undermine some of our most precious institutions, one being our unique system of enterprise of free management and free labor."

"It seems to this Committee that there is a strong tendency on the part of many of the social scientists whose research is favored by the major foundations toward the concept that there are no absolutes, that everything is indeterminate, that no standards of conduct, morals, ethics and government are to be deemed inviolate, that everything, including basic moral law, is subject to change, and that it

²⁴⁸ Again, collectivism (e.g. Fascism and Communism) is a system of government that ultimately results in the government having complete control and authority over the people.

is the part of the social scientists to take no principle for granted as a premise in social or juridical reasoning, however fundamental it may heretofore have been deemed to be under our Judeo-Christian moral system.”

“[A] great deal of so-called social science, as carried on with foundation funds, is little more than an elaborate, argument that Government can take, better care of the people than the people can take care of themselves.”

“In spite of the fact that through this superb public relations smear campaign in an effort to exonerate the tax-exempt foundations of all blame, even before the committee report has been prepared...This committee has been subjected to various and strange pressures and harassments. It began to be reviled from many directions very early in its career. A steady procession of condemnatory resolutions emanating from a puzzling assortment of organizations have followed its work...several of the major newspapers — notably the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post and Times Herald — have joined with the [communist publication] Daily Worker in a steady, constant, almost daily campaign of savage attacks, both in editorials and what purported to be news reports. These savage attacks have been of a nature so venomous and untruthful as to eliminate any explanation but one. The attitude of the committee and of its staff and the occurrences at the hearings have been deliberately misrepresented to the public with such obviously intended malice that no explanation seems rational but that the power of some of the major foundations and their sycophants is truly great....Long after the pious protestations of its adversaries have been forgotten, this record will stand as the first determined effort to alert the Nation to the presence of a force which, if allowed to persist and grow, could become stronger than the Government Itself.”²⁴⁹

As shown in the excerpts above, this congressional investigation found that the major tax-exempt foundations of America (Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, and Carnegie Endowment), since at least 1910, have been operating to promote a hidden agenda. That agenda has nothing to do with the surface appearance of charity, good works or philanthropy. The real objective has been to influence American educational institutions and to control foreign policy agencies of the Federal government. The purpose of the control has been to condition Americans to accept the creation of all-powerful World government. That government is to be based on the principle of collectivism; a government with complete control and authority over the people—and, it is to be ruled from behind the scenes by those same interests which control the tax-

²⁴⁹The above excerpts are from the Report by the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House of Representatives, Eighty-Third Congress, Second Session on H. Res. 217, Part 1, Pages 1-943. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954

exempt foundations and the Federal Reserve banking system.

The progress towards this world government has been steady and gradual, not because the people of the world have freely chosen it after hearing the arguments on both sides, but because they have been deceived. The following takes a look at some of the various strategies being used to condition the people of the world to give up their national sovereignty and turn it over to a world authority.

The Strategy To Destroy Our Country Through The Use Of Gradualism

The following speech by U.S. Senator William E. Jenner in 1954 was another of the courageous attempts to sound a detailed warning about is actually going on behind the scenes:

“Today the path to total dictatorship in the U.S. can be laid by strictly legal means, unseen and unheard by Congress, the President, or the people. We have a well-organized political-action group in this country, **determined to destroy our Constitution and establish a one-party state...** [It has a] foothold within our Government, and its own propaganda apparatus...The important point to remember about this group is not its ideology but its organization. It is a dynamic, aggressive, elite corps, forcing its way through every opening, to make a breach for a collectivist one-party state. **It operates secretly, silently, continuously to transform our Government without suspecting that change is under way...** This secret revolutionary corps understands well the power to influence the people... It conducts tactical retreats but only the more surely to advance its own secret goal...I know of the Alger Hisses who planned it that way... Dr. Wirt, of my State, told us in 1934 that **the plans were all drawn, the timetable established...** the revolutionary cabal and its allies... designated **the overall strategy. They broke the whole up into precisely measured parts and carefully timed moves, which appear to be wholly unrelated...** They will use every ally, to prevent the American people from guessing how far the transformation had gone...” If I seem to be extremist, the reason is that this revolutionary clique cannot be understood, unless we accept the fact that they are extremist. **It is difficult for people governed by reasonableness and morality to imagine the existence of a movement which ignores reasonableness and boasts of its determination to destroy;** which ignores morality, and boasts of its cleverness in outwitting its opponents by abandoning all scruples. **This ruthless power-seeking elite is a disease of our century.... This group ... is answerable neither to the President, the Congress, nor the courts. It is practically irremovable.”**

It is notable that the strategy to destroy our Constitution and national sovereignty described to Senator Jenner in 1934: “They broke the whole up into precisely measured parts and carefully timed moves, which appear to be wholly unrelated...” is a similar strategy to the step-by-step approach of the plan, that CFR member Henry Morgenthau, Jr., U.S. Secretary of the Treasury to FDR explained in 1945:

“We can hardly expect the nation-state to make itself superfluous, at least not overnight. Rather what we must aim for is really nothing more than caretakers of a bankrupt international machine which will have to be transformed slowly into a new one. The transition will not be dramatic, but a gradual one. People

will still cling to national symbols.”

And more recently, in 1974, CFR member and Bilderberg member Richard Gardner, a top advisor to President Jimmy Carter and former Ambassador to Italy presented a similar step-by-step strategy to gradually and insidiously shape the country in order to accomplish their century-long plan of creating an all-powerful One World Government:

“If **instant world government**, Charter review, and a greatly strengthened International Court do not provide the answers, what hope for progress is there? The answer...comes down essentially to this: The hope for the foreseeable lies, not in building up a few ambitious central institutions of universal membership and general jurisdiction as was envisaged at the end of the last war, but rather in the much more **decentralized, disorderly and pragmatic process** of inventing or adapting institutions of limited jurisdiction and selected membership to deal with specific problems on a case-by-case basis ... In short, the 'house of world order' will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down. **It will look like a great 'booming, buzzing confusion,'** to use William James' famous description of reality, but **an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault.**”²⁵⁰

Washington columnist Paul Scott, in 1976 called this "the new strategy change from the direct to the indirect approach to bring about world government." Instead of trying to make the UN a complete world dictatorship immediately, these Globalist elites identify different problems in different countries. Then they will propose a "solution," which can only be achieved by some kind of international agency, so that each country concerned will be forced to surrender another segment of its national independence.

The Strategy To Take Control Of Society Through Creeping Socialism

How does socialism relate to communism? It is a watered-down version. Former communist Whittaker Chambers called it “communism with the claws retracted.” Places like America and Britain wouldn’t accept outright communist revolution. Along with strong Christian roots, they had a large middle class that saw no need to violently overthrow wealthier people. So the Round Table Network again used its timeworn principle: to boil a frog, put him in lukewarm water and gradually increase the heat. If countries won’t accept communism, we’ll install it step by step. This slowly warming water is called “Fabian” or “creeping” socialism:

- In communist states, religion was abolished; that was impossible in America, so a gradual process has taken place to destroy Judeo-Christian principles and religious freedom by degrees –in one case banning school prayer; in another outlawing display of the Ten Commandments; etc., etc.
- Whereas a communist government seizes control of the economy, socialism does it gradually, confiscating personal and business income through rising taxes, and

²⁵⁰This revealing look at how the elitist planners would, through the use of gradualism, succeed in their century-long plan to create a One World Government, Richard N. Gardner, Council on Foreign Relations member, former advisor to President Jimmy Carter, Ambassador to Italy, and Columbia University law professor, as quoted in the April, 1974 issue of the CFR Journal Foreign Affairs, "The Hard Road to World Order."

inflation, while burdening companies with mounting regulations related to the environment, safety, energy, hiring practices, wages, health insurance, etc.

- Communists usurped schools; in socialism the government increasingly directs public education and slowly shapes it towards the manipulative agenda of those behind it.

The communist desire to control society is further explained by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover who wrote in 1961:

“Communists want to control everything: where you live, where you work, what you are paid, what you think ... how your children are educated, what you may not and must read and write ... Remember, always, that ‘it could happen here’ and that there are thousands of people in this country now working in secret to make it happen here.”

The strategy further explained by Syndicated Washington columnist Paul Scott, 1976

“It is Kissinger's belief, according to his aides, that by **controlling food**, one can **control people**, and by **controlling energy**, especially oil, one can **control nations and their financial systems**. By **placing food and oil under international control** along with the **worlds monetary system**, Kissinger is convinced a loosely knit **world government operating under** the framework of the **United Nations** can become a reality.”

Socialism's end result is EXACTLY the same as communism, but is achieved over many decades instead of through a single revolution

J. Reuben Clark, Undersecretary of State and former United States Ambassador to Mexico explained in 1949 the distinction between socialism and communism and warned that the common goal was world conquest:

“The paths we are following, if we move forward thereon will inevitably lead us to socialism or communism, and these two are as alike as two peas in a pod in their ultimate effect upon our liberties. And never forget for one moment that communism and socialism are state slavery. World conquest has been, is now, and ever will be its ultimate goal.”

The Establishment plays with terminology. If the public perceives the word “socialism” as too radical, it's changed to “democratic socialism,” and if people still can't stomach that, it's called “liberalism.” Socialist Norman Thomas explained:

“The American people will never knowingly, accept Socialism, but under the name of Liberalism, they will adopt every fragment of the Socialist program, until one day America will be a Socialist nation without knowing how it happened.”²⁵¹

²⁵¹ John Coleman, One World Order: Socialist Dictatorship (Carson City, Nev.: Bridger House, 1998), 31.

As further explained by Soviet Premier and head of the Communist Party of the USSR, Nikita Khrushchev in a September 29, 1959 speech at the United Nations:

“Your children’s children will live under Communism. You Americans are so gullible. No, you won’t accept Communism outright; but we’ll keep feeding you small doses of Socialism until you will finally wake up and find that you already have Communism. We won’t have to fight you; we’ll so weaken your economy, until you fall like overripe fruit into our hands.”

The Strategy To Merge The Democratic West And Communist East Into A World Totalitarian System

In the Communist Manifesto, Karl Marx wrote about the abolition of private property, a progressive income tax, a central bank, control of education, and degradation of the family unit and religion, which are all aspects of a Socialist government, the prelude to the utopian goal of Communism. Yet, they are at this point already a part of our own system, which is a necessary step towards a Great Merger—among nations.

The plan for world government was to turn nation-states into either (1) communist dictatorships, or (2) republics that would gradually convert to socialism. Eventually, the communists would ostensibly moderate toward socialism, so that the two systems, now looking similar, could be merged into regional bodies (European Union, North American Union), paving the road for one-world government.

This convergence strategy was alluded to by Armand Hammer, (CFR member) in the 1972 London’s Times:

“In fifty-one years of dealing with the Soviets I’ve never known a better climate for growth. We’re moving toward socialism, they toward capitalism. Between us there’s a meeting ground.”²⁵²

This convergence strategy was confirmed during the Reece congressional investigation in 1954

Norman Dodd—as the Director of Research during the congressional investigation of Tax-Free Foundations—gained unique insight into the planned gradual merger between the democratic West and communist East. The following is from a 1982 televised interview with him:

Dodd: “Rowan Gaither [CFR member] was, at that time, President of the Ford Foundation. Mr. Gaither had sent for me, when I found it convenient to be in New York. He asked me to call upon him at his office, which I did.”

“Upon arrival, after a few amenities, Mr. Gaither said, ‘Mr. Dodd, we have asked you to come up here today, because we thought that, possibly, off the record, you would tell us why the Congress is interested in the activities of foundations such as ourselves.’”

“And, before I could think of how I would reply to that statement, Mr. Gaither then went on, and voluntarily stated, ‘Mr. Dodd, all of us who have a hand in the

²⁵² Joseph Finder, *Red Carpet* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983), 262.

making of policies here, have had experience either with the OSS [Office of Strategic Services, CIA forerunner] during the war, or with the European Economic Administration after the war. We have had experience operating under directives. The directives emanate, and did emanate, from the White House. Now, we still operate under just such directives. Would you like to know what the substance of these directives is?"

"I said, 'Yes, Mr. Gaither, I would like very much to know.' Whereupon, he made this statement to me, 'Mr. Dodd, we are here to operate in response to similar 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.'"

"Well, parenthetically, Mr. Griffin, I nearly fell off the chair. I, of course, didn't, but my response to Mr. Gaither then was, 'Oh, Mr. Gaither, I can now answer your first question. You've forced the Congress of the United States to spend a hundred and fifty thousand dollars to find out what you have just told me.' I said, 'Of course, legally, you're entitled to make grants for this purpose. But, I don't think you're entitled to withhold that information from the people of this country, to whom you're indebted for your tax exemption. So why don't you tell the people of the country just what you told me?' And his answer was, 'We would not think of doing any such thing.'"²⁵³

This conversation between Mr. Gaither and Mr. Dodd may not seem so unbelievable when taken into context with the following statement by CFR Member, Walt W. Rostow, chief planner for the U.S. State Department (1961–66), and National Security Advisor (1966–69):

"We must do everything in our power to avoid irritating and antagonizing the communists. They are, after all merely rough and crude socialists and we must avoid doing anything that would escalate into a war. In fact, what we should do is to help them to develop so that they will mature and outgrow their violent impulses. In this way the communists will move somewhat over in our direction. **At the same time we must move our country over toward the left with more and more socialism until, ultimately, the two will merge.** Each country will then give up its armaments and armed forces and place them in the hands of a **one-World Government.**"²⁵⁴

This convergence strategy was once again described in 1970 by former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski (CFR Member and Executive Director of the Trilateral Commission):

"...This regionalization is in keeping with the Tri-Lateral Plan which calls for a

²⁵³ Source: Interview can be viewed online: Norman Dodd On Tax Exempt Foundations <https://youtu.be/YUYCBfmIcHM>; In public, of course, Gaither never admitted what he had revealed in private. However, on numerous public occasions Norman Dodd repeated what Gaither had said, and was neither sued by Gaither nor challenged by the Ford Foundation. Dodd was subsequently warned that "If you proceed with the investigation as you have outlined, you will be killed."

²⁵⁴A Proposal: Key to an Effective Foreign Policy, Walt W. Rostow, Harper, New York, 1957

gradual convergence of East and West, ultimately leading toward the goal of 'one world government'....National sovereignty is no longer a viable concept..."

As CFR member A. M. Rosenthal, wrote in The New York Times in January 1991:

"But it became clear as time went on that in Mr. Bush's mind the New World Order was founded on a convergence of goals and interests between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, so strong and permanent that they would work as a team through the U.N. Security Council."

As explained by Mikhail Gorbachev, after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1992

"The truth of the matter is that today, all of us, East and West, are moving toward a new type of civilization, whether we realize it or not. Our old stereotypes have now lost their meaning and should be radically re-examined."²⁵⁵

In summing this strategy up, as Quigley points out, the power structure that he exposed isn't loyal to Communism, or Socialism, or Fascism, or Capitalism. The Network is happy to exploit the rhetoric of any movement or ideology, prop up any dictator or tyrant, and support any economic or political model, provided it serves their one overarching aim. **That aim, to bring "all the habitable portions of the world under their control."**²⁵⁶

How The Secret Round Table Network Is Working To Reduce Sovereignty

In this context, I will briefly address immigration. For many centuries, there were mainly Japanese in Japan, Russians in Russia, Italians in Italy, Irishmen in Ireland, and so forth. Recent years have seen huge pushes to relax U.S. immigration laws. Immigration is integral to the Secret Network's plan for instituting a world government. The European Union, for example, encourages free movement within members states. As a result, nations are becoming harder to characterize. Britain had only 10,700 Indians and Pakistanis in 1955; by 2001 that figure had risen to over 1.8 million. France today has over five million Muslims, most of them immigrants from its former North African colonies; they constitute a state within a state –as witnessed by the constant rash of violence that French police haven't been able to contain.

The Secret Round Table Network encourages such situations because if you confuse national identity, you weaken national sovereignty. When Africans Muslims come to France, they usually don't consider themselves Frenchmen –and ethnically they aren't. A country not unified by a distinct identity is far easier to strip of sovereignty because the subjects themselves feel little allegiance to country, flag, and each other. "Multiculturalism" is politically correct today, but its purpose is to fragmentize nations.

²⁵⁵ Mikhail Gorbachev, after the fall of the Soviet Union, Feb 25, 1992 Deseret News Article entitled "Socialism lives on"

²⁵⁶ Tragedy and Hope, page 131

Exporting Our Economy

Over the last few years, you may have noticed America becoming embroiled in various trade agreements and organizations with acronyms –GATT (General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs); WTO (World Trade Organization); NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement); SPP (Security and Prosperity Partnership –a strengthened NAFTA); and the proposed FTAA (Free Trade Area of the Americas –a projected extension of NAFTA to the entire Western Hemisphere). You may have also noticed that American jobs are disappearing –going overseas.

In 1994, we signed the GATT Treaty, making us a member of the World Trade Organization. Congress bitterly debated the treaty, whose proponents assured us it would not undermine our trade balance: exports and imports would increase; everyone would win! However, the following year, America’s trade deficit shot from \$ 75 billion to a record \$ 103 billion.

Since then, the deficit has steadily increased, reaching a staggering \$ 721 billion by 2007. The biggest item we export is jobs. This occurred because GATT and other recent trade treaties eradicated America’s tariff structure. A tariff, of course, is a charge a government puts on foreign goods. It raises the cost of imports for consumers, but also provides revenue for the American government.

Years ago, a person shopping at Wal-Mart would see two comparable plastic products –one manufactured in China, one in America. The Chinese product, made by virtual slave labor, cost \$ 4.50, its price increased by a tariff. The American product cost \$ 5 – a bit more expensive, but it looked nicer, so the shopper would buy it. But now comes the GATT Treaty. The tariff on the Chinese import vanishes. It now sells for \$ 1.25, reflecting the labor’s true cost. Meanwhile, the American product is still \$ 5. The shopper sighs, “Well, the American one looks nicer –but I can’t pass up a bargain,” and buys the Chinese item, as do other consumers. Result: the American manufacturer must either close his business, or move his factory to China (or Mexico, or wherever labor is cheap). That, in a nutshell, is what happened to American industry.

Textiles, steel, electronics –cheap imports have destroyed virtually all manufacturing sectors. Unfortunately, many accepted the trade treaties under the illusion that removing tariffs constitutes “free enterprise.” This widely accepted myth has been refuted many times over. When we ratified the GATT Treaty in 1994, Europe received 30 votes in the World Trade Organization; Africa 35. America? One vote. Our voting power equals that of the island nation Antigua, population 64,000. Thus, we are at the mercy of other countries, many hostile to America, who set trading rules we are compelled to obey.

By whim of a majority vote, we can be forced to accept cheap imports, while certain other nations bar our products. But who pays for the WTO’s administrative costs? Naturally, U.S. taxpayers foot the lion’s share. This is what America’s Founding Fathers called “taxation without representation.” Thus, the WTO not only rapes our economy, we actually have to pay them to do that. The WTO has already proven the charges by its critics and opponents, that it is an enormous threat to America’s national sovereignty, as well as an engine of global central economic planning:

“Make no mistake about it,” warned Rep. Ron Paul (R-Texas) in 2005, “WTO

ministers tell Congress to change American laws, and Congress complies. In fact, congressional leaders obediently scrambled to make sure the corporate tax bill passed before a WTO deadline. Thousands and thousands of bills languish in committees, yet a bill ordered by the WTO was pushed to the front of the line.”

Who dreamed up international alliances like WTO and NAFTA?

Was it the American people?

Before Congress voted on the GATT Treaty, the Senate Commerce Committee, chaired by South Carolina’s Ernest Hollings, held hearings on the treaty’s merits. The Establishment then brought out one of their big guns. CFR member Felix Rohatyn and Lazard Freres investment analyst, advocated the treaty before the committee, warning that if wasn’t ratified, the markets would react adversely. That very same day, CFR member Alan Greenspan and the Fed unexpectedly raised short-term interests rates 0.75 percent, sparking a steep five-day drop in the stock market. Congress and the country grew nervous. Finally Bob Dole, Minority Leader of the Senate’s Republicans, hurried to the White House and, standing next to President Clinton (CFR, Trilateral Commission, Bilderberg Group member), vowed that the GATT Treaty would receive bipartisan support in Congress. The market immediately rebounded, and the treaty passed.

This was not the only time the Establishment has manipulated the markets to suit its purposes. Shortly before the vote, Senator Hollings declared on the Senate floor:

“They [multinational corporations and banks] have got the Trilateral Commission, and the foreign affairs association [CFR] up there in New York. If you ever run for President, they’ll invite you. And when you come at their invitation, what they’ll do is, they want you to swear, on the altar of free trade, almighty faith forever and ever. “Are you a free trader?” “Yeah, I’m for free trade.” That’s all they want. You can get out, you can get their contributions, you can get their support –I’ve been there, I know what we’re talking about! But that is what our “friend” David Rockefeller and his Trilateral Commission and all that got that steam together –it’s money, not jobs, money! . . . Well, they’re getting rich and we’re losing jobs! . . . They are debilitating and destroying us!”

Beyond Senator Hollings’s remarks; these trade treaties signify more than job destruction. CFR and Trilateral Commission member Henry Kissinger said NAFTA “will represent the most creative step toward a new world order taken by any group of countries since the end of the Cold War.”²⁵⁷

In the Wall Street Journal in 1993, CFR Director and Trilateral Commission founder David Rockefeller said of NAFTA: “Everything is in place –after 500 years –to build a true ‘new world’ in the Western Hemisphere.”

Andrew Reding of the World Policy Institute said:

“NAFTA . . . will signal the formation, however tentatively, of a new political unit –North America. . . . With economic integration will come political

²⁵⁷ Henry Kissinger, op-ed, Los Angeles Times, July 18, 1993.

integration. . . . By whatever name, this is an incipient form of international government. . . . Following the lead of the Europeans, North Americans should begin considering formation of a continental parliament.”²⁵⁸

In the Los Angeles Times in 1993, CFR member and Trilateralist Henry Kissinger said of NAFTA:

“What Congress will have before it is not a conventional trade agreement but the architecture of a new international system... a first step toward a New World Order.”²⁵⁹

Although international trade treaties propose economic consolidation, they’re really about political consolidation. One of the ways this move to a New World Order authority is being accomplished is the gradual merging of the countries of the world into different regional bodies (European, African, American and Asian) to be run virtually entirely by committees of politicians, bureaucrats and judges, none of whom are directly elected by the people, and where the supremacy of region laws takes priority over the constitution of individual Member States.

The European Union was set up this way with a continental government for 27 countries, with its own supreme court, currency, thousands of pages of law, a large civil service and the ability to deploy military force. It is de facto a supranational government that completely overrides the national and local governments of its member states. The others are in progress and at different stages. For example, the UN-appointed Commission on Global Governance explained:

“The UN must gear itself for a time when regionalism becomes more ascendant worldwide and assist the process in advance of that time. Regional co-operation and integration should be seen as an important and integral part of a balanced system of global governance.”

Ultimately, the regional bodies will be subservient to the United Nations which is to serve as the unelected, unaccountable world government.

The European Union began with the Common Market, foisted on Europeans as a purely economic arrangement. The Common Market’s official name was European Economic Community. Eventually, however, the word “Economic” was simply dropped, a European Parliament was formed, then the European Union. The EU is progressively destroying the sovereignty of Europe’s nations—where once-mighty nations that oversaw empires, such as Britain and Spain, have become little more than provinces of the European Union (EU). There has long been a plan to dismantle their sovereignty.

In the July 1968 Spectacle du Monde –well before Americans ever heard the phrase “European Union” –Raymond Bourguine wrote:

“The Europe of Jean Monnet is the famous “Supranational Europe” to which member States will progressively surrender their attributes of national

²⁵⁸ Andrew Reding, “Trading Away Democracy?” Ottawa Citizen, September 10, 1992, A13.

²⁵⁹ Henry Kissinger, op-ed, Los Angeles Times, July 18, 1993.

sovereignty. In the end their economies will be integrated by Administrators in Brussels while awaiting a European Assembly, elected by popular vote, which will turn itself into a legislative one and give birth to a new European political power. The national states will then wither away.”²⁶⁰

Bourgine’s prophecy has been fulfilled. Parliaments of EU countries are subservient to the European Parliament—their parliaments now do little more than ratify EU decisions; and their militaries are gradually being consolidated. Laws are uniform throughout the Union. National currencies are consolidated into the “Euro.” The European Court of Justice can issue arrest warrants against citizens of any member country.

The EU has its own ambassadors, and a European Constitution is in development. Furthermore, the Union is not finished –it’s a work in progress. Advocates of world government plan a universal version of the EU model for the planet.

Regional alliances such as the EU are not ends in themselves, but stepping stones to world government. Leading Establishment figure Zbigniew Brzezinski declared at Mikhail Gorbachev’s October 1995 State of the World Forum: **“We cannot leap into world government in one quick step. . . . The precondition for genuine globalization is progressive regionalization.”**²⁶¹

Even Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin recognized this principle as integral to communist plans for domination, saying:

“Divide the world into regional groups as a transitional stage to world government. Populations will more readily abandon their national loyalty to a vague regional loyalty than they will for a world authority. **Later, the regionals can be brought all the way into a single world dictatorship.”**²⁶²

How do globalist elites justify secretly plotting world government?

By promising “peace and prosperity.” Their argument has traditionally run along this line: Look, nothing’s worse than war, right? And the only reason we have war is because the world is divided into nations, who keep fighting each other. If we just got rid of nations, and replaced them with a world government, war would end, and mankind would live as one happy family. As Henry David Thoreau aptly summed it up:

“Every ambitious would-be empire clarions it abroad that she is conquering the world to bring it peace, security and freedom, and is sacrificing her sons only for the most noble and humanitarian purposes. That is a lie, and it is an ancient lie, yet generations still rise and believe it.”

This pretext is flawed too. Rudolph Rummel, professor emeritus of political science at the University of Hawaii, published a study demonstrating that, in the 20th century, six times more people were killed by their own governments than were killed in wars.²⁶³

²⁶⁰ As quoted in “The New World Order Story,” H du B Reports, March 1997, 4.

²⁶¹ As quoted in “The North American Union & the Larger Plan” by Dennis L. Cuddy, Ph.D., 2007

²⁶² Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question* (New York: International Publishers, 1942).

²⁶³ Rudolph Rummel, “20th Century Democide,” www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/20TH.HTM

In other words, wars are not the deadliest thing –governments are. This raises a question: If we had a world government, who would run it? Globalists are fond of pointing out that international alliances have defeated dictators such as Saddam Hussein. But what if a man like Hussein took over a world government? Today, if a tyrant enslaves a nation, its people may hopefully escape to another country. But if a dictator ruled a world government, where could one escape?

America’s founding fathers recognized the dangers of concentrating power in one place. They therefore split government power into branches –the President’s authority was balanced by Congress; and even within the legislature, the House and Senate could offset each other. The President and Congress were further balanced by the Supreme Court. And –at least in the Founding Fathers’ original vision –the power of the entire federal government was to be held in check by the states themselves.

Granted, there has been corruption within each federal branch; nonetheless, decentralization of power has spared us the oppression of totalitarian dictatorship that other nations have known. James Madison, fourth President of the United States and known as “Father of the Constitution,” said:

“The accumulation of all power –legislative, executive, and judiciary –in the same hands . . . may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.”²⁶⁴

Countries themselves act as a check and balance on each other. If one nation becomes despotic or belligerent, another can rise up to stop it. Thus, global government, concentrating all world power in a single regime, could create the most unrestrained tyranny in history.

²⁶⁴ Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, James Madison, *The Federalist Papers* (1787–88; reprint, Radford, Virg.: A & D Publishing, 2008), 193.

VIII

THE TAKEOVER OF THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

The Rockefellers established an oil monopoly in the United States in the 1870's. In 1899, this oil trust was reorganized as the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. In 1911, as a result of a decision of the Supreme Court, Standard was forced to separate into six companies—supposedly to break up the oil monopoly. This act did not accomplish its objective. The many “independent” companies that resulted continued to be owned—and in many cases even run—by the same men. None of them ever engaged in serious competition between themselves, and certainly not against Standard Oil of New Jersey, which continued to be Rockefeller's main holding company.

In the years following 1911, the Rockefellers returned to their original policy of acquiring other oil companies that, in the public eye, were “independent.” Consequently, the Rockefeller family obtained either control over or substantial financial interest in such vast enterprises as Humble Oil (now called Exxon), Creole Petroleum, Texaco, Pure Oil, and others. These companies control a staggering maze of subsidiaries that operated in almost every nation of the world. All together, Standard Oil of New Jersey alone admitted to outright control over 322 companies.²⁶⁵ In addition, Rockefeller established cartel links through investments in many foreign “competitors.” These included Royal Dutch (Shell Oil) and a half interest in the Soviet Nobel Oil Works.

The Rockefeller's interest in the burgeoning pharmaceutical industry converged in companies like I.G. Farben, a drug and chemical cartel formed in Germany in the early 20th century. Royal Dutch's Prince Bernhard (co-founder of the secretive Bilderberg Group) served on an I.G. Farben subsidiary's board in the 1930s and the cartel's American operation, set up in cooperation with Standard Oil, included on its board Standard Oil president Walter Teagle as well as CFR member Paul Warburg of Kuhn, Loeb Co., itself headed by Jacob Schiff of the Rothschild broker family. At its height, I.G. Farben was the largest chemical company in the world and the fourth largest industrial concern in the world, right behind Rockefeller's Standard Oil of New Jersey. The company was broken up after World War II, but like Standard Oil, its various pieces remained intact and today BASF, one of its chemical offshoots, remains the largest chemical company in the world, while Bayer and Sanofi, two of its pharmaceutical offshoots are among the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world.

With that serving as an overview, let us now explore in more detail the forces that wield tremendous influence over the medical profession, the medical schools, the pharmaceutical industry, and the medical journals; and that the average doctor is the last to suspect that much of his knowledge and outlook have been shaped subtly by these non-medical interests. It will be shown, also, that this elite group can move long levers of political power that activate government agencies in their behalf; and that these agencies, which supposedly are the servants and protectors of the people, have become the mechanism of vested interest. The information that follows is taken primarily from government hearings and reports published by various Senate and House committees from 1928 to 1946. Principal among these are the House Subcommittee to Investigate Nazi Propaganda in 1934, the Special Senate Committee Investigating the Munitions Industry in 1935, the report on cartels released by the House Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941, the Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program in 1942, the report of the

²⁶⁵ Hoffman, *op. cit.*, pp. 151, 152.

Senate Patents Committee in 1942, and the Senate Subcommittee on War Mobilization in 1946. Other sources include the Senate Lobby Investigating Committee, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, court records of the Nuremberg trials, and dozens of volumes found as standard references in any large library. In other words, although the story that follows is not widely known, it is, nevertheless, part of the public record and can be verified by anyone. This is that story.

The birth of the world's chemical and drug monopoly

In the years prior to World War II, there came into existence an international cartel that included the Rockefeller empire, centered in Germany, that dominated the world's chemical and drug industries. It had spread its operations to ninety-three countries and was a powerful economic and political force on all continents. It was known as I.G. Farben. I.G. stands for *Interessen Gemeinschaft*, which means "community of interests" or, more simply, "cartel." *Farben* means "dyes," which, because the modern chemical industry had its origin in the development of dyestuffs, now is a deceptively innocent sounding category that, in reality, encompasses the entire field of chemistry, including munitions and drugs. The international cartel agreement was between I.G. Farben, Standard Oil, Imperial Chemical, DuPont, and Shell Oil.

The basic ingredient for almost all chemicals—including those that wound as well as those that heal—is coal tar or crude oil. With the advent of the internal combustion engine, the value of these raw materials as the precursor of gasoline has given those who control their chemical conversions a degree of power over the affairs of the world that is frightening to contemplate. In other words, the present movement of civilization is driven by the engine of chemistry. But the fuel of chemistry is oil. Whereas gold once was the key to world power, now it is oil. And it has come to pass that it is the same men who control both. Howard Ambruster, author of *Treason's Peace*, summarizes:

"I.G. Farben is usually discussed as a huge German cartel which controls chemical industries throughout the world and from which profits flow back to the headquarters in Frankfurt. *Farben*, however, is no mere industrial enterprise conducted by Germans for the extraction of profits at home and abroad. Rather, it is and must be recognized as a cabalistic organization which, through foreign subsidiaries and by secret tie-ups, operates a far-flung and highly efficient espionage machine—the ultimate purpose being world conquest—and a world superstate directed by *Farben*."²⁶⁶

By 1929, I.G. Farben had concluded a series of limited cartel agreements with its largest American competitor, the DuPont Company. DuPont was a major power in itself and it always had been reluctant to enter into cooperative ventures with *Farben* which usually insisted on being the dominant partner. The primary reason that such an industrial giant as DuPont finally relented and entered into cartel agreements with I.G. is that Standard Oil of New Jersey had just done so. The combination of these two Goliaths presented DuPont with a serious potential of domestic competition. DuPont might have been able to stand firmly against I.G. alone, but it could not hope to take on both I.G. and the great Rockefeller empire as well. Standard Oil, therefore, was the

²⁶⁶ Howard Ambruster, *Treason's Peace*, (New York: Beechhurst Press, 1947), p. vii.

decisive factor that brought together the ultimate “community of interest”—I.G., Standard Oil, Imperial Chemical, DuPont, and as we shall see, Shell Oil.

The agreement between I.G., Rockefeller Standard, and Shell was consummated in 1929. How it came about is a fascinating story and sheds considerable light on the behind-the-scenes maneuvers of companies that, in the public eye, are perceived as competitors. One of the factors leading to Germany’s defeat in World War I was its lack of petroleum. German leaders resolved never again to be dependent upon the outside world for gasoline. Germany may not have had oil deposits within its territory, but it did have abundant reserves of coal. One of the first goals of German chemists after the war, therefore, was to find a way to convert coal into gasoline. By 1920, Dr. Bergius had discovered ways to make large quantities of hydrogen and to force it, under great pressure, at high temperatures, and in the presence of specific catalysts, into liquid coal products. The final steps into refined gasoline were then assured. It was only a matter of perfecting the hydrogenation process.

I.G. suddenly was in the oil business. One might assume that the cartel would have eagerly gone into production. But the plan, instead, was to interest existing oil producers in their process and to use their patents as leverage to gain concessions and business advantages in other areas. This was to be the bait to ensnare Rockefeller Standard Oil which, in turn, would bring in DuPont. And it worked exactly as planned. Frank Howard of Standard Oil was invited to visit the great Baldische plant at Ludwigshafen in March of 1926. What he saw was astounding— gasoline from coal! In a near state of shock, he wrote to Walter Teagle, president of Standard Oil:

“Based upon my observations and discussions today, I think that this matter is the most important which has ever faced the company . . . The Baldische can make high-grade motor oil fuel from lignite and other low-quality coals in amounts up to half the weight of the coal. This means absolutely the independence of Europe on the matter of gasoline supply. Straight price competition is all that is left . . . I shall not attempt to cover any details, but I think this will be evidence of my state of mind.”²⁶⁷

The following three years were devoted to negotiation. The International cartel agreement was signed on November 9, 1929 and it accomplished several important objectives: First, it granted Rockefeller’s Standard Oil one-half of all rights to the hydrogenation process in all countries of the world except Germany. This assured Standard that it would control, or at least profit from, its own competition in this field. In return, Standard gave I.G. 546,000 shares of its stock valued at more than \$30,000,000. The two parties also agreed not to compete with each other in the fields of chemistry and petroleum products. In the future, if Standard Oil wished to enter the field of industrial chemicals or drugs, it would do so only as a partner of Farben. Farben, in turn, agreed not to enter the field of petroleum except as a joint venture with Standard. Each party disavowed “any plan or policy” of “expanding its existing business in the direction of the other party’s industry as to become a serious competitor of that other party.”²⁶⁸

²⁶⁷ Sasuly, I.G. Farben, op. cit., pp. 144–145.

²⁶⁸George Stocking and Myron Watkins, *Cartels in Action*, New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, (1946), p. 93.

As Frank Howard of Standard Oil phrased it:

“The I.G. may be said to be our general partner in the chemical business. . . . The desire and intention of both parties is to avoid competing with one another.”²⁶⁹

Here, then, was a perfect example of how two giant industrial empires came together, a step at a time, until eventually, in large areas of their activity, they were moving in unison as one. The goal of each simply was to remove all marketplace competition between themselves and assure that each had a secure guarantee of future growth and profit.

Dr. Carl Bosch, head of I.G. at the time, was not merely being picturesque when he said that I.G. and Standard had “married.” He was describing quite accurately the philosophical essence of all major cartel agreements. Space does not permit a detailed chronicle of all of I.G. Farben’s polygamous marriages with other major U.S. firms, but at least two more should be mentioned in passing.

On October 23, 1931, I.G. and Alcoa signed an accord, known as the Alig Agreement, in which the two companies pooled all their patents and technical knowledge on the production of magnesium. The other industrial giant that became part of the international web was none other than the Ford Motor Company.

When Henry Ford established a branch of his company in Germany, I.G. Farben immediately purchased most of the forty percent of the stock which was offered for sale. The marriage was completed when Carl Bosch, I.G.’s president, and Carl Krauch, I.G.’s chairman of the board, both joined the board of directors of the German Ford Company. In the United States, Edsel Ford joined the board of directors of the American I.G. Chemical Company as did Walter Teagle, president of Standard Oil, Charles E. Mitchell (CFR member), president of Rockefeller’s National City Bank of New York, and Paul M. Warburg (CFR member), brother of Max Warburg who was a director of the parent company in Germany.

The nature of cartels

A cartel is a grouping of companies that are bound together by contracts or agreements designed to promote inter-company cooperation and, thereby, reduce competition between them. Some of these agreements may deal with such harmless subjects as industry standards and nomenclature. But most of them involve the exchange of patent rights, the dividing of regional markets, the setting of prices, and agreements not to enter into product competition within specific categories. Generally, a cartel is a means of escaping the rigors of competition in the open free-enterprise market. The result always is higher prices and fewer products from which to choose. Cartels and monopolies, therefore, are not the result of free enterprise, but the escape from it.

This is an accurate description of the hidden reality behind most of the world’s major products today. By the year 1939, cartels controlled eighty-seven percent of the mineral products sold, sixty percent of agricultural products, and forty-two percent of all manufactured products. Needless to say, the trend has greatly accelerated since

²⁶⁹ As quoted by Ambruster, *Treason’s Peace*, op. cit., p. 52.

1939, so one can well imagine what the situation is like today. The chemical industry—and that includes pharmaceuticals—is completely cartelized.²⁷⁰

Even as far back as 1937, this fact was so obvious that Fortune magazine editorialized:

“The chemical industry, despite its slowly lowering curve of real prices, is an “orderly” industry. It was practicing “cooperation” long before General Johnson invented it in 1933. It has seldom been bedeviled by over production, has had no private depression of its own, and has not often involved itself in long or bloody price wars ...By and large, the chemical industry has regulated itself in a manner that would please even a Soviet Commissar...The industry . . . is . . . the practitioner of one definite sort of planned economy.”²⁷¹

This is reminiscent of the sentiments expressed in 1973 by the United States Tariff Commission. In its report to the Senate, it said:

“In the largest and most sophisticated multinational corporations, planning and subsequent monitoring of plan fulfillment have reached a scope and level of detail that, ironically, resemble more than superficially the national planning procedures of Communist countries.”²⁷²

The comments about resembling the planned economy of a Soviet Commissar in a Communist country are quite “on target.” They shed a great deal of light on the inherent philosophy of cartels. If it is true that cartels and monopolies are not the result of free enterprise but the escape from it, then it follows that the best way to escape free enterprise is to destroy it altogether. This is why cartels and collectivist governments inevitably work together as a team. They have a common enemy and share a common objective: the destruction of free enterprise.

Cartels and monopolies, without the help of government, would be hard-pressed to exist, at least at the level they do now. Look at any of the major world markets—in oil, pharmaceuticals, sugar, tea, chocolate, rubber, steel, petroleum, automobiles, food—any of them, and one will find a mountain of government restrictions, quotas, and price supports. And scampering all over this mountain, there is an army of lobbyists, representing special interests, applying pressures on politicians who, in turn, endorse the laws that, supposedly, are designed to protect the people.

It follows, also, that if big government is good for cartels, then bigger government is better, and total government is best. It is for this reason that, throughout their entire history, cartels have been found to be the behind-the-scenes promoters of every conceivable form of totalitarianism. They supported the Nazis in Germany; they embraced the Fascists in Italy; they financed the Bolsheviks in Russia. And they are the

²⁷⁰ George Stocking and Myron Watkins, *Cartels in Action*, (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1946), p. 93.

²⁷¹ “Chemical Industry,” *Fortune*, Dec, 1937, pp. 157, 162.

²⁷² Report entitled *Implications of Multinational Firms for World Trade and Investment for U.S. Trade and Labor*, Feb. 1973, p. 159.

driving force behind that nameless totalitarianism that increasingly becomes a grim reality in the United States of America.

Again, it seems to be a paradox that the “super rich” so often are found in support of socialism or socialist measures. It would appear that these would be the people with the most to lose. But, under socialism—or any other form of big government—there is no competition and there is no free enterprise. This is a desirable environment if one is operating a cartelized industry and also has powerful political influence “at the top.” That way, one can make larger profits and be part of the ruling class as well. These people do not fear the progressive taxation scheme that oppresses the middle class. Their political influence enables them to set up elaborate tax-exempt foundations to preserve and multiply their great wealth with virtually no tax at all.

Without exception, they embrace either socialism or some other form of collectivism,²⁷³ because these represent the ultimate monopoly. These government-sponsored monopolies are tolerated by their citizens because they assume that, by the magic of the democratic process and the power of their vote, somehow, it is they who are the benefactors. This might be true if they took the trouble to become informed on such matters, and if they had independent and honest candidates from which to choose, and if the political parties were not dominated by the super-rich, and if it were possible for people to win elections without vast sums of campaign money. In other words, these monopolies theoretically could work to the advantage of the common man on some other planet, with some other life form responding to some other motives, and under some other political system. As for us Earthlings, forget it.

The reality, therefore, is that government becomes the tool of the very forces that, supposedly, it is regulating. The regulations, upon close examination, almost always turn out to be what the cartels have agreed upon beforehand, except that now they have the police power of the state to enforce them. And it makes it possible for these financial and political interests to become secure from the threat of competition. About the only time that these regulations are used to the actual detriment of any of the multi-national companies or financial institutions is when they are part of the internal struggle of one group maneuvering for position or attempting to discipline another group. The “people” are never the benefactors.

Behind-the-scenes promoters of totalitarianism

One of the earliest examples of cartel support for totalitarian regimes occurred in Germany even before World War I. Those cartels which, later, were to join together into the I.G. Farben, supported Otto von Bismarck because they saw in his collectivist philosophy of government an excellent opportunity to gain favoritism in the name of patriotism.

Bismarck was the first to introduce socialized medicine as we know it in the modern world. He recognized that its appeal among the masses would make it an ideal

²⁷³ Again, in a collectivist society, the government has complete control and authority over the people. Individuals are subordinate to the dictatorship of the group; civil liberties are curtailed and property rights are virtually non-existent. Collectivism is the opposite of the ideals of individualism which is what America is based upon, and is a difficult idea to put into practice, as seen in the attempted collectivist society of Soviet communism.

opening wedge leading to more control over the rest of the economy later on. It was his view that socialized medicine would lead the way to a socialized nation.

In 1916, while still under the regime of Kaiser Wilhelm, an official of I.G. Farben, named Werner Daitz, wrote an essay that was printed and widely distributed by the cartel. In it he said:

“A new type of state socialism is appearing, totally different from that which any of us have dreamed or thought of. Private economic initiative and the private capitalist economy will not be crippled, but will be regimented from the points of view of state socialism in that capital will be concentrated in the national economy and will be directed outward with uniform impetus...This change in capitalism demands with natural peremptoriness a reconstruction of a former counterpoise, international socialism. It breaks this up into national socialism.”²⁷⁴

Here is a rare glimpse into the cartel mind. Note that, in the “new” socialism, there will be no conflict with economic initiative (for the cartels) and no threat to a “private capitalist economy” (meaning the private ownership of wealth, not the free enterprise system). Capital will be “regimented” and “concentrated in the national economy and directed outward with uniform impetus” (controlled by government according to cartel priorities). The change will require a “reconstruction of a former counterpoise, international socialism” (an acceptance of certain features of Marxian communism which the cartels previously opposed).

Eighteen years later, the theoretical stratagem had become the reality. On September 30, 1934, Farben issued a report that declared: “A phase of development is now complete which conforms to the basic principles of national socialist economics.”²⁷⁵

The encyclopedia reminds us that national socialism is the term used in Germany to identify the goals of the Nazi party. In fact, the party’s complete name was the National Socialist German Workers’ Party (NSDAP). But Nazism was also identified with the fascism of Mussolini, and the two terms have come to be interchangeable. Although the two did differ in some minor respects, they both were merely local manifestations of national socialism, and were, consequently, totalitarian regimes regardless of the labels. The dictionary definition of fascism is government control over the means of production with ownership held in private hands. That definition may satisfy the average college exam in political science, but falls far short of telling the whole story. In reality, the twentieth century fascism of Germany was private monopolist control over the government which then did control industry, but in such a way as to favor the monopolists and to prevent competition.

The American economist, Robert Brady, has correctly described the German fascist state as “a dictatorship of monopoly capitalism. Its ‘fascism’ is that of business

²⁷⁴ Sasuly, I.G. Farben, op. cit., p. 53.

²⁷⁵ Scientific and Technical Mobilization, Hearings before the Kilgore Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, Pt. XVI, p. 1971.

enterprise organized on a monopoly basis and in full command of all the military, police, legal and propaganda power of the state.”²⁷⁶

“The German chemical industries came as close to complete cartelization as the combined efforts and organizational talents of German business and a Nazi state could achieve—and that was close, indeed. Even before 1933, industrial syndicalization had progressed far, perhaps farthest of all in chemicals. Fascism merely completed the program and integrated the entire structure...In the cartels which the Nazi state set up over German industry, it was often hard to determine where state control ended and cartel control began. Totalitarianism ultimately involved almost complete unification of business and state.”²⁷⁷

This unification did not happen as a result of blind, natural forces. It came about as a result of long and patient efforts on the part of cartel leaders, plus the corruptibility of politicians, plus the abysmal naiveté of the voters. Long before Hitler became a national figure, the cartel had been the dominant force, behind the scenes, in a long succession of German governments. Farben’s president, Hermann Schmitz, had been a personal advisor to Chancellor Bruening. Dr. Karl Duisberg, I.G’s first chairman, (also founder of the American Bayer Co.) and Carl Bosch, Schmitz’s predecessor as president of I.G, created a secret four-man Political Committee for the purpose of forcing a controlling link with each of Germany’s political parties. At the Nuremberg trials, Baron von Schnitzler testified that I.G. did not hesitate to use plenty of hard cash in its role of hidden political manipulator. He estimated that each election cost the cartel about 400,000 marks—which in the 1930’s was a considerable expenditure. But in this way, the cartel was protected no matter who was victorious in the political arena.

At first, the International chemical and drug cartel was not convinced that Hitler was the “strong man” that would best serve their purposes. But his program of national socialism and his ability to motivate large crowds through oratory singled him out for close watching and cautious funding. Although certain leading members of the trust had cast their lot with Hitler as early as 1928, it wasn’t until 1931 that the cartel officially began to make sizable contributions to the Nazi war chest. Max Ilgner, a nephew of Hermann Schmitz, was the first to establish a close and personal contact with Hitler. Ilgner generally was referred to as I.G.’s “Director of Finance.” His real function, however, was as head of the organization’s international spy network. Originally conceived as a means of gathering information about competitive business ventures, it expanded rapidly into a politically oriented operation that seldom has been equaled even by the efficient intelligence agencies of modern governments.

So complete was the coverage of every important aspect of conditions in foreign countries, that Farben became one of the main props of both Wehrmacht and Nazi Party intelligence. In the fall of 1932, the Nazi Party began to lose ground badly. Yet, out of all the contesting groups, the Nazis were most suitable to Duisberg’s plans. So, at the crucial moment, the entire weight of the cartel was thrown in Hitler’s direction. The initial financial contribution was three million marks! And much more was to follow.

²⁷⁶ Sasuly, I.G. Farben, op. cit., p. 128.

²⁷⁷ George Stocking and Myron Watkins, *Cartels in Action*, (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1946)

Hitler received backing more powerful than he had ever dared hope for. The industrial and financial leaders of Germany, with I.G. Farben in the lead, closed ranks and gave Hitler their full support...With that backing, he quickly established a blood-thirsty fascist state.²⁷⁸

Not only did the money arrive in what seemed like unlimited quantities, but many of the leading German newspapers, which were either owned by or beholden to the cartel because of its advertising accounts, also lined up behind Hitler. In this way, they created that necessary image of universal popularity that, in turn, conditioned the German people to accept him as the great leader. Germany's strong man had suddenly appeared. Even in the United States this same heavy-handed tactic was used. If an American newspaper was unfriendly to the Nazi regime, I.G. withheld its advertising—which was a tremendous economic lever. In 1938, I.G. sent a letter to Sterling Products, one of its American subsidiaries, directing that, in the future, all advertising contracts must contain “. . . a legal clause whereby the contract is immediately cancelled if overnight the attitude of the paper toward Germany should be changed.”²⁷⁹

As previously stated, Schmitz had been the personal advisor to Chancellor Bruening. After Hitler came to power, he became an honorary member of the Reichstag and also a Geheimrat, a secret or confidential counselor. Another Farben official, Carl Krauch, became Goering's trusted advisor in carrying out the Four-Year Plan. But, as a matter of policy, the leaders of the cartel avoided taking official government positions for themselves, even though they could have had almost any post they desired. In keeping with this policy, Schmitz repeatedly had declined the offer to be named as the “Commissar of German Industry.” The Nazi regime was the Frankenstein monster created by Farben. But Farben was, at all times, the master, in spite of shrewd efforts on its part to make it look to outsiders as though it had become the helpless victim of its own creation. This was extremely wise, as was demonstrated later at the Nuremberg trials. Almost all of these men were deeply involved with the determination of Nazi policies throughout the war—and even had coordinated the operation of such concentration camps as Auschwitz, Bitterfeld, Walfen, Hoechst, Agfa, Ludwigshafen, and Buchenwald for the value of the slave labor they provided. They built the world's largest poison-gas industry and used the product experimentally on untold thousands who perished in those camps.²⁸⁰

In May of 1941, Richard Krebs, who had been first a Communist and then a Nazi (and subsequently turned against both),²⁸¹ testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and said:

“The I.G. Farbenindustrie, I know from personal experience, was already in 1934 completely in the hands of the Gestapo. They went so far as to have their own

²⁷⁸ Sasuly, I.G. Farben, op. cit. p. 63, 65, 69.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 106.

²⁸⁰ For an excellent account of Farben's role in administering these camps, see *The Devil's Chemists*, by Josiah E. DuBois, Jr., legal counsel and investigator for the prosecution at the trial of I.G. Farben's leaders at Nuremberg, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1952).

²⁸¹ See Krebs' own personal account, written under the pen name of Jan Valtin, entitled *Out of the Night* (New York: Alliance Book Corp., 1941).

Gestapo prison on the factory grounds of their large works at Leuna and . . . began, particularly after Hitler's ascent to power, to branch out in the foreign field through subsidiary factories."²⁸²

By 1932 it was obvious to many observers that Nazi Germany was preparing for war. It was equally obvious that I.G. Farben was both the instigator and the benefactor of these preparations. It was during these years that German industry experienced its greatest growth and its highest profits. In the United States, however, things were not going as smoothly for the International chemical and drug cartel subsidiaries and partners.

The Nazi war machine received tremendous help from American cartel partners

As the war drew nearer, the American cartel members continued to share their patents and technical information on their newest processes. But Farben was returning the favor less and less— especially if the information had any potential value in war production, which much of it did. When the American companies complained, Farben replied that it was forbidden by the Nazi government to give out this information and, that if they did so, they would be in serious trouble with the authorities! Meanwhile, the American companies continued to honor their end of the contracts, mostly because they were afraid not to. In almost every case Farben controlled one or more patents that were vital to their operations, and any overt confrontation could easily result in a loss of these valuable processes which would mean business disaster. This was particularly true in the field of rubber.

Rubber is basic to modern transportation. It is a companion product to gasoline inasmuch as it supplies the wheels which are driven by the gasoline engines. Without rubber, normal economic life would be most difficult. Warfare would be impossible. I.G. had perfected the process for making Buna rubber but did not share the technology with its American partners. Standard Oil, on the other hand, had been working on another process for butyl rubber and passed on all of its knowledge and techniques to the Nazis while refusing to provide it to the U.S. Navy:

“True to their obligations to the Nazis, Standard sent the butyl information. But they did not feel any obligation to the U.S. Navy. In 1939, after the outbreak of war, a representative of the Navy's Bureau of Construction and Repair visited Standard's laboratories and was steered away from anything which might give clues as to the manufacture of butyl.”

Standard did not have the full Buna rubber information. But what information it did have, it only gave to the U.S. rubber makers after much pressure by the government when war was already underway. As for butyl rubber, Standard did not give full rights to manufacture under its patents until March, 1942.

Because of a cartel of the natural rubber producers, the United States found itself facing an all-out war without an adequate rubber stock-pile. And because of the operation of the I.G.–Standard Oil cartel, no effective program for making synthetic rubber was underway.²⁸³

²⁸² As quoted by Ambruster, *Treason's Peace*, op. cit., p. 273

²⁸³ Sasuly, I.G. Farben, op. cit., pp. 151, 155.

Aluminum is another material that is essential for modern warfare. But here, too, International cartel influence stood in the way of American development for the war. Even though the United States was the greatest user of aluminum in the world, and in spite of the fact that its industrial capacity was greater than any other nation, in 1942 it was Germany that was the world's greatest producer of this war-essential metal. Alcoa (the Aluminum Company of America) had a major subsidiary in Canada known as Alted, which was an integral part of the world aluminum cartel. It was the policy of this group to restrict the production of aluminum in all nations except Germany—probably in return for valuable patent rights and promises of non-competition in other fields. Even though Alcoa never admitted to becoming a direct participant in these agreements, nevertheless, the record speaks for itself. It did limit its production during those years far below the potential market demand. Consequently, here was another serious industrial handicap confronting the United States as it was drawn into war.

The American development of optical instruments was yet another victim of this era. The firm of Bausch and Lomb was the largest producer of American high-quality lenses of all kinds. Most of these lenses were manufactured by the German firm of Zeiss. As was the pattern, American technology was deliberately retarded by International cartel agreement.

These were the products that were in short supply or lacking altogether when the United States entered the war: rubber, aluminum, atabrine, and military lenses such as periscopes, rangefinders, binoculars, and bombsights. These were handicaps that, in a less productive and resourceful nation, could easily have made the difference between victory and defeat. Meanwhile, the Nazis continued to enjoy the solicitous cooperation of their American cartel partners. And they benefited immensely by American technology. A document found in the captured files of I.G. at the end of the war reveals how lop-sided was the exchange. In this report to the Gestapo, Farben was justifying its "marriage" with Standard Oil, and concluded:

"It need not be pointed out that, without lead tetraethyl, modern warfare could not be conceived...In this matter we did not need to perform the difficult work of development because we could start production right away on the basis of all the experience that the Americans had had for years."²⁸⁴

American ties to German industry began almost immediately after the guns were silenced in World War I. The name of Krupp has become synonymous with German arms and munitions. Yet, the Krupp enterprises literally were salvaged out of the scrap heap in December of 1924 by a loan of ten million dollars from Hallgarten and Company and Goldman, Sachs and Company, both in New York.

Vereinigte Stahlwerk, the giant Farben-controlled steel works, likewise, received over one hundred million dollars in favorable long-term loans from financial circles in America. The 1945 report of the United States Foreign Economic Administration concluded: "It is doubtful that the [Farben] trust could have carried out its program of expansion and modernization without the support of the American investor."²⁸⁵

²⁸⁴ New York Times, Oct. 19, 1945, p. 9.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 82.

But far more than money went into Nazi Germany. Along with the loans to German enterprises, there also went American technology, American engineers, and whole American companies as well.

The fact that the Nazi war machine had received tremendous help from its cartel partners in the United States is one of the most uncomfortable facts that surfaced during the investigation at the end of the war. And this was not just as the result of negotiations and deals made before the war had started. It constituted direct collaboration and cooperation during those same years that Nazi troops were killing American soldiers on the field of battle.

The Ford Company, for example, not only operated “independently,” supplying military hardware in Germany all through the war, but in Nazi-occupied France as well. Maurice Dollfus, chairman of the board of Ford’s French subsidiary, made routine reports to Edsel Ford throughout most of the war detailing the number of trucks being made each week for the German army, what profits were being earned, and how bright were the prospects for the future. In one letter, Dollfus added:

“The attitude you have taken, together with your father, of strict neutrality, has been an invaluable asset for the production of your companies in Europe.”²⁸⁶

It was clear that war between the United States and Germany made little difference. Two months after Pearl Harbor, Dollfus reported net profits to Ford for 1941 of fifty-eight million francs. And then he said:

“Since the state of war between the U.S.A. and Germany, I am not able to correspond with you very easily. I have asked Lesto to go to Vichy and mail this...We are continuing our production as before...The financial results for the year are very satisfactory...we have formed our African company...”²⁸⁷

It was one of the curious quirks of war that, because of cartel interlock, the Ford Motor Company was producing trucks for Nazis in both Germany and France, producing trucks for the Allies in the United States, and profiting handsomely from both sides of the war. And if the Axis powers had won the war, the top men of Ford (as well as of other cartel industries) undoubtedly would have been absorbed into the ruling class elite of the new Nazi order. With close friends like Bosch and Krauch they could not lose.

The record is clear that the heads of those financial interests did not suspend their collaboration when World War II broke out. They merely made them secret and reduced them to the bare minimum. In October of 1939, Frank Howard of Standard Oil was in Europe for the specific purpose of finding ways to keep the Standard— I.G. cartel functioning in spite of the war. Howard himself described his mission:

²⁸⁶ DuBois, *The Devil’s Chemists*, op. cit., pp. 247, 248.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 251

“We did our best to work out complete plans for a modus vivendi which would operate through the term of the war, whether or not the United States came in.”
288

On June 26, 1940, the day after France capitulated to the Nazis, a meeting was held at the Waldorf–Astoria which brought together some of the key American business tycoons who were interested in protecting their German–based operations during the war. The meeting was called by Torkild Rieber, chairman of the board of Texaco. Among others present were James Mooney (CFR member), chief of General Motors’ overseas operations; Edsel Ford; executives from Eastman Kodak; and Col. Sosthenes Behn, (CFR member), head of ITT.²⁸⁹

The case of ITT is most instructive. ITT began to invest in the Nazi pre–war economy in 1930. It formed a holding company called Standard Elektrizitats and then bought another company, Lorenz, from Philips. Seeing that war was rapidly approaching, ITT did everything possible to make its new holdings look like German companies. Then in 1938, just as the Nazi troops were preparing to march into Poland, ITT, through its subsidiary Lorenz, purchased twenty–eight percent ownership of the Focke–Wulf Company which, even then, was building bombers and fighter planes. ITT could not claim either ignorance or innocence. They simply were investing in war.

During the course of that war, ITT’s plants in Germany became important producers of all kinds of military communications equipment. They also installed and serviced most of the key telephone lines used by the Nazi government. In the United States, ITT was regarded as highly patriotic. It developed the high–frequency direction finder, nicknamed Huff–Duff, which was used to detect German submarines in the Atlantic. Colonel Behn, the head of ITT at the time and CFR member, was awarded the Medal of Merit, the highest civilian honor, for providing the Army with land–line facilities. Anthony Sampson, in *The Sovereign State of ITT*, summarizes:

“Thus, while ITT Focke–Wulf planes were bombing Allied ships, and ITT lines were passing information to German submarines, ITT direction finders were saving other ships from torpedoes...In 1967, nearly thirty years after the events, ITT actually managed to obtain twenty–seven million dollars in compensation from the American government for war damage to its factories in Germany, including five–million dollars for damage to Focke–Wulf plants—on the basis that they were American property bombed by Allied bombers. It was a notable reward for a company that had so deliberately invested in the German war effort, and so carefully arranged to become German. If the Nazis had won, ITT in Germany would have appeared impeccably Nazi; as they lost, it re–emerged as impeccably American.”²⁹⁰

It is not within the scope of this study to analyze all of the possible motives of those who led us into the two global wars of the twentieth century. Standard textbooks give such explanations as ancient rivalries, competition for natural resources, militarism,

²⁸⁸ Sasuly, I.G. *Farben*, op. cit., pp. 149–150.

²⁸⁹ Ladislav Farago, *The Game of the Foxes*, (New York: D. McKay Co., 1972), pp. 463–479.

²⁹⁰ Sampson, *The Sovereign State of ITT*, (New York: Stein & Day 1973), pp. 40, 47.

offended national or racial pride, and so forth. Certainly, these factors did play a part, but a relatively minor one compared to the financial and political goals of these men who, from behind the scenes, set the forces of war into motion. War has been profitable to these men in more ways than one. True, fantastic profits can be made on war production through government-backed monopolies. But those who were the most responsible also looked upon war as a means of bringing about rapid and sweeping political changes. The men behind a Hitler, a Mussolini, a Stalin, and, yes, even an FDR recognized that, in wartime, people would be far more willing to accept hardship, the expansion of government, and the concentration of power into the hands of political leaders than they ever would have dreamed of doing in times of peace. The concept of big government—and certainly the appeal of world government—could not have taken root in America except as the outgrowth of national and international crisis. Economic depressions were helpful, but not enough. Sporadic riots and threats of internal revolution were helpful, but also not enough. War was, by far, the most effective approach. This was doubly so in Europe and Asia, as can be confirmed merely by comparing maps and ruling regimes before 1939 and after 1945. As Lenin had predicted, the best way to build a “new order” is not by gradual change, but by first destroying the old order and then building upon the rubble.²⁹¹

The desire for rapid political and social change, therefore, can be a powerful motivation for war on the part of the members of the Round Table Network who would be the benefactors of those changes—especially if they were playing their chips on both sides of the field. Yes, war can be extremely rewarding for those who know how to play the game.

Concealment of ownership of the international chemical and drug cartel

So let us return to the dusty historical record for further enlightenment on current events. The American cartel partners who attempted to conceal their ownership in German industry before the war were not unique. German interests were active doing exactly the same thing in the United States. World War I had taught them a lesson. During that war, all German-owned industry in America was seized by the federal government and operated in trust by the office of the Alien Property Custodian. At the end of World War I, the industries were sold under conditions which, supposedly, were to prevent them from reverting to German control. In the field of chemicals and pharmaceuticals, however, this goal was completely thwarted. Within a few years, all of these companies were back under Farben ownership or control even more firmly than before the war.

It was during this period that Farben experienced its greatest expansion in the United States. Sterling Drug organized Winthrop Chemical. They brought DuPont into half interest of the Bayer Semesan Company. The American I.G. Chemical Company transformed itself several times and, in the process, absorbed the Grasselli Dyestuff Company, which had been a major purchaser of former German properties. Sterling acquired numerous patent “remedies” such as Fletcher’s Castoria and Phillip’s Milk-of-Magnesia. With Lewis K. Liggett they formed Drug, Incorporated, a holding company for Sterling, Bayer, Winthrop, United Drug, and Rexall-Liggett Drugstores. They bought Bristol Meyers, makers of Sal Hepatica; Vick Chemical Company; Edward J. Noble’s Life Savers, Incorporated; and many others. By the time the Nazis began to tool up for war

²⁹¹ It is important to know that Lenin accepted but did not favor outright war as a means of destroying the old order. He claimed that Communists should work at destruction from within, not by external conquest.

in Europe, Farben had obtained control over a major segment of America's pharmaceutical industry. Investment in both the arts of wounding and healing always have been a dominant feature of cartel development, for the profit potential is greater in these respective fields than in any other. When one wishes to wage a war or regain his health, he seldom questions the price.

When Farben's extensive files fell into the hands of American troops at the end of World War II, they were turned over to the Justice and Treasury Departments for investigation and analysis. One of the inter-office memorandums found in those files explained quite bluntly how the cartel had attempted to conceal its ownership of American companies prior to the war. The memorandum states:

"After the first war, we came more and more to the decision to "tarn" [camouflage] our foreign companies... in such a way that the participation of I.G. in these firms was not shown. In the course of time the system became more and more perfect...Protective measures to be taken by I.G. for the eventuality of [another] war should not substantially interfere with the conduct of business in normal times. For a variety of reasons, it is of the utmost importance...that the officials heading the agent firms, which are particularly well qualified to serve as cloaks, should be citizens of the countries where they reside..."²⁹²

This memorandum sheds considerable light on previous events. On October 30, 1939, the directors of American I.G. (including Walter Teagle of Rockefeller's Standard Oil, CFR member Charles Mitchell of Rockefeller's National City Bank, CFR member Paul Warburg of the Federal Reserve System, Edsel Ford, William Weiss, Adolph Kuttroff, CFR member Herman Metz, Carl Bosch, Wilfried Greif, and Hermann Schmitz, who also had been president of American I.G.) announced that their company had ceased to exist. It had been absorbed by one of its subsidiaries, the General Aniline Works. Furthermore, the newly dominant company was changing its name to the General Aniline and Film Corporation. The dead give-away letters "IG" had vanished altogether. Nothing had changed except the name. Exactly the same board of directors had served both companies since 1929.

As part of the camouflage, Schmitz formed a Swiss corporation called Internationale Gesellschaft für Chemische Unternehmungen A.G., more commonly known as I.G. Chemie. The final step in this planned deception was to go through the motions of selling its American-based companies to I.G. Chemie. Thus, in the event of war, these companies would appear to be Swiss owned (a neutral country) and with thoroughly American leadership. The phrase "going through the motions" is used because all of the money received by the American corporations as a result of the "sale" was returned almost immediately to Farben in the form of loans. But, on paper, at least, I.G. Chemie of Basel was now the official owner of eighty-nine percent of the stock in Farben's American companies.

The American side of this transaction was handled by Rockefeller's National City Bank of New York. This is not surprising inasmuch as the head of its investment division, CFR member Charles Mitchell, also was on the board of these I.G. holding companies.

²⁹² Ambruster, *Treason's Peace*, op. cit., p. 89. Also see Sasuly, *I.G. Farben*, op. cit., p. 95-96.

But Rockefeller was more deeply involved than that. In 1938, the Securities and Exchange Commission began a lengthy investigation of American I.G. Walter Teagle, a member of the board, was called to the witness stand. Mr. Teagle, as you recall, was also president of Rockefeller's Standard Oil. Under questioning, Mr. Teagle claimed that he did not know who owned control of the company he served as a director. He did not know how many shares were held by I.G. Chemie, or who owned I.G. Chemie. In fact, he had the audacity to say that he didn't have any idea who owned the block of 500,000 shares—worth over a half-a-million dollars—that had been issued in his name! Mr. Teagle, of course, was either lying, or suffering from a classic case of convenient amnesia. Evidence was introduced later showing that, in 1932, he had received a letter from Wilfried Greif, Farben's managing director, stating in plain English: "I.G. Chemie is, as you know, a subsidiary of I.G. Farben."²⁹³ Also brought out in the investigation was the fact that on May 27, 1930, while Teagle was in London, he received a cable from Mr. Frank Howard, vice-president of Standard Oil, carrying this message:

"In view of the fact that we have repeatedly denied any financial interest in American I.G., it seems to me to be unwise for us to now permit them to include us as stockholders in their original listing which is object of present transaction. It would serve their purpose to issue this stock to you personally...Will this be agreeable to you as a temporary measure?"²⁹⁴

The extent of hidden chemical and drug cartel power in the United States government

Finally, in June of 1941, after three years of investigation, the Securities and Exchange Commission gave up the cause. Either because it was baffled by the cartel's camouflage (unlikely) or because it yielded to pressure from the cartel's friends high in government (likely), it issued this final report to Congress:

"All attempts to ascertain the beneficial ownership of the controlling shares have been unsuccessful...As a consequence, the American investors, mainly bond holders, are in the peculiar position of being creditors of a corporation under an unknown control."²⁹⁵

The evidence of international cartel influence within the very government agencies that are supposed to prevent them from acting against the interests of the citizenry should not be passed over lightly. It is, unfortunately, a part of the stain that obscures the picture of cancer and pharmaceutical research as shown in Appendix I and II of this document. So let us turn now to that aspect of the record. The story begins in 1916 when Dr. Hugo Schwitzer, of the Bayer Company, wrote a letter to the German Ambassador von Bernstorff in which he spoke of the necessity of bringing about the election of a president of the United States whose personal views and party politics were in harmony with the cause of I.G. Farben.

²⁹³ Ambruster, op. cit., p. 114.

²⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 114.

²⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 121.

At that time, the Republican Party was favored for that purpose. Shortly afterward, Herman Metz (CFR member), a Tammany leader and lifelong Democrat, switched allegiance to the Republican Party. Metz was president of the H.A. Metz Company of New York, a large pharmaceutical house that was controlled by Farben. In 1925, he helped to organize General Dyestuff Corporation, another Farben outlet, of which he became president. In 1929, he helped organize the American I.G., and he became vice-president and treasurer of that organization. The conversion of Metz from a Democrat to a Republican was significant because it signaled the cartel's affinity for the Republican Party.

Did President Hoover (CFR member) receive the support of the International chemical and drug cartel because he was a man whose party politics were "in harmony" with its cause? It is hard to imagine otherwise. While he was Secretary of Commerce, he was given the heavy responsibility of deciding what to do about the menace of I.G. Farben. To broaden the share of responsibility for this decision and to brighten the process with the aura of "democracy," he set up a Chemical Advisory Committee to study the problem and make recommendations. This has become a standard ploy for making the voters think that all viewpoints have been melted down into a "consensus." The committee members usually are carefully selected so that a clear majority can be counted on to conclude exactly what was wanted in the first place.

If there were ever any exceptions to this rule, they did not occur on the Chemical Advisory Committee. Hoover appointed such men as Henry Howard, vice-president of the Grasselli Chemical Company, Walter Teagle, president of Standard Oil, Lamont DuPont of the DuPont Company, and Frank A. Blair, president of the Centaur Company, a subsidiary of Sterling Products. The international cartel was in no danger.

CFR member and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was the leading partner in Sullivan and Cromwell, the largest of the law firms on Wall Street. Sullivan and Cromwell specialized in representing foreign business interests, and its partners held interlocking directorates with many leading corporations and banking houses—especially those comprising the Farben-American interlock. John Foster Dulles represented Blyth and Company, the investment banking partner of the First National City Bank and the First Boston Corporation, two key investment enterprises of the Rockefeller group associated with the Chase Manhattan Bank. Dulles also represented Standard Oil and was made chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation, a position signifying great trust on the part of the Rockefeller family. Sullivan and Cromwell had been the principal representatives of such powerful investment houses as Goldman, Sachs, and Company; Lehman Brothers; and Lazard Freres, the firm that, together with Kuhn, Loeb and Company, had masterminded the expansion and mergers of ITT. As recently as 1945, Dulles had been listed as one of the directors of the International Nickel Company of Canada. This also was part of the Farben interlock and had been the prime mover behind the stockpiling of nickel in Nazi Germany before the war.²⁹⁶

Avery Rockefeller was a director of the J. Henry Schroeder Banking Corporation and the Schroeder Trust Company. He was also a full partner and stockholder in its affiliate, Schroeder, Rockefeller and Company. It is not surprising to learn, therefore, that John Foster Dulles also had been the American representative of the Schroeder trust which

²⁹⁶ William Hoffman, David; Report on a Rockefeller, (New York: Lyle Stuart, Inc., 1971), pp. 18, 19. Also Ambruster, Treason's Peace, op. cit., p. 85.

was Hitler's agent in the United States. Gerhardt Westrick had been a Sullivan and Cromwell representative in Germany where he represented such multi-nationals as ITT. And at the beginning of World War II, Dulles became a voting trustee of Farben-controlled American corporations in an attempt to prevent them from being seized as enemy property.

Instead of this man going down in American history as a tool of international monopoly and a possible traitor in war, he was appointed as a member of a special high-level consulting committee established by the Alien Property Custodian to formulate the basic policies of that office. And then he was chosen by President Eisenhower (CFR member) as Secretary of State. His brother, Allen Dulles (also a CFR member), also a partner of Sullivan and Cromwell, was equally enmeshed in the international cartel web as a negotiator with Farben interests for the Office of Strategic Services in Switzerland. (It was then that Allen Dulles had said, "Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy or Japan contemplates war upon us.") At the end of the war, after using his influence to protect Hitler's agent, Westrick,²⁹⁷ he was placed by President Eisenhower at the head of the Central Intelligence Agency. Such is the power of the forces being described.

Perhaps the best way to judge the extent of hidden cartel power in the United States government is to observe how its German component fared during and after the war. As noted previously, its American holdings were seized by the federal government in February of 1942. Within a few months, all of the original directors and officers were compelled to resign. But whom did the government put in their places?

Operating control has passed to a group of men who are tied in with a constellation of corporate interests which is rising rapidly in American business under the leadership of an international financier, Victor Emanuel. Emanuel himself sits on the board of directors of General Aniline and Film Corporation (GAF) [American I.G.'s new name] There is a liberal sprinkling of his associates among the other directors and officers.²⁹⁸

Emanuel's assumption of leadership over I.G.'s holdings in the United States is significant. Between 1927 and 1934, he had been in London as an associate of the Schroeder banking interests. This is the same organization that, in conjunction with the Rockefeller group, represented I.G. and became the financial agent of Adolph Hitler.

As is well known, the Schroeders of London are related to the Schroeders of Germany. Baron Bruno Schroeder is credited with having introduced Hitler to the principal industrialists of the Ruhr. Baron Kurt Schroeder held a high rank in the SS and was known as "The SS banker." The London banking house, J. Henry Schroeder and Company, was described by Time magazine in July, 1939, as an "economic booster of the Rome-Berlin Axis."²⁹⁹

²⁹⁷ Sampson, *The Sovereign State of ITT*, op. cit., p. 43.

²⁹⁸ Sasuly, *I.G. Farben*, op. cit., p. 186.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

And what of Victor Emanuel, President of Standard Gas and Electric, who dominated the “new” leadership of the Rockefeller–Farben empire? The answer was provided in one short sentence in a report of the Securities and Exchange Commission dated January 19, 1943. It said:

“The Schroeder interests in London and New York have worked with Emanuel in acquiring and maintaining a dominant position in Standard affairs.”³⁰⁰

The much publicized shuffling of General Aniline and Film Corporation directors and officers was a charade. Men with demonstrated loyalty to the international cartel’s interests continued to dominate. As usual, the American people hadn’t the slightest inkling of what was really happening.

What transpired in Germany itself, however, is even more revealing of chemical and drug cartel influence at the very highest levels of American government. During the later stages of the war, the major industrial cities of Germany were nearly levelled by massive bombing raids. This was the decisive factor that crippled the Nazi war machine and brought the conflict to an end. But when the Allied occupational forces moved into Frankfurt, they were amazed to discover that there was one complex of buildings left standing amid the rubble. Somehow, these and these only had been spared. The buildings housed the international headquarters of I.G. Farben. Bombardiers had been instructed to avoid this vital target—the very backbone of Nazi war production—on the lame excuse that American forces would need an office building when they moved into town.

Parenthetically, it should be noted that the Under–Secretary of War at that time (promoted to Secretary of War in 1945) was Robert P. Patterson (CFR member) who, before his appointment by President Roosevelt, had been associated with Dillon, Read Company, another Rockefeller investment banking firm. Dillon–Read had helped to finance a substantial portion of Farben’s pre-war expansion—including its sprawling office building that was spared in the bombing raids. James Forrestal (CFR member), former president of Dillon, Read Company, was Secretary of the Navy at the time but later became the first Secretary of Defense. If one were of a suspicious nature, one might conclude that Mr. Patterson and Mr. Forrestal might have used their influence to protect some of the assets of their company’s investment.

As the Allied armies pushed into Germany, the extent of cartel power within the American government suddenly became visible—literally. Scores of American investment bankers, lawyers, and industrial executives—all with connections to the Farben mechanism—showed up in brigadier-general uniforms to direct the “de–Nazification and de–cartelization” of post-war Germany! One such figure was Kenneth Stockton, chairman of ITT’s European board of directors. According to Anthony Sampson, Stockton appeared “alongside Westrick.”³⁰¹ The most conspicuous among these “generals” was Brigadier–General William Draper, (CFR member), Commanding Officer of the Economics Division of the American Control Group, which was the division with the greatest responsibility for implementing the de–cartelization

³⁰⁰ Ambruster, op. cit., p. 366.

³⁰¹ Ambruster, op. cit., p. 41.

program. And what was Draper's civilian experience that qualified him for this post? He, too, was with the Wall Street firm of Dillon Read—of course!

In May of 1945, Max Ilgner was arrested and held for trial at Nuremberg. As head of I.G.'s international spy network which became the backbone of the Nazi Supreme Command, one might think that Ilgner would be concerned over the future. He was not. Shortly after being arrested, he wrote a letter to two of his assistants and instructed them to keep in close touch with each other and with all the other I.G. leaders. He stressed the importance of keeping the structure functioning because, he said, it would not be much longer before the Americans would remove all restrictions.
302

He was correct. Within six months the cartel's factories were humming with activity. I.G. shares were enjoying spectacular confidence in the German stock market, and free American taxpayer money in the form of the Marshall Plan was on its way.

Meanwhile, Colonel Bernard Bernstein, chief investigator for the Finance Division of the Allied Control Council and an outspoken critic of American coddling of cartelists, was fired by his superior officers. James Martin, the man who was head of the de-cartelization branch of the Department of Justice, resigned in disgust. One by one, the foes of monopoly were squeezed out. In anger and frustration, Martin explained his resignation: "We had not been stopped in Germany by German business. We had been stopped in Germany by American business."³⁰³

With Farben rapidly returning to its pre-war position of prosperity and influence in Europe, all that was left was to release its American holdings from government control. By this time, I.G. Chemie in Switzerland had brightened its image by changing its name to French: Societe Internationale pour Participations Industrielles et Commerciales. In German, however, this translated into International Industrie und Handelsbeteiligungen A.G., or Interhandel, the name by which it became widely known. Once again, nothing had changed but the name.

On behalf of Interhandel, the Swiss banks and the Swiss government demanded that the United States government now release the "Swiss-owned" companies. They claimed that Interhandel was not owned by German nationals (although they steadfastly refused to reveal who did own it), and that its American properties had been illegally seized. In court, however, the Treasury Department proved—primarily from Farben's own files captured in Frankfurt—that Interhandel was merely the latest name for what Treasury described as:

" . . . a conspiracy to conceal, camouflage, and cloak the ownership control, and domination by I.G. Farben of properties and interests in many countries of the world, including the United States."³⁰⁴

³⁰² Sasuly, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

³⁰³ Sampson, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

³⁰⁴ Quoted by Waller, *The Swiss Bank Connection*, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

It would be a serious mistake to categorize the international cartel that has been the subject of this chapter as German. The leaders of its component parts, regardless of their nationality, consider themselves as internationalists —or more accurately, globalists —with little or no loyalty to the country of their birth. Their patriotism is directed toward the giant multi-national industrial and financial organizations that protect and sustain them with a vision that extends far beyond profit-and-loss ledgers to the horizons of a One-World collectivist government with them as rulers. We must also keep in mind that this international cartel is a grouping of interests that act in unison in those areas that serve their mutual goal which is the creation of a single industrial and financial complex that will dominate the entire planet.

The largest and most powerful member of this International cartel today is centered in New York City and is known as the Rockefeller group. When Farben's vast holdings were finally sold in 1962, the Rockefeller group was the dominant force in carrying out the transaction. One may assume, therefore, that, if there was any way to benefit from inside information or to place a minority into a position to reap the profits of control, the Rockefeller group did so. Consequently, it is difficult for an outsider to separate the pure Rockefeller control from that which is shared by I.G. Farben or its descendants. That it constitutes a major power center within the pharmaceutical industry, however, cannot be denied. The profit potential in drugs is enormous. The very nature of the product lends itself to monopoly and cartel manipulation. When a person is ill or dying, he does not question the price of a drug offered to him for relief. This is especially true if the drug is available only through a prescription. The mystique of that procedure eliminates competition between brands. Profits can be extremely high—not for the physician or the druggist—but for the firms that manufacture the drugs.

This is the primary reason for the FDA's drive to require all but the weakest-potency vitamins or medicine to be available only through prescription. Price and brand competition simply has to be stopped. Pharmaceutical firms support this measure because they know that their control over drug-store distribution would give them a monopoly. They also know that, if prescriptions are required, vitamins and medicines will be covered by insurance. Consequently, prices can be raised without consumer complaint. (Never mind that the cost eventually must be paid by the consumer, either in higher insurance premiums or higher taxes.) And so this is merely another example of using the power of government to eliminate competition and increase costs to the consumer. Although many otherwise well informed persons are totally unaware of it, cartels do exist. They have completely dominated the chemical industry for decades. The pharmaceutical industry, far from being exempt from this influence, has been at the center of it from the beginning.

It has been observed that almost every head of state that visits the United States pays a personal visit to the head of the Rockefeller empire. This has included visits to David Rockefeller by such personages as the Emperor of Japan and former Premiers of the Soviet Union. And when Rockefeller travels to foreign lands, he always is accorded a royal welcome of the caliber usually reserved for heads of state. Yet, the American people generally do not consider the Rockefellers to be that important. As historian Ferdinand Lundberg observed:

“There apparently is a difference of opinion between foreign leaders . . . and the American public about the precise status of the Rockefellers. Can it be that the foreign political sharks, as they muster out the palace guard and the diplomats to greet them, are mistaken? My own view of them accords with that of the foreigners. The finpols (financial politicians) are ultra-bigwigs, super-megaton bigshots, Brobdingnagian commissars of affairs. In relation to them the average one-vote citizen is a muted cipher, a noiseless nullity, an impalpable phantom, a shadow in a vacuum, a subpeasant.”³⁰⁵

Perhaps the reason Americans do not regard the Rockefellers as the “Brobdingnagian commissars” that they really are is because, like their Farben counterparts in Nazi Germany, they have wisely chosen to stay in the background. They are seldom in the news and are overshadowed by the public appearances and pronouncements of the nation’s politicians. The men who sit at the pinnacle of this world power prefer to leave the publicity-seeking to their political subordinates who, by temperament, are more suited to the task. The amount of power held by a John or a David Rockefeller may not be as great as that held for a single moment by a president of the United States. By comparison, however, the president is but a passing comet streaking toward oblivion. Political figures come and go. Some are revered in the history books of their nation. Some are tried as war criminals. Others are assassinated. Most merely are cast aside and forgotten when they have outlived their usefulness. But the power of the Rockefellers is handed down from generation to generation as a title of nobility and has become a living, growing, nearly immortal reality of its own.

³⁰⁵ Lundberg, *op. cit.*, p. 21

IX

THE TAKEOVER OF MODERN MEDICINE

Overview of the Medical Takeover

Pharmaceuticals provided a lucrative new opportunity for the Rockefellers, but in a turn-of-the-century America that was still largely based on naturopathic, herbal remedies, it was a tough sell. Rockefeller went to work changing that.

In 1901 John D. Rockefeller established the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. The Institute recruited Simon Flexner, a pathology professor at the University of Pennsylvania, to serve as its director. His brother, Abraham, was an educator who was contracted by the Carnegie Foundation to write a report on the state of the American medical education system. His study, The Flexner Report, along with the hundreds of millions of dollars that the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations were to shower on medical research in the coming years, resulted in a sweeping overhaul of the American medical system. Naturopathic and homeopathic medicine, medical care focused on unpatentable, uncontrollable natural remedies and cures was now dismissed as quackery; only drug-based allopathic medicine requiring expensive medical procedures and lengthy hospital stays was to be taken seriously.

The fortunes of Carnegie, Morgan and Rockefeller financed surgery, radiation and synthetic drugs. They were to become the economic foundations of the new medical economy.

The hijacking of the medical industry was accomplished by the takeover of the medical schools by the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations in particular. They offered tremendous amounts of money to the schools that would agree to cooperate with them. The Foundations said to the schools: “we’re giving you all this money, now would it be too much to ask if we could put some of our people on your Board of Directors to see that our money is being spent wisely?”

Almost overnight all of the major universities received large grants from these sources and also accepted one, two or three of these people on their Board of Directors and the schools literally were taken over by the financial interests that put up the money.

Now what happened as a result of that is the schools did receive an infusion of money, they were able to build new buildings, they were able to add expensive equipment to their laboratories, they were able to hire top-notch teachers, but at the same time as doing that they schewed the whole thing in the direction of pharmaceutical drugs. That was the efficiency in philanthropy. The doctors from that point forward in history would be taught pharmaceutical drugs. All of the great teaching institutions in America were captured by the pharmaceutical interests in this fashion, and it’s amazing how little money it really took to do it.

The Rockefellers birthed entire medical industries from their own research centers and then sold their own products from their own petrochemical companies as the “cure.” It was Frank Howard, a Standard Oil of New Jersey executive, who would go on to persuade Alfred Sloan and Charles Kettering to donate their fortunes to the cancer center that would then bear their name. As director of research at Sloan-Kettering, Howard appointed Cornelius Rhoads, a Rockefeller Institute pathologist, to develop his wartime research on mustard gas for the US Army into a new cancer therapy. Under Rhoads’ leadership, nearly the entire program and staff of the Chemical Warfare Service were reformed into the SKI drug development program, where they worked on

converting mustard gas into chemotherapy.

The drug cartel's influence over the nation's medical schools

As covered in the previous chapter, the Rockefeller group, in conjunction with the hidden hand of I.G. Farben, has become a dominant force in the American pharmaceutical industry. One of the consequences of this reality is that one almost never finds consumer price competition among prescription drugs and patent medicines. Generally, the only competition we see is along the lines of vague advertising claims such as "Laboratory tests prove Bayer is better," or "Research has shown that Advil is faster." Over the years, the pharmaceutical houses have lived up to an agreement to stay within the narrow field of their specialty and to refrain from trying to cut into the established markets of their rivals. It is, as they say, an "orderly" industry. One of the reasons for this non-competition is that most drugs are patented and are available only from one manufacturer. Another reason is that the prescription is made by a physician who is more concerned with the effectiveness of a drug than with its price. But, in addition, there is the fact that the drug houses bombard the market with so many new drugs each year that the physician often does not know how effective the drugs are that he prescribes. All he knows is that he has seen them advertised in the AMA Journal, has been handed a "fact sheet" by a field representative from the company which manufactures them, and may have had some success with them on previous patients. Because he is a practitioner, not a researcher, he cannot conduct controlled experiments to determine the relative effectiveness of the new drugs as compared to older or similar drugs available through another firm.

All he knows is that they seem to help some of his patients. If the first drug does not bring about the desired results, then he will issue a new prescription and try something else. The result is that it is not unusual for a patient to buy multiple drugs from different manufacturers with everybody getting a piece of the financial action. This point was brought home rather bluntly at a conference sponsored in 1963 by Johns Hopkins University. One of the featured speakers was Dr. George Baehr of New York, who stated:

"As a consultant for many years to physicians in private practice, it has been my experience that many general practitioners and specialists have acquired the habit of shifting repeatedly and needlessly from one drug to another. They are usually motivated to change their prescribing habits by the persuasive propaganda of advertising literature and of visiting detail men."³⁰⁶

There is nothing about this procedure that is improper from the physician's point of view. He is doing only what he can to help his patients by making available to them what he has been told is the latest technology in the field of drugs. Remember, it is not he who makes a profit from writing the prescription. There is no questioning the fact that the doctor functions as a salesman for a multi-billion-dollar drug industry, but he is not paid for this vital service. He has been trained for it, however. Through the curricula of the nation's leading medical schools, students are exposed to such an extensive training in the use of drugs (and practically none in the field of nutrition) that, upon graduation, they naturally turn to the use of drugs as the treatment of choice for practically all of man's ills.

³⁰⁶ Omar Garrison, *The Dictocrats*, op. cit., p. 21.

In recent years, the private physician has represented a constantly shrinking portion of the total medical profession. As his influence wanes, he is being replaced by group clinics, state-supported institutions, and research centers. Many of these are the recipients of large grants for specific medical projects and they become very sensitive to the ideological or scientific preferences of those who give the money. It's not that the donors tell them specifically what to do or what to find, it's just that the recipients know in advance that, if they stray too far outside the unstated but clearly understood objectives of those who make the grant, then that will be the last time their name is on the roll call when the free money is given out. There is the celebrated case, for instance, of the \$15,000 grant from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to the American Bar Association to study the United Nations Genocide Convention. When the ABA had the gall to condemn the convention, the Carnegie Foundation was enraged and demanded an immediate stop to the project or its money back.³⁰⁷

Another example of the influence of foundations over the world of academia is the way in which the nutrition department of Harvard has been converted into the public relations department of the General Foods Corporation. For years the head of this department at Harvard was Professor Stare, known within health-food circles as the "Cornflakes Professor." One of the Professor's dubious achievements was to defend "enriched" white bread and other miracle products of the processed-food industry. He dismissed as "rubbish" and "nutritional quackery" all suggestions that chemical additives to foods may not be safe or that processed supermarket foods are not just as nutritious as anything fresh from local organic gardens. On one occasion he condemned Dr. Carlton Fredericks for his support of vitamin B6 and challenged him to produce even one authoritative reference to support its value. Whereupon Dr. Fredericks sent Stare's own report on B6 written years before he had come under the influence of Harvard and foundation money.³⁰⁸

Omar Garrison gives further insight into how this influence came to be decisive:

"Perhaps it is without significance that Dr. Stare is a board member of a large can company, and that his department at Harvard has been the recipient of substantial research grants from the food industry. For example, in 1960, the Harvard president announced what he called a "momentous" gift of \$1,026,000 from General Foods Corporation, to be used over a ten-year period for expansion of the nutritional laboratories of the university's school of public health, where Dr. Stare is professor of nutrition. The seductive question is: Can any scientific research remain wholly objective and untainted by loyalty when it is so generously endowed by big corporations whose commercial future will be influenced by the outcome of such research?"³⁰⁹

Joseph Goulden, in his authoritative study of foundations entitled *The Money Givers*, explains how foundation control has been extended to the medical profession:

³⁰⁷ "Bar Group Accused by Carnegie Fund," *New York Times*, Oct. 15, 1950, pp. 1, 66. Also "Bar Group Denies Peace Fund Misuse," *New York Times*, Oct. 20, 1950, p. 30.

³⁰⁸ Details given in a lecture by Dr. Carlton Fredericks at the National Health Federation Convention in Los Angeles, Jan. 16, 1972.

³⁰⁹ Garrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 195, 196.

“The medical profession does quiver excitedly when it hears the fast rattle of thousand dollar bills. Since Ford [through the Ford Foundation] began nationwide operations in 1950, it has spent more than a third of a billion dollars on medical schools and hospitals....

Foundations are popular with the medical establishment because they do so much to preserve it. A well-endowed regional foundation—Kellogg in Michigan, Moody in Texas, Lilly in Indiana—can be as influential in hospital affairs as is the state medical association, through grants for construction, operating expenses, and research.”³¹⁰

Bearing in mind that the tax-exempt foundations are precision tools designed to further monopolies and cartels, it follows that they will be used, not only for expanding the wealth of those who control them, but also for expanding the size and reach of government, for total government is the ultimate monopoly and the final goal. This has been a conspicuous aspect of foundation grants since their inception. The majority of foundation-supported projects in the social and political sciences have resulted in the promotion of expanded government power as the solution to the problems and injustices of the nation and the world. Plush grants have gone to scholars, researchers, schools, dramatists, churches, theater groups, mass-action organizations, poets, and ivory tower think-tanks. They have been given to those within the Establishment, to those who are anti-Establishment, to those who claim to be in the middle, and to those who plot violent revolutions to overthrow the government. They have been bestowed upon Republicans, Democrats, New-Agers, militants, pacifists, socialists, and Communists. The apparent divergence of these groups leads the casual observer to the erroneous conclusion that the foundations are not selective or that they are promoting a kind of melting-pot democracy of ideas. But, upon closer examination, the one thing that all of these recipients share in common is that they promote the growth of government; and that, in fact, is why they have been smiled upon by the forces of monopoly.

There are a thousand examples that could be cited in support of this proposition, but let us limit ourselves only to the field of medicine which is the area of our present interest. Recent studies of socialized medicine in England and Sweden have turned up an interesting fact. Because prescription drugs in these countries are “free” (paid through taxes), the per-capita use of these medications is much higher than in the United States. The statistics show that, when an individual has no financial interest in his medical bill, he tends to overuse medical services just to make sure that he is getting all the benefits to which he thinks he is entitled. Doctors, also, tend to write prescriptions in marginal cases of need just to “process” the patient through his office more quickly. The result is that, under socialized medicine, the drug manufacturers are rewarded with an automatic and maximum market saturation for their products. The pharmaceutical cartel that controls the medically oriented foundations has not overlooked this fact, and we can be certain that the history of foundation pressure for socialized medicine in the United States is no accident.

The Milbank Fund was created by Albert G. Milbank (CFR member), who was Chairman of the Borden Company and also the leading partner in the Wall Street law firm of

³¹⁰ Joseph Goulden, *The Money Givers*, (New York: Random House, 1971), pp. 145, 149.

Milbank, Tweed, Hope, Hadley and McCloy. Milbank was no stranger to the cartel. John J. McCloy, one of his partners, was Chairman of the Chase National Bank, trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, chairman of the board of the CFR and a member of the Executive Committee of Squibb Pharmaceutical. The significance of the Milbank Fund is not that it has been the kindly sponsor of projects supposedly to upgrade the quality of public health, but that it was one of the first foundations to use its resources openly to promote government expansion via socialized medicine.

Richard Carter, in his expose of the AMA, entitled *The Doctor Business*, recounts the story:

“During the Coolidge and Hoover administrations, organized medicine encountered little legislative difficulty. Its worst problems were those posed by the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care and the philanthropic foundations which financed the Comin’s work. The Milbank Fund was regarded as particularly virulent. Despite protests from local medical societies, it continued pilot studies in New York State which illustrated the advantages of publicly organized preventive medicine. Worse, its secretary, John A. Kingsbury (CFR member), was an advocate of federal health insurance and so was its president, Albert G. Milbank (CFR member). With the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, such advocacy became formidable. It was expected that Roosevelt would include compulsory health insurance in his Social Security laws.”³¹¹

He who pays the piper calls the tune

The entry of the Rockefeller group into the foundation arena is of paramount importance to the subject of this treatise, for no other single force has been as influential in shaping the contours of modern medicine in America. One of the first moves in that direction was made when John D. Rockefeller retained the professional services of a public-relations expert by the name of Ivy Lee. When Lee was called before the Congressional Committee to Investigate Foreign Propaganda and Other Subversive Activities,³¹² he testified reluctantly that he had been retained by I.G. Farben to give professional advice to most of the top Nazi leaders, including Goebbels, the Minister of Propaganda, and Hitler himself. Lee became famous in later years for accomplishing what seemed to be an impossible task—improving the popular image of John D. Rockefeller. He had advised the old tycoon to give away a small percentage of his wealth each year in the form of gifts to hospitals, libraries, schools, churches, and other charities, but to do so in the most conspicuous manner possible, usually with a public building to bear his name as a continuing testimony to his generosity and benevolence.

To obtain favorable press coverage, he advised Rockefeller to carry rolls of shiny dimes with him at all public appearances so he could hand them out to any youngsters that might be present. It was largely through following this kind of advice that John D. Rockefeller gradually lost the old (and earned) reputation for cunning and ruthlessness and became increasingly portrayed as a kindly philanthropist who loved children. The public-relations value of philanthropy did not originate with Ivy Lee. Rockefeller

³¹¹ Richard Carter, *The Doctor Business*, (New York: Doubleday, 1958), pp. 203, 204.

³¹² This later became known as the Dies Committee after Martin Dies, but in 1934 its chairman was John W. McCormack of Massachusetts.

himself had observed how the negative image of George Peabody (CFR member), had been changed almost overnight by conspicuous acts of public charity, and the same thing with his close friend Andrew Carnegie. Shortly after Carnegie proclaimed his famous “Gospel of Wealth” in which he stated that men of great fortune had an obligation to further humanitarian objectives through philanthropy, Rockefeller wrote to him and said: “Be assured, your example will bear fruits.”³¹³ Later, when the first Rockefeller general philanthropic board was created, Carnegie was made a trustee and served for eleven years. Rockefeller and Carnegie, applying the typical philosophy of industrial cartels, agreed not to compete or overlap in their philanthropic endeavors, and operated their respective foundations as though they were one; a fact which, through the years, has given each of them an economic leverage even greater than would be indicated by their separate vast resources.

The one man who probably deserves more credit than any other for advancing the profitable science of foundation philanthropy was Rockefeller’s close friend, business and personal advisor, and director of Rockefeller’s General Education Board (GEB), Frederick Gates.³¹⁴ Gates had attracted the attention of John D. Rockefeller as a result of his effective service to the flour magnate George A. Pillsbury. Gates had shown Pillsbury how to dispose of a portion of his estate in such a manner that, not only did he receive maximum public approval, but he also was able to capture control of money from other sources as well. This was the Gates formula: Pillsbury gave the Owatonna Baptist Academy \$50,000 on condition that the Baptist community at large would raise an equal amount. Gates then took on the job of raising the additional funds. The result was that \$100,000 was raised in all, and it was done in such a way that the entire business community, through its own financial share in the venture, was led to personally identify with Mr. Pillsbury and his “noble” project. Pillsbury put up only half, yet he obtained the same public credit and private influence over how the funds were used as he would have if he had financed the entire venture. That was getting double mileage out of one’s philanthropy! John D. was quick to appreciate the usefulness of such a man as Fred Gates, the creator of this concept, and soon made him a key figure in his business enterprises. Rockefeller, himself, later described Gates in these glowing terms:

“Fred Gates was a wonderful business man. His work for the American Baptist Education Society required him to travel extensively. Once, as he was going south, I asked him to look into an iron mill in which I had an interest. His report was a model of clarity! Then I asked him to make some investigation of other property in the west. I had been told this particular company was rolling in wealth. Mr. Gates’ report showed that I had been deceived. Now I realized that I had met a commercial genius. I persuaded Mr. Gates to become a man of business.”³¹⁵

John D. Rockefeller had a passion for efficiency—not only in business, but in the administration of his philanthropic funds as well. In the mind of this man, the word

³¹³ Warren Weaver, *U.S. Philanthropic Foundations; Their History, Structure, Management, and Record*, (New York: Harper & Row, p. 35.

³¹⁴ Allan Nevins, *John D. Rockefeller*, (New York: Scribner & Sons, 1959), v. 2, p. 271.

³¹⁵ John K. Winkler, *John D.—A Portrait in Oils* (New York: Blue Ribbon Books, 1929), pp. 176, 177.

“efficiency” meant more than merely the absence of waste. It meant expending the money in such a way as to bring about the maximum return to the donor. The Gates “matching funds” formula developed for Pillsbury was refined even further for Rockefeller and soon evolved into a pattern in which John D. often controlled a philanthropic venture with as little as one-fourth of the total capitalization. Scores of volunteer fund-raisers could be recruited to raise the balance from the public at large. But since the largest single contribution came from Rockefeller, he received the credit and was able to place control of the entire fund into the hands of trustees who were subservient to his will. This was the pattern that produced such profitable ventures as the Charity Organization Society, the State Charities Aid, the Greater New York Fund, and many others. The New York Tuberculosis and Health Association was a classic example. Originally established by a group of physicians dedicated to a crusade against T.B., it soon fell captive to the financial domination of Rockefeller money. Rockefeller put in charge of the program a relatively unknown social worker by the name of Harry Hopkins.³¹⁶ Under Hopkin’s direction, the T.B. Association grew to international proportions and, by 1920, was collecting many millions of dollars each year.

Rockefeller controlled the operation, but most of the money came from the public through contributions and the purchase of Christmas Seals. One of the great scandals of 1932 centered around the accusation made by New York City Health Commissioner Lewis I. Harris, in a letter to the New York Times of June 8, and by the subsequent admission of the fund’s officers, “that all its money had been expended on salaries and overhead.” The philanthropy formula worked so well that it was decided to expand. A multitude of similar agencies were established to exploit the public’s dread of other diseases as well. Within a few years there sprang into being such organizations as The Heart Association, The Social Hygiene Association, The Diabetes Association, The National Association for the Prevention of Blindness, The American Cancer Association, and many others.

The American Cancer Society (ACS), incidentally, was formed officially in May of 1913 at the Harvard Club in New York. In later years its orientation was determined by such personages sitting on its board of directors as Alfred P. Sloan (CFR member), (General Motors), Charles D. Hilles (CFR member) (ATT), Monroe Rathbone (CFR member), (Standard Oil), and Frederich Ecker (Metropolitan Life). The American Cancer Society holds half ownership in the patent rights to 5FU (5 fluorouracil), one of those drugs considered as an “acceptable” treatment for cancer.³¹⁷ The drug is manufactured by Hoffman-LaRoche Laboratories which was within the I.G.-Rockefeller orbit. Many donors to the ACS would be outraged to learn that this organization has a vested interest in the sale of drugs and a financial tie-in with the drug industry.

The ACS denies that it has ever received any money for its share of the patent. When a researcher wrote to Hoffman-LaRoche suggesting that this was strange inasmuch as such payments would help to fund ACS “humanitarian programs,” Mr. Samuel L. Welt, Assistant Vice President and Chief Patent Counsel replied: “We do not feel that we are

³¹⁶ Hopkins, like most Rockefeller protégés, moved into government work. He became WPA director, U.S. Secretary of Commerce, Lend-Lease Administrator, and personal advisor to FDR. He even took up residency in the White House. Later it was learned that he had been a member of the Communist Party.

³¹⁷ See Jones, Nutrition Rudiments in Cancer, op. cit., p. 17.

in a position to comment on what payments, if any, the American Cancer Society received on account of the patent.”³¹⁸

Rockefeller’s first entry into philanthropy on a grand scale was in 1890 when, following the formula established by Gates, he pledged \$600,000 to the Baptist University of Chicago on condition that the meat packers and dry-goods merchants of the city also contribute a minimum of \$400,000. Biographer John T. Flynn describes the reaction: When the news of Rockefeller’s princely gift was made known, the National Baptist Education Society Convention was being held in Boston. The announcement of the gift was received with cheers:

“When the gift was named and the actual sum of money pronounced, the audience rose and sang the Doxology. Men burst out into exclamations of praise and joy. “The man who has given this money is a godly man,” chanted one leader. Another rose and exclaimed: “The coming to the front of such a princely giver! A man to lead! It is the Lord’s doing. God has kept Chicago for us. I wonder at his patience.” On the following Sabbath throughout the country, sermons of thanksgiving were preached in almost all Baptist pulpits. “When a crisis came,” intoned one minister, “God had a man to meet it.” “God,” cried out another, “has guided us and provided a leader and a giver and so brought us out into a large place.” In scores of pulpits the phrase: “Man of God!” was uttered. A writer to the Independent said: “No benefaction has ever flowed from a purer Christian source.”³¹⁹

There is an old saying: “He who pays the piper calls the tune.” This is one of those eternal truths that exist—and always will exist—in business, in politics, and in education. We have seen how John D. Rockefeller captured the hearts of Baptist ministers with a mere \$600,000 granted to Chicago University. What remains to be demonstrated is that he also captured control of the university. Within a year after the grant, Rockefeller’s personal choice, Dr. William Rainey Harper, was named president of the institution. And within two years, the teaching staff had been successfully purged of all anti-Rockefeller dissidents. A professor of economics and a professor of literature distinguished themselves by proclaiming that Mr. Rockefeller was “superior in creative genius to Shakespeare, Homer, and Dante.”³²⁰

In contrast, a Professor Bemis was expelled from the staff for “incompetence” when he repeatedly criticized the action of the railroads during the Pullman strike of 1894. A few years later, after the Rockefeller family, through the “philanthropy” of John Archbald, had gained parallel influence at Syracuse University in western New York, an economics instructor by the name of John Cummons was dismissed by the Chancellor for similar reasons.

Rockefeller sets out to capture control of American medical education

The process began in 1901 with the creation of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. It included on its board such politically oriented “medical” names as Doctors

³¹⁸ Letter to G. Edward Griffin, January 11, 1977; Griffin, Private Papers, op. cit.

³¹⁹ Flynn, *God's Gold*, op. cit., pp. 305, 306.

³²⁰ Josephson, *The Robber Barrons*, op. cit., p. 324.

L. Emmett Holt (CFR member), Christian A. Herter (CFR member), T. Mitchell Pruden, Hermann M. Briggs, William H. Welch, Theobald Smith, and Simon Flexner. Christian Herter was slated for bigger things, of course, and became Secretary of State under President Eisenhower (CFR member). Simon Flexner also was destined for larger success. Although his name never became as well-known as that of Herter, he and his brother, Abraham Flexner, probably influenced the lives of more people and in a more profound way than has any Secretary of State.

Abraham Flexner was on the staff of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. As mentioned previously, the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations traditionally worked together almost as one enterprise in the furtherance of their mutual goals, and this certainly was no exception. The Flexner brothers were the lens that brought the Rockefeller and the Carnegie fortunes into focus on the unsuspecting and vulnerable medical profession.

Prior to 1910, the practice of medicine in the United States left a great deal to be desired. Medical degrees could be purchased through the mail or obtained with marginal training at understaffed and inadequate medical schools. The profession was suffering from a bad public reputation and reform was in the air.

The American Medical Association had begun to take an interest in cleaning its own house. It created a Council on Medical Education for the express purpose of surveying the status of medical training throughout the country and of making specific recommendations for its improvement. But by 1908 it had run into difficulty as a result of committee differences and insufficient funding. It was into this void that the Rockefeller-Carnegie combine moved with brilliant strategy and perfect timing. Henry S. Pritchett (CFR member), the president of the Carnegie Foundation, approached the AMA and simply offered to take over the entire project. The minutes for the meeting of the AMA's Council on Medical Education held in New York in December of 1908 tell the story:

“At one o'clock an informal conference was held with President Pritchett and Mr. Abraham Flexner of the Carnegie Foundation. Mr. Pritchett had already expressed by correspondence the willingness of the Foundation to cooperate with the Council in investigating the medical schools. He now explained that the Foundation was to investigate all the professions: law, medicine, and theology.”³²¹

He agreed with the opinion previously expressed by the members of the Council that while the Foundation would be guided very largely by the Council's investigation, to avoid the usual claims of partiality no more mention should be made in the report of the Council than any other source of information. The report would therefore be, and have the weight of a disinterested body, which would then be published far and wide. It would do much to develop public opinion.”³²²

³²¹ The reader should not pass over the fact that the same strategy for control over education was being executed in other key areas as well.

³²² Morris Fishbein, M.D., *A History of the AMA*, (Philadelphia & London: W.B. Saunders Co., 1947), pp. 987, 989.

Here was the “philanthropy formula” at work again: (1) have others pay a major portion of the bill (the AMA had already done most of the work; the cost to Carnegie was only \$10,000), (2) receive a public-image bonus (Isn’t it wonderful that these men are taking an interest in upgrading medical standards!), and (3) gain control over a vital sphere of American life. This is how that control came about. The Flexner Report, as it was called, was published in 1910. As anticipated, it was “published far and wide,” and it did “do much to develop public opinion.” The report correctly pointed out the inadequacies of medical education at the time. No one could take exception with that. It also proposed a wide range of sweeping changes, most of which were entirely sound. No one could take exception with those, either. The alert observer, however, would note that the recommendations included strengthening courses in pharmacology and the addition of research departments at all “qualified” medical schools. Taken at face value, the Flexner Report was above reproach and, undoubtedly, it performed a service that was much needed. It is what followed in the wake of the report that reveals its true purpose in the larger plan. Rockefeller and Carnegie began immediately to shower millions of dollars on those medical schools that were susceptible to control. Those that did not conform were denied the funds and eventually were forced out of business by their well-funded competitors.

A hundred and sixty schools were in operation in 1905. By 1927, the number had dropped to eighty. Most of those that were edged out had been sub-standard, but excellence was not the sole criterion for determining which ones would receive funding. The primary test was the willingness of the school administration and faculty to accept a curricula geared to drug research. That is how the money would come back to the donors—plus a handsome profit. Historian Joseph Goulden describes the process this way:

“Flexner had the ideas, Rockefeller and Carnegie had the money, and their marriage was spectacular. The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research and the General Education Board showered money on tolerably respectable schools and on professors who expressed an interest in research.”³²³

Since 1910, the foundations have “invested” over a billion dollars in the medical schools of America. Nearly half of the faculty members now receive a portion of their income from foundation “research” grants, and over sixteen percent of them are entirely funded this way. Rockefeller and Carnegie have not been the only source of these funds. Substantial influence also has been exerted by the Ford Foundation, the Kellogg Foundation, the Commonwealth Fund (a Rockefeller interlock created by Edward Harkness of Standard Oil), the Sloan Foundation, and the Macy Foundation. The Ford Foundation has been extremely active in the field of medical education in recent years, but none of them can compare to the Rockefellers and the Carnegies for sheer money volume and historical continuity. Joseph C. Hinsey, in his authoritative paper entitled “The Role of Private Foundations in the Development of Modern Medicine,” reviews the sequence of this expanding influence:

“Starting with Johns Hopkins Medical School in 1913, the General Education Board supported reorganizations which brought about full-time instruction in the clinical as well as the basic science departments of the first two years of

³²³ Goulden, *The Money Givers*, op. cit., p. 141.

medical education at Washington University in St. Louis, at Yale, and at Chicago. In 1923, a grant was made to the University of Iowa in the amount of \$2,250,000 by the General Education Board and the Rockefeller Foundation. Similar grants in smaller amounts were made to the following state-supported medical schools: University of Colorado, University of Oregon, University of Virginia, and University of Georgia. An appropriation was made to the University of Cincinnati, an institution which received some of its support from municipal sources. Howard University and the Meharry Medical School were strengthened, the latter by some eight million dollars. The General Education Board and the Rockefeller Foundation later made substantial grants to the medical schools at Harvard, Vanderbilt, Columbia, Cornell, Tulane, Western Reserve, Rochester, Duke, Emory, and the Memorial Hospital in New York affiliated with Cornell.”³²⁴

It is necessary to add to this list the medical schools of Northwestern, Kansas, and Rochester; each heavily endowed, either by Rockefeller money or by the Commonwealth Fund which is closely aligned with Rockefeller interests.³²⁵ After Abraham Flexner completed his report, he became one of the three most influential men in American medicine. The other two were his brother, Dr. Simon Flexner of the Rockefeller Institute, and Dr. William Welch of Johns Hopkins Medical School and of the Rockefeller Institute.

According to Hinsey, these men, acting as “a triumvirate”: were not only involved in the awarding of grants for the Rockefeller Foundation, but they were counselors to heads of institutions, to lay board members, to members of staffs of medical schools and universities in the United States and abroad. They served as sounding boards, as stimulators of ideas and programs, as mediators in situations of difficulty.³²⁶

The Association of American Medical Colleges has been one of the principal vehicles of foundation and cartel control over medical education in the United States and Canada. Organized in 1876, it serves the function of setting a wide range of standards for all medical schools. It determines the criteria for selecting medical students, for curriculum development, for programs of continuing medical education after graduation, and for communication within the profession as well as to the general public. The Association of American Medical Colleges, from its inception, has been funded and dominated by the Commonwealth Fund, the China Medical Board (created in 1914 as a division of the Rockefeller Foundation), the Kellogg Foundation, the Macy, Markle, Rockefeller, and Sloan foundations.³²⁷

By way of analogy, we may say that the foundations captured control of the apex of the pyramid of medical education when they were able to place their own people onto the boards of the various schools and into key administrative positions. The middle of the pyramid was secured by the Association of American Medical Colleges which set standards and unified the curricula. The base of the pyramid, however, was not consolidated until they finally were able to select the teachers themselves.

³²⁴ Article reprinted in Warren Weaver’s *U.S. Philanthropic Foundations*, op. cit., pp. 264, 265.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 268.

³²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

³²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 267, 268.

Consequently, a major portion of foundation activity always has been directed toward what generally is called “academic medicine.” Since 1913, the foundations have preempted this field. The Commonwealth Fund reports a half-million dollars appropriated for this purpose in one year alone, while the Rockefeller Foundation boasts of over twenty-thousand fellowships and scholarships for the training of medical instructors.³²⁸

In *The Money Givers*, Joseph Goulden touches upon this sensitive nerve when he says:

“If the foundations chose to speak, their voice would resound with the solid clang of the cash register. Their expenditures on health and hospitals totaled more than a half-billion dollars between 1964 and 1968, according to a compilation by the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel. But the foundations’ “innovative money” goes for research, not for the production of doctors who treat human beings. Medical schools, realizing this, paint their faces with the hue desired by their customers.”³²⁹

Echoing this same refrain, David Hopgood, writing in the *Washington Monthly*, says:

“The medical school curriculum and its entrance requirements are geared to the highly academic student who is headed for research. In the increasingly desperate struggle for admission, these academically talented students are crowding out those who want to practice medicine.”³³⁰

And so it has come to pass that the teaching staffs of our medical schools are a special breed. In the selection and training process, emphasis has been put on finding individuals who, because of temperament or special interest, have been attracted by the field of research, and especially by research in pharmacology. This has resulted in loading the staffs of our medical schools with men and women who, by preference and by training, are ideal propagators of the drug-oriented science that has come to dominate American medicine. And the irony of it is that neither they nor their students are even remotely aware that they are products of a selection process geared to hidden commercial objectives. So thorough is their insulation from this fact that, even when exposed to the obvious truth, few are capable of accepting it, for to do so would be a blow to their professional pride. Generally speaking, the deeper one is drawn into the medical profession and the more years he has been exposed to its regimens, the more difficult it is to break out of its confines.

Dr. David L. Edsall at one time was the Dean of the Harvard Medical School. The conditions he describes at Harvard are the same as those at every other medical school in America:

“I was, for a period, a professor of therapeutics and pharmacology, and I knew from experience that students were obliged then by me and by others to learn about an interminable number of drugs, many of which were valueless, many of

³²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 265, 266.

³²⁹ Goulden, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

³³⁰ “The Health Professionals: Cure or Cause of the Health Crises?” *Washington Monthly*, June, 1969.

them useless, some probably even harmful. Almost all subjects must be taken at exactly the same time, and in almost exactly in the same way by all students, and the amount introduced into each course is such that few students have time or energy to explore any subject in a spirit of independent interest. A little comparison shows that there is less intellectual freedom in the medical course than in almost any other form of professional education in this country.”³³¹

Yes, he who pays the piper does call the tune. It may not be possible for those who finance the medical schools to dictate what shall be taught in every minute detail. But such is not necessary to achieve the cartel’s goals. It is certain, however, that there is total control over what is not taught, and under no circumstances will one of Rockefeller’s shiny dimes ever go to a medical college, to a hospital, to a teaching staff, or to a researcher that holds the unorthodox view that the best medicine is in nature. Because of its generous patron, orthodoxy always will fiddle a tune of patented drugs. Whatever basic nutrition may be allowed into the melody will be minimal at best, and it will be played over and over again that natural sources are in no way superior to those that are synthesized. The day when orthodox medicine embraces nutrition in the treatment of disease will be the day when the cartel behind it has succeeded in also monopolizing the natural vitamin and natural remedy industry—not one day before.

In the meantime, while medical students are forced to spend years studying the pharmacology of drugs, they are lucky if they receive a single course on basic nutrition. The result is that the average doctor’s spouse knows more about nutrition than the doctor does. Returning to the main theme, however, we find that the chemical and drug cartel’s influence over the field of orthodox medicine is felt far beyond the medical schools. After the doctor has struggled his way through ten or twelve years of learning what the cartels have decided is best for him to learn, he then goes out into the world of medical practice and immediately is embraced by the other arm of cartel control—The American Medical Association. So let us turn, now, to that part of this continuing story.

Capturing control of the American Medical Association (AMA)

The American Medical Association climbed into bed with the Rockefeller and Carnegie interests in 1908 for the praiseworthy purpose of upgrading American medicine. The impact of this organization on the average physician is probably greater than even he/she recognizes. First of all, the medical student cannot obtain an M.D. degree except at a school that has been accredited by the AMA. Internships must be served only at a hospital that meets AMA standards as a teaching institution. To become a specialist, the physician’s residency must conform to AMA requirements. The license to practice is issued in accordance with state laws worked out by AMA leaders. To prove their standing as an ethical practitioner, the physician must apply to and be accepted by county and state societies in conformity with AMA procedures. AMA publications provide the physician with continuing education in the form of scientific articles, research findings, reviews and abstracts from medical books, question-and-answer discussions of clinical problems, evaluations of new drugs, foods, and appliances, authoritative essays, editorials, letters to the editor, and a hundred similar appeals to his intellectual understanding of the profession he practices. At the AMA’s week-long

³³¹ Quoted by Morris A. Bealle, *The New Drug Story*, (Wash. D.C.: Columbia Publishing Co., 1958), pp. 19, 20.

convention each year, the physician is exposed to what is called “a complete post-graduate education under one roof.” As Richard Carter explained in his critical work entitled *The Doctor Business*:

“On the national level, the AMA extended its authority far beyond the medical schools. As custodian of medical standards, it began determining the eligibility of hospitals to train new physicians. It gave authoritative advice on the training of nurses and technicians. It was influential in the passage of pure food and drug legislation, exposure of unscientific remedies, and stigmatization of cultism and quackery.”³³²

Since 1922 the state medical journals have become financially interlocked with the *AMA Journal*, so there no longer is any possibility of publishing such harsh views. The AMA spends millions of dollars per year for television programs to affect public opinion, maintains one of the richest and most active lobbies in Washington, spends many millions in support of favored political candidates, is instrumental in the selection of the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, and . . . well, let us just say that the AMA is a substantial force in American medicine.

Who controls the AMA? Most people would assume that the dues-paying members control their own association, but nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, a doctor with a busy personal medical practice seldom becomes involved with the leadership of the AMA simply because they don't have the time to spare. Furthermore, the temperament that is required for success in the practice of medicine is not the same as that required for success in running a large membership organization. For this reason, the AMA, from its inception, has been dominated by atypical physicians: those who enjoy the limelight and the thrill of accomplishment through medical politics. The typical physician, by comparison, is not only baffled by the intrigue and maneuvering for position behind the scenes, but wants no part of it. They are more than content to leave the affairs of the association in the hands of those who enjoy the game.

The structure and operating procedures of the AMA were well conceived to put total control of that organization into the hands of the one man who occupies the chief full-time staff position. Although supposedly hired by the AMA as its employee, actually he is beyond reach of the general membership because of his inside knowledge, his ability to devote unlimited time to the task, and his powerful influence in the selection of members of the self-perpetuating Board of Trustees. But he holds even a mightier sword than that over the head of the organization because he also is the man who is responsible for bringing in the money. The AMA could not survive on membership dues alone, and without the income secured by him, the Association would undoubtedly founder. The key to financial solvency for the organization has been its monthly publication, the *AMA Journal*. Altogether over half of the AMA's total income the association derives comes from advertising. And who advertises in the *AMA Journal* and related publications? The lion's share is derived from the Pharmaceutical Manufacturer's Association whose members make up ninety-five percent of the American drug industry.

³³² Richard Carter, *The Doctor Business*, (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1958) pp. 78, 79.

Capturing control of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

In 1970, Dr. Herbert Ley made a statement that, coming from a lesser source, easily could be dismissed as the ranting of an uninformed malcontent. Considering that Dr. Ley was a former Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, however, his words cannot be brushed aside so lightly. He said:

“The thing that bugs me is that the people think the FDA is protecting them. It isn’t. What the FDA is doing and what the public thinks it’s doing are as different as night and day.”³³³

What is the FDA doing? As will be shown by the material that follows, the FDA is “doing” three things:

1. First, it is providing a means whereby key individuals on its payroll are able to obtain power and wealth through granting special favors to politically influential groups that are subject to its regulations. This activity is similar to the “protection racket” of organized crime: for a price, one can induce FDA administrators to provide “protection” from the FDA itself.
2. Secondly, as a result of this political favoritism, the FDA has become a primary factor in that formula whereby cartel-oriented companies in the food-and-drug industry are able to use the police powers of government to harass or destroy their competitors.
3. And thirdly, the FDA occasionally does some genuine public good if that does not interfere with serving the vested interest of its first two activities.

To appreciate the extent of chemical and drug cartel influence within the FDA, let us look briefly at the larger picture—at evidence of that same influence in other agencies and at all levels of government. Previously we outlined the degree to which the cartel succeeded in placing its friends and agents into such areas of government as the office of the Alien Property Custodian, the Attorney General’s office, the State Department, and the White House itself. In addition to the names previously mentioned, there are such dignitaries as Secretary of State Dean Rusk (CFR member and former head of the Rockefeller Foundation, as was John Foster Dulles (who was also a CFR member)); Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon (CFR member and a member of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank); Eugene Black (CFR member and Director of the U.S. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (also Second Vice-President and Director of Chase Manhattan); John J. McCloy (CFR member) President of the UN World Bank (also Chairman of the Board of Chase Manhattan, and trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Chairman of the Executive Committee for Squibb Pharmaceutical).³³⁴ Senator Nelson Aldrich (whose daughter married John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and whose son, Winthrop (CFR member), became Chairman of the

³³³ San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 2, 1970, as quoted in *Autopsy on The A.M.A.*, (Student Research Facility, Berkeley, 1970), p. 42.

³³⁴ McCloy had been Assistant Secretary of War from April 1941 to November 1945. As High Commissioner in West Germany after the war, he was instrumental in making Konrad Adenauer, his brother-in-law, Chancellor of West Germany. He also was Chairman of the Board of the Ford Foundation and chief U.S. disarmament negotiator.

Chase National Bank and also was appointed as Ambassador to Great Britain); President Richard Nixon (CFR member), and Attorney General John Mitchell (Wall Street attorneys for Warner – Lambert Pharmaceutical); and many others. The list of men who are or were in key positions within the Rockefeller group reads like a “Who’s Who in Government.”

It is impossible to appraise the extent of Rockefeller influence within the federal government without mentioning the Council on Foreign Relations again. The Rockefeller controlled CFR has come to be called “the hidden government of the United States,” and as already seen, that is a fairly accurate description. The list of CFR members subsequently move into control of literally all of the nation’s power centers, and maintains hidden control over such power centers as government, media, education, and finance. To see that this is not an exaggeration, since 1953, the majority of the following posts have been in the hands of CFR members: Presidents, Vice Presidents, Secretaries of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, CIA directors, National Security Council, Secretaries of the Treasury, members of the President’s Cabinet, Under-Secretaries, Ambassadors to the UN and major countries, and presidential advisors. When it comes to the Federal Reserve System, virtually 100% of the board members have been CFR since 1953—which tells us something about how important it is to these people to have control over our monetary system. So much for government, CFR members include top executives and journalists for practically all media outlets. Let us emphasize that CFR members do not merely work for these media giants as subversive agents hiding within the working staffs, they control them at the top. They are the owners and the key executives who determine content and editorial policy. It is through these channels of communication and entertainment that members of the CFR have been able to manipulate America’s perception of reality.

We have previously covered the role of the tax-exempt foundations in furthering the objectives of the pharmaceutical cartel, so it should not come as a surprise to learn that these foundations also are dominated by members of the CFR. They include directors of the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Carnegie Fund, Heritage Foundation, Kettering Foundation and Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research.

For many years, David Rockefeller was the chairman and principle benefactor of the CFR. Its continuing leadership consists of proven and trusted lieutenants who are firmly within the Rockefeller financial interlock. Virtually all of the nation’s largest universities and corporations and banking houses and insurance companies are also run by members of the CFR.³³⁵

The glue that binds members of the CFR together is the plan for all-powerful world government and the personal power they anticipate from that. But making money is not far behind as a secondary motive, and it is that motive that comes into play in cancer research (As will be looked at in Appendix I). So let us forget the CFR for now and return to domestic policy. In particular, let us take a close look at how the pharmaceutical cartel has captured control over the FDA.

³³⁵ For an overview of this subject, including a list of members and the positions they have held, see *The New American* (Conspiracy Report), September 16, 1996. Also *Shadows of Power; The Council on Foreign Relations and the American Decline* by James Perloff, (Appleton, WI: Western Islands, 1988).

In 1960, during the much publicized investigation of the drug industry conducted by the Senate, it was revealed that many top FDA officials had been receiving extra-curricular “incentives” from some of the very companies they were supposed to regulate. For example, Dr. Henry Welch, director of the FDA Antibiotic Division, had been paid \$287,000 in kick-backs (he called them “honorariums”) that were derived from a percentage of drug advertising secured for leading medical journals. His superiors were fully aware of this conflict of interest but did nothing to terminate it. It was only after the fact was made public and caused embarrassment to the administration that Welch was asked to resign.

In 1940, an incident occurred that, if it been widely publicized, perhaps would have shocked the nation into realizing that the FDA was not protecting the people, but was protecting the drug cartelists instead. It was at that time that Winthrop Chemical was under fire for shipping 400,000 tablets labelled as “Sulfathiazole,” which were found later to contain five grains of Luminal each. One or two grains of Luminal puts people to sleep. Five grains put some of them to sleep permanently. These tablets are known to have killed seventeen victims in various parts of the country. Winthrop Chemical failed to notify the public immediately of the fatally poisonous character of the pills. Instead, the company, with the aid and approval of the A.M.A. Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the American Medical Association, continued to push the sale of the Sulfathiazole pills, thus increasing the number of fatalities. The FDA was sympathetic toward Winthrop Chemical and extremely helpful. Exercising their bureaucratic powers, Dr. Klumpp, head of the FDA drug division, and his superior, FDA Commissioner Campbell, refrained from prosecuting for the deaths. They helped to push up the matter and merely revoked Winthrop’s license to ship Sulfathiazole for three months, after the market had been glutted with the product. The suspension of shipment for three months was a meaningless gesture. Commenting on this episode, Howard Ambruster adds:

“Dr. Klumpp, by this time, had moved onward and upward. He had accepted a position awarded him by Dr. Fishbein and became Director of the A.M.A. division on food and drugs and secretary of its Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry (the same council that had “accepted” Winthrop’s Sulfathiazole and approved its advertising). And Dr. Klumpp kept moving. Not long thereafter, Edward S. Rogers, chairman of the Board of Sterling Products, announced that Dr. Klumpp had been elected president of Winthrop.”³³⁶

Some years later, an antibiotic drug by the name of Chloramphenicol was manufactured and distributed by Parke-Davis and Company. Shortly after it was released, reports began to appear in the medical literature to the effect that Chloramphenicol was responsible for blood toxicity and leukopenia (reduction of the white blood cells), and that it had caused several deaths from aplastic anemia. The man who was director of the FDA’s Bureau of Medicine at that time—and the man who could have ordered Parke-Davis to withdraw this drug from the market—was Dr. Joseph F. Sadusk. Instead of clamping down on Parke-Davis, however, Sadusk used his official position to prevent the drug from being recalled, and even ruled against requiring a precautionary label. Finally, in 1969, after the drug had earned a substantial profit for its producer, and after it had been replaced by a newer product,

³³⁶ Ambruster, *Treason's Peace*, op. cit., p. 213.

Parke–Davis was allowed to get off the hook merely by sending a letter to all physicians stating that chloramphenicol was no longer the drug of choice for any of the infections it originally had been designed to cure. Soon afterward, Dr. Sadusk left the FDA, supposedly to work at his alma mater, Johns Hopkins University. But, within the year, the pay–off was complete: He became vice–president of Parke–Davis and Company. Dr. Sadusk’s successor was Dr. Joseph M. Pisani who shortly resigned to work for The Proprietary Association, the trade association that represents the manufacturers of non–prescription drugs—a part of the very industry Dr. Pisani had “regulated.” Dr. Pisani was replaced by Dr. Robert J. Robinson, whose stay was even shorter than that of his predecessor. He became a top executive at Hoffman–LaRoche, a leading manufacturer of prescription drugs. Omar Garrison continues the list, in his well–researched book, *The Dictocrats*:

“Dr. Howard Cohn, former head of FDA’s medical evaluation, who made a profitable transition from the agency to Ciba Pharmaceutical Company; Dr. Harold Anderson, chief of FDA’s division of anti–infective drugs, who terminated his government employment to take a position with Winthrop Laboratories; Morris Yakowitz, who felt that a job with Smith, Kline and French Laboratories would offer greater personal rewards than his post as head of case supervision for FDA; and Allen E. Rayfield, former director of Regulatory Compliance, who chucked his enforcement duties (including electronic spying) to become a consultant to Richardson–Merrell, Inc.”³³⁷

In 1964, under pressure from Congress, the FDA released a list of its officials who, during the preceding years, had left the agency for employment in industry. Out of the eight hundred and thirteen names appearing on that list, eighty–three—better than ten percent—had taken positions with companies they previously regulated. Many of these people, of course, were from the very top FDA echelons of management —men who were charged with making decisions and issuing directives. While these men were with the FDA, they had access to information regarding the research and processes of all companies. When they went to work for one of those companies, therefore, there is no reason they couldn’t have taken that information with them which, obviously, could put the firm that hired them at a tremendous advantage over its competitors.

Here, again, we find the classic pattern of government bureaucratic power being used, not for the protection of the people as is its excuse for being, but for the aggrandizement of individuals holding that power and for the elimination of honest competition in the market place. The voters approve one extension of government power after another always in the naive expectation that, somehow, they will benefit. But, in the end, they inevitably find themselves merely supporting a larger bureaucracy through increased taxes, paying higher prices for their consumer goods and losing one more chunk of personal freedom.

There are almost no exceptions to this rule, as will be obvious if one but reflects for a moment on the results of government entry into such areas of economic activity as prices and wages, energy conservation, environmental protection, health care and so on. As the Frenchman, Frederic Bastiat, observed over a hundred years ago, once government is allowed to expand beyond its prime role of protecting the lives, liberty

³³⁷ Op. cit., pp. 70, 71.

and property of its citizens; once it invades the market place and attempts to redistribute the nation's wealth or resources, inevitably it falls into the hands of those who will use it for "legalized plunder." There is no better way to describe the governments of the world today—and the government of the United States is no exception.

X
THE TAKEOVER OF AMERICA'S EDUCATION SYSTEM

The United States consistently spends far more money per school age student than any other country in the world. Excluding the huge sums spent on the 10 percent of children who go to private schools, the United States spends an estimated \$11,800 of public money per child per year compared with \$4,000–\$5,000 in comparable countries. Yet, in 2016, the United States was 31st on the list of world rankings for school educational achievement, well below the Czech Republic, below even Vietnam and Lithuania. The U.S. ranks near the bottom among 35 industrialized nations.

Very few have any idea how our modern educational system was born as to who drafted, funded and designed it and what their stated plans and goals were for public education. As a result, many will say that the education system has failed. Many feel that given the amount of money we spend on public schools that we should be producing much higher quality students that are equal to, or superior to, education in other countries. Much of the blame for the failure in our public schools has been placed on local staff and educators, the children and the culture. That's wrong. These failures are not the result of an accident. Providing a quality education for our children was never the intention of the original framers of our education system, as you will read below. In fact the system is working exactly as these few men of enormous wealth had planned it all out nearly a century ago.

History of our nation's public school system

Prior to the late 1800's, education was a private practice that took place in private institutions or through home schooling. The current American school system took root at the turn of the 20th century.

With the implementation of enforced compulsory public education in Massachusetts and other areas of the country during this period of industrial revolution, major industrialists initially opposed public education for fear that they'd lose their bottom-rung workers who worked in factories or cleared roadbeds and laid track. The first U.S. Commissioner of Education and one of the most influential educators in the 1890s, William Torrey Harris, actually wrote a reassuring letter to railroad baron Ellis Huntington in 1889, assuring him that the emerging American Public Education System was "scientifically designed" in Germany "not to overeducate" but to produce instead socially compliant workers. It's a sad fact that the robber barons of the Nineteenth Century had no desire to cultivate among their future workforce the ability to think differently—it was created in response to the need to fill factories with compliant workers. Harris's view on education can be seen all throughout, his book, *The Philosophy of Education*:

"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."³³⁸

To provide further introduction to the views of the men who shaped our Education in America, in 1890, Industrial giant Andrew Carnegie wrote eleven essays which were published under the title *The Gospel of Wealth*. The underlying premise was that the

³³⁸ Agile Innovation: The Revolutionary Approach to Accelerate Success, Inspire Encouragement, & Ignite Creativity, Langdon Morris, 2014

free-enterprise system had been locked-up by men such as himself, J.P. Morgan, and John D. Rockefeller, and that they not only owned everything, but also controlled the government. His worry, was that subsequent generations would realize this, and work against them. His solution was to control the education system, and to create a direct relationship between the amount of education a person had, and how good of a job they could get.

John D. Rockefeller, who was quoted as saying "I don't want a nation of thinkers, I want a nation of workers." founded the General Education Board (GEB) in 1903, which provided major funding for schools across the country and was especially active in promoting the State-controlled public school movement. The General Education Board was not interested in encouraging critical thinking, rather its focus was on organizing children and creating reliable, predictable, obedient citizens. Rockefeller alone, with 1903 dollars provided over one million dollars, then increased it to \$10 million in 1907, later a further sum of \$32 million and through subsequent decades granted some \$7.5 billion. With significant money buys significant influence and loyalty. As John D. Rockefeller said, "The ability to deal with people is as purchasable a commodity as sugar or coffee and I will pay more for that ability than for any other under the sun."³³⁹

One of the most influential figures in the Educational historical record is Abraham Flexner (1866–1959), an American educational theorist and assistant secretary for the Rockefellers' General Education Board, who played a huge role in transforming both public school and medical school education in our country. It is at this critical juncture in the historical record that one finds the beginnings, not only of the dumbing down of American public education, but also the stifling and shutting down of the alternative inexpensive natural medicine practice that flourished at the turn of the 20th century. The Flexner Report was a book-length study of medical education in the United States and Canada, written by Abraham Flexner and published in 1910 under the direction of the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundation that discredited all forms of medicine except for medicine based on the use of surgery and chemical drugs. At this point the General Education Board would give a total of over \$96 million to medical schools that disregarded naturopathy, homeopathy, and chiropractic forms of medicine.³⁴⁰

Following this impetus toward total power over the medical field, in 1916, while at the Rockefeller General Education Board and under its aegis and imprint, Flexner published a controversial paper innocuously titled "A Modern School." Its contents, however, were anything but innocent or innocuous, for in it he proposed an experimental school which would abolish the study of Greek and Latin, and under which literature and history "would not be completely abolished, but new methods would be instituted for teaching these subjects." Additionally, the study of classical literature and English grammar would be completely dropped.³⁴¹ In other words, Flexner's program amounted to nothing less than a total program to sever American education and students from an informed understanding of their roots within Western culture; it was

³³⁹ Attributed in 'How to Win Friends and Influence People (1937) by Dale Carnegie.

³⁴⁰ Paolo Lionni, The Leipzig Connection, p. 72

³⁴¹ Ibid.

a program designed to rob them of their culture, and hence, of their critical and independent reasoning faculties.

Even The New York Times chimed in on what the real underlying philosophy of Flexner's proposal really was, and what its ultimate issue would be:

“Unblushing materialism finds its crowning triumph in the theory of the modern school. In the whole plane there is not a spiritual thought, not an idea that rises about the need of finding money for the pocket and food for the belly... It is a matter of instant inquiry, for very sober consideration, whether the General Education Board, indeed, may not with the immense funds at its disposal be able to shape to its will practically all the institutions in which the youth of the country are trained. If this experiment bears the expected fruit we shall see imposed on the country a system of education born of the theories of one or two men, and replacing a system which has been the natural outgrowth of the American character and the needs of the American people.”³⁴²

Rockefeller put his close friend, business and personal advisor, and director of charity for the Rockefeller Foundation, Frederick T. Gates, in charge of his General Education Board (GEB).” In 1913 Gates tipped the Rockefeller philosophy on education in the Board's Occasional Paper No.1:

“In our dream, we have limitless resources, and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hand. The present educational conventions fade from our minds; and, unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive rural folk. We shall not try to make these people or any of their children into philosophers or men of learning or of science. We are not to raise up from among them authors, orators, poets, or men of letters. We shall not search for embryo great artists, painters, musicians. Nor will we cherish even the humbler ambition to raise up from among them lawyers, doctors, preachers, politicians, statesmen, of whom we now have ample supply.”

³⁴³

The General Education Board soon expanded horizons to take into its "molding hands" the city folk at well. As Rene Wormser, Counsel for the congressional Reece Committee observed:

“Research and experimental stations were established at selected universities, notably Columbia, Stanford, and Chicago. Here some of the worst mischief in recent education was born. In these Rockefeller-and-Carnegie established vineyards worked many of the principal characters in the story of the suborning of American education. Here foundations nurtured some of the most ardent

³⁴² The New York Times, Jan 21, 1917, Sections 7-8, p. 2, cited in Lionni, The Leipzig Connection, p. 74.

³⁴³ The Country School of Tomorrow: Occasional Papers No. 1 (General Education Board: New York, 1913) written by Frederick T. Gates, then president of the GEB, contained a section entitled “A Vision of the Remedy”

academic advocates of upsetting the American system and supplanting it with a Socialist state.”³⁴⁴

Wormser also revealed that the Committee had discovered that these foundations were using their wealth to attack the basic structure of our Constitution and Judeo-Christian ethics; and that the Carnegie Endowment was attempting to mold the minds of our children by deciding “what should be read in our schools and colleges.” He also described how the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment, and the Carnegie Corporation jointly sponsor conferences to push the goals of the United Nations.³⁴⁵

At an annual meeting in St. Paul Minnesota in 1914, National Education Association (NEA), alarmed by the activity of the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations, passed a resolution which stated:³⁴⁶

“We view with alarm the activity of the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations—agencies not in any way responsible to the people—in their efforts to control the policies of our State educational institutions, to fashion after their conception and to standardize our courses of study, and to surround the institutions with conditions which menace true academic freedom and defeat the primary purpose of democracy as heretofore preserved inviolate in our common schools, normal schools, and universities.”

The U.S. Congress first investigated the activities of the large foundations in 1915 under the Commission on Industrial Relations. The Commission found that,

“The domination by the men in whose hands the final control of a large part of American industry rests is not limited to their employees, **but is being rapidly extended to control the education and social survival of the nation. This control is being extended largely through the creation of enormous privately managed funds for indefinite purposes, hereafter designated “foundations”**, by the endowment of colleges and universities, by the creation of funds for the pensioning of teachers, by contributions to private charities, as well as through controlling or influencing the public press...”

The 1917 Congressional Record of the United States Senate published the following excerpt from a booklet containing articles by Bishop Warren A. Candler, Chancellor of Emory University in Atlanta:

“This board [the Rockefeller’s General Education Board] was authorized to do almost every conceivable thing which is anywise related to education, from opening a kitchen to establishing a university, and its power to connect itself with the work of every sort of educational plant or enterprise conceivable will be especially observed. This power to project its influence over other corporations

³⁴⁴ Foundations: Their Power and Influence (Devin-Adair: New York, 1958, p. 341),

³⁴⁵ Ibid.

³⁴⁶ In 1917 NEA reorganizes and moves to Washington DC where it becomes the largest labor union in the U.S..

is at once the greatest and most dangerous power it has.”

Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations planned the demise of traditional academic education in 1918. Rockefeller’s focus would be national education; Carnegie would be in charge of international education:

"The only way to maintain control of the population was to obtain control of the education in the U.S. They realized this was a prodigious task so they approached the Rockefeller Foundation with the suggestion that they go in tandem so the portion of education which could be considered domestically oriented would be taken over by the Rockefeller Foundation, and the portion which was oriented to international matters be taken over by the Carnegie Endowment."³⁴⁷

The Guggenheim Foundation agreed to award fellowships to historians recommended by the Carnegie Endowment. Gradually, through the 1920’s, they assembled a group of twenty promising young academics, and took them to London. There they briefed them on what was expected of them when they became professors of American history. That twenty were the nucleus of what was eventually to become the American Historical Association. The Guggenheim Foundation also endowed the American Historical Association with \$400,000 at that time.

The International Bureau of Education was established in 1925 with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. The Bureau later became part of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

The foundations (principally Carnegie and Rockefeller) stimulated two-thirds of the total endowment funding of all institutions of higher learning in America during the first third of this century. During this period the Carnegie-Rockefeller complex supplied 20 % of the total income of colleges and universities and became in fact, if not in name, a sort of U.S. Ministry of Education:

“A very powerful complex of foundations and allied organizations has developed over the years to exercise a high degree of control over education. Part of this complex, and ultimately responsible for it, are the Rockefeller and Carnegie groups of foundations.”

The Father of modern education

A great influence on how public education would be directed was the Rockefeller-supported John Dewey (1859–1952), better known as the "Father of modern education" and a great influence with the powerful National Education Association (NEA). Dewey, with Rockefeller money, helped found Teachers College; by 1912 it was the fourth largest graduate school in the US.

At the same time the National Education Association, the country's chief education lobby, was also financed largely by the Rockefellers and Carnegie foundations. It, too, threw its considerable weight behind the Dewey philosophies. As an NEA report maintained in 1934:

³⁴⁷ Interview with chief investigator Norman Dodd, 1980. Interview can be viewed online: Norman Dodd On Tax Exempt Foundations <https://youtu.be/YUYCBfmlcHM>

“A dying laissez-faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the "owners," must be subjected to a large degree of social control.”

Little wonder that Reece Committee Counsel Wormser says evidence compiled during and after the Reece investigation of foundations:

“There is much evidence that, to a substantial degree, foundations have become the directors of education in the United States....Leads one to the conclusion that there was, indeed something in the nature of an actual conspiracy among certain leading educators in the United States to bring about socialism through the use of our school systems....The impact of foundation money upon education has been very heavy, largely tending to promote uniformity in approach and method, tending to induce the educator to become an agent for social change and a propagandist for the development of our society in the direction of some form of collectivism.”³⁴⁸

Mr. Dewey's progressive model of active learning or pragmatism promoted a revolt against abstract learning and attempted to make education an effective tool for integrating culture and vocation. He was also the co-author of the "Humanist Manifesto" which called for a "synthesizing of all religions" and a socialized and cooperative economic order." John Dewey dismissed math, history, science, literature, geography—In order to make room for cooking, sewing, and manual training. Now, here's what must be confronted directly: would the average American have voted for this? Of course not.

The U.S. House Committee on Un-American Activities later discovered that Dewey belonged to 15 Marxist front organizations. Dewey taught the professors who trained America's teachers. Obsessed with "the group," he said, "You can't make socialists out of individualists. Children who know how to think for themselves spoil the harmony of the collective society, which is coming, where everyone is interdependent." In 1932 John Dewey became honorary president of the Rockefeller funded NEA.³⁴⁹

Since the beginning of Western civilization, school curriculum was centered around the development of academic skills, the intellectual faculties, and high literacy. Dewey wanted to change all of that. This was because high literacy produced that abominable form of independent intelligence which was basically, as Dewey believed, anti-social. Thus, from Dewey's point of view, the school's primary commitment to literacy was indeed the key to the whole problem. In 1897, my Pedagogic Creed by John Dewey was published. In it, Dewey states,

“I believe that the school is primarily a social institution.... Examinations are of use only so far as they test the child/s fitness for social life...”

³⁴⁸ Once again, a collectivist society is totalitarian in nature where all things belong to and are done to serve a greater good. This “so-called” greater good is almost always ambiguous and dictated by those wielding the power of the centralized government—regardless of how harsh, arbitrary or incompetent it may be. This is a desirable system of government for those with wealth and power. The “people” are never the benefactors of this type of system.

³⁴⁹ Dennis Laurence Cuddy, PH.D., Chronology of Education with Quotable Quotes, 1993) p. 17

In 1898, Dewey wrote an essay, “The Primary–Education Fetish,” in which he explained exactly what he meant:³⁵⁰

“There is... a false education god whose idolators are legion, and whose cult influences the entire educational system. This is language study—the study not of foreign language, but of English; not in higher, but in primary education. It is almost an unquestioned assumption, of educational theory and practice both, that the first three years of a child’s school life shall be mainly taken up with learning to read and write his own language. If we add to this the learning of a certain amount of numerical combinations, we have the pivot about which primary education swings.... It does not follow, however, that conditions—social, industrial and intellectual—have undergone such a radical change, that the time has come for a thoroughgoing examination of the emphasis put upon linguistic work in elementary instruction.... The plea for the predominance of learning to read in early school life because of the great importance attaching to literature seems to me a perversion.”

The same premise underlies the 170 pages of Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on Social Studies, published by the Rockefeller funded American Historical Association in 1934. Its Committee on Direction included CFR member Isaiah Bowman, CFR member George Counts, CFR member Carlton J. H. Hayes and Jesse H. Newton. Excerpts follow:

“Under the molding influence of socialized processes of living there is a notable waning of the once widespread popular faith in economic individualism; and leaders in public affairs, supported by a growing mass of the population, are demanding the introduction into economy of ever wider measures of planning and control. Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez-faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.³⁵¹”

Since America's public school system was decentralized, the secret network of organizations had concentrated on influencing schools of education, and on financing the writing of textbooks which were subsequently adopted nationwide. These foundation-produced textbooks were so heavily slanted in favor of socialism that Wormser concluded:

“It is difficult to believe that the Rockefeller Foundation and the National Education Association could have supported these textbooks. But the fact is that Rockefeller financed them and the N.E.A. promoted them very widely.”

The Cox Committee, named for its chairman, Congressman E.E. Cox, had denounced these foundations for precisely these reasons. He named in particular the Rockefeller Foundation—whose funds have been used to finance individuals and organizations

³⁵⁰ Dennis Laurence Cuddy, PH.D., Chronology of Education with Quotable Quotes., 1993) p. 9

³⁵¹ Again, collectivism is a system of government, such as communism, fascism, and other forms of tyranny where all things belong to and are done to serve the “so-called” greater good of those wielding the power.

whose business it has been to get communism into the private and public schools of the country, to talk down America and play up Russia.

It goes without saying that, by controlling the textbooks, these foundations gained an open sesame to the minds of millions of students in the government schools. As prominent American Journalist John T. Flynn observed, it wasn't necessary to poison every glass of water coming out of every tap in a given community. It was necessary only to drop one cup of poison into the reservoir, a strategy that Adolph Hitler was well aware of when it came to molding the thoughts of a child into the goals of the state:

"Let me control the textbooks and I will control the state...When an opponent declares, 'I will not come over to your side,' I calmly say, 'Your child belongs to us already...What are you? You will pass on. Your descendants, however, now stand in the new camp. In a short time they will know nothing else but this new community."

Harold Rugg, writer of the Rockefeller funded Social Studies Textbook Series Entitled The Frontier Thinkers which was published by the Progressive Education Association, in 1921 became president of the National Association of Directors of Education Research which would later become known as the American Educational Research Association. In his book, The Great Technology (1933), Harold Rugg elucidated the grand vision:

"A new public mind is to be created. How? Only by creating tens of millions of individual minds and welding them into a new social mind. Old stereotypes must be broken up and 'new climates of opinion' formed in the neighborhoods of America. Through the schools of the world we shall disseminate a new conception of government - one that will embrace all the activities of men, one that will postulate the need of scientific control... in the interest of all people."

The Rockefeller-endowed Lincoln Experimental School at Columbia Teachers College was the testing ground for Harold Rugg's series of textbooks, which moved 5 million copies by 1940 and millions more after that. In these books Mr. Rugg advanced this theory:

"Education must be used to condition the people to accept social change... The chief function of schools is to plan the future of society."

Like many of his activities over three vital decades on the school front, the notions he had put forth in The Great Technology (1933), were eventually translated into practice in urban centers. He advocated that the major task of schools be seen as "indoctrinating" youth, using social "science" as the "core of the school curriculum" to bring about the desired climate of public opinion.

Money for Rugg's six textbooks came from Rockefeller Foundation grants to the Lincoln School. He was paid two salaries by the foundation, one as an educational psychologist for Lincoln, the other as a professor of education at Teachers College, in addition to salaries for secretarial and research services. The Rockefeller Foundation funded General Education Board provided to produce three books, which were then distributed by the Rockefeller and Carnegie funded National Education Association.

In an address before the Sixth World Fellowship of the New Education Fellowship—this being the international organization of the Progressive Education Movement—at Nice, France, in 1932, Rockefeller-supported Dr. Rugg declared:

“The world is on fire, and the youth of the world must be equipped to combat the conflagration. Nothing less than thoroughgoing social reconstruction is demanded, and there is no institution known to the mind of man that can compass that problem except education.”

So successful was this movement that by June of 1955, the Progressive Education Association which had been founded by John Dewey officially disbanded. Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish, the Association's president, explained:

“Founded in 1919 the PEA was a protest movement against traditional education, based in large part up on the philosophy of John Dewey. One reason for PEA's end is that many of the practices it has advocated have been adopted by the nation's schools.”

The preceding words of Dr. Paul Mantoux, Director of Politics of the League of Nations (precursor to the United Nations), are taken from the foreword to *International Understanding* by John Eugene Harley, published by the Stanford University Press in 1931 (Mr. Mantoux was also specifically named by Dr. Quigley as a member of Lord Milner's Secret Round Table society in England):

“And the builder of this new world must be education. Education alone can lay the foundation on which the building is to rest. On this point a kind of consensus has been reached by those who trust the future of international cooperation and those who refuse to believe in it. When the latter go about repeating that to succeed in such a task one would have to change human nature, they do but exaggerate the acknowledged need for a **gradual and patient reshaping of the public mind.... How can a well-prepared elite be raised throughout the world to spread its influence over the masses,** who can then support them in their turn?... Here we encounter the real problem, and it is essentially a problem of education.... In our day, the problem has become more far-reaching still. Brutal events have supplied evidence of a truth that had been slowly gaining ground, namely, **the interdependence of nations and the need for establishing in the world an order** and harmony hitherto lacking.”

In 1943, the American Federation of Teachers published a book authored in part by CFR member Dr. George S. Counts, titled *America, Russia, and the Communist Party in the Postwar World*. In its Preface, the book indicates that one of the problems “progressive” education must face is that of “education for world-citizenship.”³⁵² All of these studies reflected a prewar study, funded by the Carnegie Corporation in 1934, a study which was eventually published in the book *Conclusions and Recommendations for the Social Studies*, under the auspices of the American Historical Association. The significant implications of this sponsorship are revealed by a significant statement on the very first page:

³⁵² Iserbyt., p. 50.

“The Commission could not limit itself to a survey of textbooks, curricula, methods of instruction, and schemes of examination, but was impelled to consider the condition and prospects of the **American people as a part of Western Civilization merging into a world order.**”³⁵³

In other words, the American Historical Association viewed, and views, its role principally as a “gatekeeper” insuring that curricula, textbooks, and instruction are all consonant to “a world order.” Those components of Western civilization that are not consonant to that order are presumably to be ignored and gradually withdrawn from the popular culture via the social engineering process of schooling.

United States membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 1946 marked the end of United States autonomy in education. From this time on UNESCO would dictate education policy to our government and others. This legislation was accompanied by President Harry Truman’s remarkable statement: “Education must establish the moral unity of mankind.”

Truman’s recommendation was bolstered by Dr. Brock Chisholm, director of the UN World Health Organization and friend of Soviet agent Alger Hiss (CFR member). Chisholm redefined health to include “mental” health, and asserted for the reinterpretation and eventually eradication of the concept of right and wrong as belated objectives of practically all effective psychotherapy. Chisholm went on to recommend that teachers all over the world be trained in “no right/no wrong” psychotherapeutic techniques found in the schools today. Chisholm advocated the gradual shaping of human behavior for the pursuit of world government:

“**To achieve world government**, it is necessary to remove from the minds of men their individualism, loyalty to family tradition, national patriotism and religious dogmas....”³⁵⁴

President Eisenhower’s (CFR member) closest advisor, his brother Milton Eisenhower, addressing the closing session of the first day’s conference on UNESCO at Wichita, Kansas., December 12, 1947 explained:

“**One can truly understand UNESCO** only if one views it in its historical context [and] viewed in this way it reveals itself as **one more step** in our halting, painful, but I think very **real progress toward a genuine world government.**”³⁵⁵

In 1948, Julian Huxley (first Director-General of UNESCO) wrote in ‘UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy’:

“The general philosophy of UNESCO should be a scientific world humanism,

³⁵³ Ibid., p. 40, citing the American Historical Association, *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Social Studies* (New York: Chas. Scribner’s Sons, 1934), p. 1.

³⁵⁴ The Utah Independent, (September, 1977).

³⁵⁵The Kansas Story on Unesco . Dept. of State Publication 3378. Int’l . Org’n. and Conference Series IV, United Nations Educational, Scientific & Cultural Org’n. 7, March, 1949. (P. 23)

global in extent and evolutionary in background... In its education program it can... familiarize all peoples with the implications of **the transfer of full sovereignty from separate nations to a world organization...** Tasks for the media division of UNESCO [will be] to **promote the growth of a common outlook** shared by all nations and cultures... **to help the emergence of a single world culture.**"³⁵⁶

The Eleventh International Conference on Public Education, held at Geneva, Switzerland, the end of June 1948, based its discussions upon the initial draft. Convened by UNESCO and the International Bureau of Education, the Conference considered these propositions:

"That one of the chief aims of education today should be the preparation of children and adolescents to participate consciously and actively in the building up of a world society" [and] That this preparation should include the formation and **the development of psychological attitudes favorable to the construction, maintenance and advancement of a united world"**

By 1950 the Rockefeller Foundation endowed Columbia Teachers College in New York City, formerly named the Russell's Teacher College, produced one-third of all presidents of teacher-training institutions, one-fifth of all American public school teachers, and one-quarter of all superintendents. The Rockefeller Foundation additionally funded and founded the University of Chicago, Rockefeller University (which focused on offering only postgraduate and postdoctoral education), the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, Harvard School of Public Health as well as the Rockefeller University Press. They also controlled school textbook companies and scholastic literature copyrights used in the public school systems thus being able to direct the historical narrative used in schools through Guggenheims American Historical Society.

The following remarks were added to the Congressional record in 1951 on UNESCO:

"UNESCO's scheme to pervert public education appears in a series of nine volumes, titled 'Toward Understanding' which presume to instruct kindergarten and elementary grade teachers in the fine art of preparing our youngsters for the day when their first loyalty will be to a world government, of which the United States will form but an administrative part... The program is quite specific. The teacher is to begin by eliminating any and all words, phrases, descriptions, pictures, maps, classroom material or teaching methods of a sort causing his pupils to feel or express a particular love for, or loyalty to, the United States of America. Children exhibiting such prejudice as a result of prior home influence - UNESCO calls it outgrowth of the narrow family spirit - are to be dealt an abundant measure of counter propaganda at the earliest possible age. Booklet V, on page 9, advises the teacher that:"

"The kindergarten or infant school has a significant part to play in the child's education. Not only can it correct many of the errors of home training, but it can also prepare the child for membership, at about the

³⁵⁶ Dennis Laurence Cuddy, PH.D., Chronology of Education with Quotable Quotes, 1993) p. 9

age of seven, in a group of his own age and habits – the first of many such social identifications that he must achieve on his way to membership in the world society."³⁵⁷

In testimony to Congress in 1952, Congressman William Jenner of Indiana asked:

"How many of you Senators know what the UN is doing to change the teaching of the children in your own home town? The UN is at work there, every day and night, changing the teachers, changing the teaching materials, changing the very words and tones—changing all the essential ideas which we imagine our schools are teaching to our young folks. How in the name of Heaven are we to sit here, approve these programs, appropriate our own people's money—for such outrageous "orientation" of our own children, and of the men and women who teach our children, in this Nation's schools?" ³⁵⁸

In 1956 Rockefeller associate, Dr. George S. Counts (CFR member) helped organize a small group of educators to look at changing the curricula, textbooks and teaching techniques in the schools of America. The group was called the Commission on Social Studies of the American Historical Association. Its work was financed by the Carnegie Corporation and was carried out by the Carnegie founded American Historical Association. The Commission recommended that separate courses in history, economics, civics, and geography be abandoned – or, rather, all combined into one course to be called 'social studies,' with emphasis on 'social' or 'conflict of masses' ideas. ... Here was the most strategic of all teaching areas for the advancement of a particular philosophy. Important excerpts from the Commission's Conclusions and Recommendations were:

"The Commission "deems desirable the incorporation into the material of social science instruction in the schools of the best plans and ideals of the future of society and of the individual. Bearing in mind the Commission's dictum that **collectivism**³⁵⁹ "is the future already coming into reality", its **recommendations clearly indicate how the schools are to "best" serve this "future."** Organized public education in the United States, much more than ever before, is now compelled, if it is to fulfill its social obligation, to adjust its objectives, its curriculum, its methods of instruction, and its administrative procedure to **the requirements of the emerging integrated order**...It must recognize **the new order** and proceed to equip the rising generation to cooperate effectively in the increasingly **interdependent society** and to live rationally and well within its limitations and possibilities....**To "condition" the child for this "new" order**, emphasis will be placed on the development of the social and creative rather than the acquisitive impulses."³⁶⁰

³⁵⁷From the Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 82nd Congress, First Session on Thursday, October 18, 1951.

³⁵⁸ Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates, Volume 98, Part 2, 1952, p. 2553

³⁵⁹ Once again, in a collectivist system, such as communism and fascism, the dictatorial government has complete control and authority over the people.

³⁶⁰ Conclusions And Recommendations For The Social Studies (Chas. Scribner's Sons: New York, 1934)

Professor Harold Laski, a philosopher of British socialism, said of this report: “At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a Socialist America.”

As prominent banker and CFR member James Warburg, explained in 1959:

“We are living in a perilous period of **transition from the era of the fully sovereign nation-state to the era of world government**, and a deliberate search for methods and means by which American children may best be educated into responsible citizens not merely of the United States but of the world.”³⁶¹

Professor John Goodlad, renown educational researcher, theorist, and recipient of Rockefeller Foundation grants for at least thirty years, said in 1969:

“The most controversial issues of the twenty-first century will pertain to the ends and means of **modifying human behavior** and **who shall determine them**. The first educational question will not be “what knowledge is of the most worth?” but “what kinds of human beings do we wish to produce?” The possibilities virtually defy our imagination.”

On February 21, 1986 Senator Jesse Helms made a presentation of the “Americanism Award” to Mr. Norman Dodd, congressional research director for the 1953–1954 Reece Committee, recognizing his courageous work during the Congressional investigation of tax-exempt foundations. The following is an excerpt of Senator Helms’ videotaped comments:

“...I am convinced that there can’t be any other American who has done more to bring the attention of the American people to the real story of the onslaught against American civilization than that distinguished American, Mr. Norman Dodd. [I]t was ...1954 when Mr. Dodd served as the able director of research for the Reece Commission to investigate the tax-exempt foundations, and oh sir! how they needed to be investigated. Mr. Norman Dodd, as research director of the Reece Committee, provided a great service to our nation by exposing the real designs of the tax-exempt foundations, such as, who else but the Rockefeller Foundation, and the bottom line of their activities was, and it still is, fundamentally to alter our cultural life so that socialism instead of freedom becomes the American way of life. That’s what they’re about. Oh, they have other pretexts, just as do such organizations today as the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission. We are sounding a call to arms...[The public needs to] go back to the hearing records of the Reece Committee and carefully review the massive amount of testimony and findings—over 1,000 pages.”

In April 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) said in its final report, *A Nation at Risk*:

“**Our society and its educational institutions seem to have lost sight of the**

³⁶¹ James Paul Warburg, “The West in Crisis” 1959

basic purposes of schooling, and of the expectations and disciplined effort needed to attain them.”

The NCEE report also went on to describe the dumbing down of America as an act of war:

“If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves.”

The examination of the record as set out in this chapter explicitly shows that the takeover of education and the dumbing down that has resulted was not by accident; it is deliberate as evidenced in yet another example: On November 11, 1992, Several Days After The 1992 Presidential Election, Marc Tucker, of the Carnegie Corporation, and the existing director of the National Center on Education and the Economy wrote a letter to Hillary Clinton on NCEE letterhead in which he excitedly outlined the opportunity the Clinton Administration now had to “remold the entire American system...” He provided a detailed blueprint for a revolution to completely change our nation and its citizens by training children from a very young age to properly serve the global economy. The letter’s introductory paragraph stated:

“I still cannot believe you won! But utter delight that you did pervades all the circles in which I move. I met last Wednesday in **David Rockefeller’s office with him**, John Sculley [Apple Computer executive] et al. It was a great celebration. Both John and **David R. were more expansive than I have ever seen them**—literally radiating happiness. My own view and **their’s** is that this country has seized its last chance....

...**We** propose, first, that the President appoint a national council on human resource development.... It would be established in such a way to assure continuity of membership across administrations, so that the consensus it forges will outlast any one administration....Second, we propose that a new agency be created, the National Institute for Learning, Work and Service.”³⁶²

Going deeper.... The 18 page letter laid out a plan "to remold the entire American system" into "a seamless web that literally extends from cradle to grave and is the same system for everyone," a system of unending skill development that begins in the home and continues through school, post-secondary education and the workplace. It was a concept for essentially dumbing-down our schools and changing the character of the nation through behavior modification. It moved away from an academically intensive curriculum to one that is integrated with vocational training, producing skilled manpower for the labor market. In it Tucker said, **"Our objective will require a change in the prevailing culture--the attitudes, values, norms, and accepted ways of doing thing."**

This plan by Tucker and Rockefeller was implemented in three laws passed by Congress and signed by President Clinton (CFR, Trilateral Commission, Bilderberg

³⁶² In 1998, Rep. Bob Schaffer placed in the Congressional Record an 18-page letter that has become known as Mr. Marc Tucker's "Dear Hillary" letter.

Group member) in 1994: the Goals 2000 Act, the School-to-Work Act, and the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Common Core

The Common Core State Standards were subsequently crafted in 2009 behind closed doors by a small group of individuals also connected to the Carnegie Foundation, and then copyrighted by two Washington lobbyist group (the National Governors Association (NGA), and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)), making it devoid of any government ownership.³⁶³ These private organizations transformed the formal education of tens of millions of elementary, middle-school, and high-school students in America overnight, without any oversight or any way for American citizens electorally to get at them.³⁶⁴

The fact that the people who secretly designed Common Core are unknown by the general public (unelected and non-government) and beyond public control is not all too surprising based on what the Reece congressional investigation discovered back in 1954:

“The result of the development and operation of the network in which Foundations have played such a significant role seems to have provided this country with what is tantamount to a national system of education under the tight control of organizations and persons, little known to the American public. Its operations and ideas are so complex as to be beyond public understanding or control.”³⁶⁵

When it came to the actual implementation of Common Core, American taxpayer dollars were used to force State governments to adopt Common Core into the schools (any state that took this federal money, in any form at all, was obligated to adopt the Common Core State Standards when they were finally written). Most of the states who simply took the money out of desperation for their state education budgets agreed to take Common Core, sight unseen—as this was before the Common Core Standards were ever written.

Here’s Diane Ravitch, respected liberal historian of American education, and former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Education summing up the implementation of Common Core:

³⁶³ In America we actually have a 1965 federal statute that prohibits the Federal Government from creating a national curriculum, or national education standards. Common Core was a successful attempt to circumvent that. Moreover, in 1979 the law that created the Department of Education forbids it to exercise "any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum" or "program of instruction" of any school system. Furthermore, the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees that the states have sovereignty over educating their children. The power to oversee education belongs to the states or to the people themselves, not to the federal government.

³⁶⁴ The copyright of Common Core states: NGA Center/CCSSO shall be acknowledged as the sole owners and developers of the Common Core State Standards, and no claims to the contrary shall be made. Any publication or public display shall include the following notice: "Copyright 2010. National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers. All rights reserved." States and territories of the United States as well as the District of Columbia that have adopted the Common Core State Standards in whole are exempt from this provision of the license.

³⁶⁵ Dodd Report to the Reece Committee on Foundations on pg.12

“I have long advocated for voluntary national standards, believing that it would be helpful to states and districts to have general guidelines about what students should know and be able to do as they progress through school. Such standards, I believe, should be voluntary, not imposed by the federal government....For the past two years, I have steadfastly insisted that I was neither for nor against the Common Core standards. I was agnostic. I wanted to see how they worked in practice...I have come to the conclusion that the Common Core standards effort is fundamentally flawed by the process with which they have been foisted upon the nation.....[The President and Education Secretary] often say that the Common Core standards were developed by the states and voluntarily adopted by them. This is not true. They were developed by an organization called Achieve and the National Governors Association, both of which were generously funded by the Gates Foundation. There was minimal public engagement in the development of the Common Core. Their creation was neither grassroots nor did it emanate from the states. In fact, it was well understood by states that they would not be eligible for Race to the Top funding (\$4.35 billion) unless they adopted the Common Core standards. Federal law prohibits the U.S. Department of Education from prescribing any curriculum, but in this case the Department figured out a clever way to evade the letter of the law. Forty-six states and the District of Columbia signed on, not because the Common Core standards were better than their own, but because they wanted a share of the federal cash... The Common Core standards have been adopted in 46 states and the District of Columbia without any field test. They are being imposed on the children of this nation despite the fact that no one has any idea how they will affect students, teachers, or schools. We are a nation of guinea pigs, almost all trying an unknown new program at the same time.... The former Texas state commissioner of education, Robert Scott, has stated for the record that he was urged to adopt the Common Core standards before they were written. Now that David Coleman, the co-lead author of the Common Core standards, has become president of the College Board, we can expect that the SAT will be aligned to the standards. No one will escape their reach, whether they attend public or private school. Is there not something unseemly about placing the fate and the future of American education in the hands of one man?”³⁶⁶

As Ms. Ravitch alluded to, the actual writing of Common Core has been traced back to a very small group of unelected individuals connected to the Carnegie Corporation, chief of whom is David Coleman. He has never been elected to anything; he has never been appointed to anything; and he doesn't have the kind of educational background that would qualify him to oversee the writing of national standards in anything.

Obviously there are many problems with the way Common Core was implemented. After the standards had been paid for by the Gates Foundation and drafted, they convened a committee of twenty-nine individuals called the Validation Committee, whose job was to validate the standards. Well, unbelievably, of the twenty-nine people that Common Core brought to Washington, there was only two individuals with any type of education credentials or scholarly background. There was only one expert in

³⁶⁶ Former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Education Diane Ravitch, who was appointed to office under both President Clinton and George H.W. Bush “Why I Oppose Common Core Standards,” February of 2013, in which she summarized many of the concerns that most critics of Common Core have.

English, and one expert in Math. (These were the two sets of standards being validated at the time – English and Math).

Professor James Milgram, a Stanford University Math professor, who did most of the mathematical calculations for the Apollo moon shot in the late '60s, was the Math expert. The English professor was Dr. Sandra Stotsky, also a University professor, and considered to be one of the foremost English Language Arts expert in America today. Well, both Stotsky and Milgram **voted absolutely No on the Common Core Standards**. In fact, so disturbed were they by the Standards that they convinced other people on the Committee to vote No. Milgram said, and I quote: "It's an absolute joke to think that Common Core math will prepare American children for college, careers, for college math, or for STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) careers." "An absolute joke", Milgram called it. Dr. Stotsky said, and I quote: "Common Core English will set our kids two years behind the two years they're already behind the rest of the world in reading, writing and comprehension." They managed to convince other people on the Committee too. But what the Validation Committee did was: rather than allow Stotsky and Milgram – the only two experts –to rewrite the Standards completely (which is what they wanted to do), the Committee just erased their comments from the entire procedure.³⁶⁷

Moreover, not only were childhood professionals excluded from the crafting of Common Core Standards, **but grave doubts by the some of the most knowledgeable education and health experts were actually raised well before Common Core was ever implemented**. In fact, in 2010 more than 500 early childhood professionals submitted grave concern that the imposition of these standards were developmentally inappropriate and endangers children. The Joint Statement of Early Childhood Health and Education Professionals on the Common Core Standards Initiative was signed by educators, pediatricians, developmental psychologists, and researchers, including many of the most prominent members of those fields. Their statement reads in part:

"We have grave concerns about the core standards for young children.... The proposed standards conflict with compelling new research in cognitive science, neuroscience, child development, and early childhood education about how young children learn, what they need to learn, and how best to teach them in kindergarten and the early grades...."³⁶⁸

³⁶⁷ "[Dr] Milgram and I were members of Common Core's Validation Committee, which was charged with reviewing each successive draft of the standards. We both refused to sign off on the academic quality of the national standards, but made public our explanation and criticism of the final version of Common Core's standards." Dr. Sandra Stotsky Denver Post, December 17, 2013 "State and national policy makers, educators, and the general public have been misinformed and are thoroughly confused...They do not seem to understand that [the] Common Core's standards do not prepare high school students for STEM [Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths] areas in college."

³⁶⁸ The Joint Statement opposing the standards was signed by three past presidents of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) (the foremost professional organization for early education in the U.S) Yet it had no role in the creation of the K-3 Core Standards.—David Elkind, Ellen Galinsky, and Lilian Katz—and by Marcy Guddemi, the executive director of the Gesell Institute of Human Development; Dr. Alvin Rosenfeld of Harvard Medical School; Dorothy and Jerome Singer of the Yale University Child Study Center; Dr. Marilyn Benoit, past president of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry; Professor Howard Gardner of the Harvard Graduate School of Education; and many others.

Unbelievably, instead of answering the serious criticism and warnings, the people driving this Common Core juggernaut crafted the following Limitation of Liability:

“Under no circumstance shall NGA Center or CCSSO...be liable for any...damages however caused and on any legal theory of liability...arising in any way out of the use of the Common Core State Standards, even if advised of the possibility of such risk and potential damage...”³⁶⁹

Those who control education will over a period of several generations control a nation

The historical record provides extensive detail to how education in America became co-opted and corrupted. These findings affirm what the Congressional Committee investigations into the major tax-exempt Foundations found, that the powerful foundations (Rockefeller and Carnegie) have been the controlling influence in American education for over a century directly opposite of the founding principles of individual freedom that our country is based on. It documents their continuing efforts to manipulate and control Americans using the educational system as the primary vehicle for bringing about planned social, political, and economic change towards world government. These powerful interests have explicitly changed the education system from one that is based on the freedom to learn to think critically as individuals, to a system to modify behavior, attitudes and beliefs which have nothing to do with commonly understood educational objectives. These findings are similar in many ways to what the Reece congressional investigation found, that the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations were undermining extremely important aspects of our way of life in the U.S., and that all of this dumbing down of our public schools was deliberate and not some sort of huge national accident. The success in creating a dumbed down educational system in this country has allowed the wealthy and powerful families of this country to assimilate the people of this country into a population which can be easily deceived and controlled, thus keeping them from ever doing anything about it.

³⁶⁹ [www.corestandards.org/public -license](http://www.corestandards.org/public-license)

XI
THE TAKEOVER OF AMERICA'S POLITICAL SYSTEM

The Council on Foreign Relations is an organization that people don't really know what it is, but increasingly this phrase, "CFR," "Council on Foreign Relations," is becoming more and more common. People don't know much about it, but they've heard it so it's no longer alarming when they hear it.

There are four things we must understand about the CFR

(1) One is that this Council on Foreign Relations is not the inner-core of a secret society. It's two rings out from the center, at least. And then the ring beyond the CFR is much bigger. That ring is called the Republican-Democrat Party. That's the next ring out, and there are rings beyond that. The CFR also has its own organizational "rings within rings" structure which allows for such a large, semi-secret group to still hold public forums and maintain a publically accessible website and maintain some past-and-present members who are seemingly pro-American, while those in the core inner group of the CFR directs the policy and aims of the CFR. What does that mean? It means that just because people are in the Council on Foreign Relations does not mean that they're all part of the inner-core of the secret society. In fact, some CFR members may not have the slightest clue as to who is directing them or why.

(2) Second is they are not partisan. This is perhaps the most important thing to know today is that this is not an issue of Republicans versus Democrats. You find about an equal number of Republicans and Democrats on this membership list. To these people, political partisanship is a joke. They use partisan politics as a gimmick to manipulate the thinking and the loyalties and the activities of the common man. None of these people are Democrats or Republicans with the capital letters in front of them — only as a matter of convenience. That's the second thing to know.

(3) The third thing to know is that many people in the CFR are elitists. Many of whom intend to rule the world—as Admiral Chester Ward found out firsthand as a member of the CFR—**"submergence of U.S. sovereignty into an all-powerful one-world government"**³⁷⁰— but they really believe that their vision of the New World Order, based on the model of collectivism, is the highest morality and they intend to use any method whatsoever to bring that about. An example of how these people think that their plan for all-powerful World Government is of the highest good is described by David Rockefeller in a speech to the International Industrial Conference in 1965:

"Each of us has the duty to fashion his own contribution to fit the grand design of a global community. What we do will manifest itself in ways that we cannot foretell and it will have an unforeseen impact upon individual lives and whole societies.... What we are is God's gift to man: what we become is man's gift to God."

(4) The fourth thing to know is that the method by which they intend to rule is called democracy.³⁷¹

³⁷⁰ Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward, *Kissinger on the Couch* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1975), 144-50.

³⁷¹ Contrary to popular belief, the form of government in our country is not a democracy, it is actually a republic—and there is a vast difference between the two forms of government.

How does a ruling elite control the masses in an age where people have been conditioned to think that they should determine their own political destiny? We've been taught in America we'll vote on everything and our vote will make it correct, and as long as we're given the vote, everything is fine. We've been taught that, so how does the ruling elite deal with that mass psychology where everybody thinks that they should have a right to vote on their leaders and on the issues and so forth? Quigley answers that question in his book. He says to perpetuate the deception of democracy, to allow people to continue to think that they are participating in their own political destiny, all we have to do is **create two political parties and control them both** and let the idiots jump from one party to the next and choose one candidate adverse the other as long as they never get out of that two-box trap that we set for them. Let them really battle each other on secondary issues, but when it comes to the final end game of building a New World Order — building an all-powerful one-world government based on the model of collectivism — all candidates in both parties must be in total agreement. That's the Round Table formula. Here's what Quigley said about this:

"The national parties and their presidential candidates with the Eastern Establishment assiduously fostering the process behind the scenes moved closer together and nearly met in the center with almost identical candidates and platforms. Although the process was concealed as much as possible by the revival of obsolescent or meaningless war cries and slogans, often going back to the civil war. **The argument that the two parties should represent opposed ideals and policies, one perhaps of the right and the other of the left, is a foolish idea except to the doctrinaire and academic thinkers. Instead, the two parties should be almost identical so that the American people can throw the rascals out at any election without leading to any profound or extreme shifts in policy.** Either party in office becomes in time corrupt, tired, un-enterprising and vigorless. Then it should be possible to replace it every four years if necessary by the other party, which will be none of these things but which will still pursue with new vigor approximately the same basic policies."³⁷²

That is the Secret Network formula, and if it sounds familiar it's because we have been living under that formula since at least World War I.

Let's take a look at some of these basic policies that Quigley is talking about

It is anything that advances the New World Order based on the model of collectivism. The candidates and the parties should be fierce campaigners. They should attack each other with great vigor but, when the elections are over, they will work as a team for their common goals. All else is showmanship. As long as they are advancing the goal of the New World Order based on the model of collectivism, then everything else is just showmanship. Let's turn to a couple of brief examples.

Just about every major political event in American politics since War II is a good example if you know what to look for. For instance, the Panama Canal. The Carter administration gave away the Panama Canal, but the thing was that nobody wanted that. The voters didn't want that. Republican voters didn't want that. Democrat voters didn't want it. They conducted polls among the American people and the poll was overwhelmingly — approximately, 85% or something wanted to save the Panama Canal

³⁷² Tragedy and Hope, page 1247

for the American people, and the other 15% didn't have an opinion. And yet they gave away the Panama Canal. Why? Who were these elected representatives serving? That happened to have been the goal of the Council on Foreign Relations and the drive to give away the Panama Canal was led on both sides of the aisle by members of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Now in a more current day the Republicans, of course, are clamoring for war in the Middle East and they advocate that we give more power to the UN. Now the Democrats, they're different. They call for peace in the Middle East and advocate that we give more power to the UN. Of course, after the Democrats did win a majority in Congress, we thought, oh, now there's going to be a big shift in policy. Well, there wasn't, was there? Quigley called it exactly. They could argue about it in campaign days, but once you're elected you go back to what you're programmed to do, which is to follow the directives of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The Republicans promote legislation to restrict rights in the name of terrorism. The Democrats give speeches of concern over that, and then they vote for those laws. There's really no difference except the rhetoric. The electorate does not want that, but that is the goal of the Council on Foreign Relations. By the way, the legislation for the Patriots Act I and II and all the rest of these liberty-stealing acts that came through after 9/11, all of those were written in principle before 9/11, and they were written by members of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The Democrats promote legislation to restrict freedom in the name of stopping global warming. The Republicans object strongly to that, and then they vote for those laws. Now the electorate doesn't want that, but that is the goal of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The Republicans are all for restricting freedom of speech in order to prevent sedition — anti-sedition laws to protect America and to protect the government, to protect our homeland. The Democrats don't like that, but they promote similar laws in the name of stopping hate speech. Hate speech now is prohibited. The American people don't want that — either of those—but both of those are the goal of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Republicans give speeches about the danger of illegal immigration. The Democrats give speeches about compassion, and then both of them join together and support measures promoting a borderless country. The American people don't want that, but that is the goal of the Council on Foreign Relations.

When anti-Common Core activism was most vibrant, candidates for Republican offices in all 50 states promised to push back on the intrusive standards if elected. American voters installed them in record numbers and even won back the U.S. Senate. Despite Republican control of the House, Senate, and the majority of governorships and state legislatures, no progress was ever made in removing Common Core at the State level. The American people didn't want that, but that is the goal of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Republican party leaders in the past have allegedly stolen elections outright using electronic voting machines that were designed to be fraudulent — not something that

was hacked into and some evil person figured out how to rig a perfectly innocent election voting machine.³⁷³ These machines are designed from the very beginning to do that. You would think the Democratic National Committee leaders would be outraged because their candidate reportedly lost the election with rigged voting machines, but they're not. They did nothing. They remained silent because they know that rigged voting machines are really the ultimate form of what Dr. Quigley describes. They know that this is the way — ultimately — to allow the American people to think that they're participating in their own political destiny. (Now there's quite a grassroots movement to expose all of this and to reverse all this, but you'll find that this is coming from the grassroots. There's no support whatsoever from the top of either political party).

We have to mention the cheerleaders too. It's not just the political candidates themselves, but the cheerleaders are out there to tell us how to think and to shape the debate, and they're the ones that really have as much or maybe more influence on how we vote than the candidates themselves. So who are the cheerleaders? Rush Limbaugh would be one. He would be right up there at the top. If there was an award to give a Roundtable Network cheerleader, he would get an award. He does a great job of exposing and ridiculing corrupt Democrats, but he never met a Republican he didn't like, regardless. He's all for the UN and will never mention the CFR — never.

On the other side, we've got such a nice likeable guy, Michael Moore. Now Michael does a great job of exposing and ridiculing corrupt Republicans, but he never met a Democrat he didn't like, and he's all for the UN and will never mention the CFR.

There's an organization that many of you have heard about called Accuracy in Media. I used to think they were pretty good because they did a great job of exposing the deceit and treachery within the ranks of Democrats, and then finally it dawned on me — hey guys, what about the other side of the aisle. They never mention deceit and treachery among the Republican groups, and they never mention the CFR.

There's an organization called MoveOn. It does a great job of exposing deceit and treachery within the ranks of Republicans, but it never criticizes Democrats whatsoever, and never mentions the CFR. Are you beginning to get the picture here? We have cheerleaders that are on the payroll.

A carefully crafted illusion of political choice

Few voters also never seem to consider the way in which they initially meet "their" choices for president. If a strange man were to knock on their door and say "I'm running for president of the United States," there is almost zero chance they'd view him as a legitimate candidate. However, if they meet the exact same stranger through one of the Round Table Network's main propaganda instruments (radio, print, or television), suddenly the reaction is very different. Suddenly the stranger deserves a serious look.

This is what Bernays (pioneer in the field of public relations and propaganda) referred to as "one of the most firmly established principles of mass psychology," and the

³⁷³ There are many allegations of fraud to include statistical studies performed on some of 2004's many electoral voter machine anomalies found that they almost certainly weren't coincidence. For one example, see <http://www.electionmathematics.org/em-exitpolls/OH/2004election/ohio-exit-polls-2004.pdf>

Establishment Elite applies the principle masterfully. Essentially, it is this: the vast majority of people accept the idea that “credible” individuals and organizations should be trusted to do their reasoning for them.

In the case of elections, the public trusts the so-called credible media to narrow the field down to the top-tier candidates. A political “sideshow” ensues and, at the end, voters choose who they’d prefer to have in office. But their choice isn’t what they perceive it to be. Sure, they are technically choosing who they prefer, but they are choosing from a list of candidates that was chosen for them.

Sadly, this sleight of hand works just as well today as it did one hundred years ago. And unless this concept becomes widely understood, it will work one hundred years from now as well. Returning to Bernays, from his book Propaganda:

“Political campaigns today are all sideshows, all honors, all bombast, glitter, and speeches. These are for the most part unrelated to the main business of studying the public scientifically, of **supplying the public with party, candidate, platform...and selling the public these ideas and products.**”

In short: without the Network’s backing, a candidate will remain a relative nobody in the election. They will be relegated to begging door to door for enough money to run an (almost meaningless) advertising campaign. However, with the backing of the Establishment Elite, the candidate can count on millions of dollars in campaign donations, a long list of credible endorsements, and a nearly priceless amount of exposure through the Round Table Network’s propaganda instruments. (In the unlikely event that a truly independent candidate emerges, with enough money or a large-enough following to gain some ground, the Network will simply use its instruments to smear and ostracize the candidate and the candidate’s supporters.)

To be clear, this isn’t to suggest that the Network-backed candidates are necessarily involved in the election deception. “President of the United States” is a job title that fewer than forty-six men have held. The desire to join the ranks of such an exclusive club, with all of its attendant perks, is undoubtedly very real. The candidates might even genuinely disagree with a few positions held by their opponents. In fact, it’s even better if they do. (The meaningless bickering between them, and the partisan hysteria it incites among the public, only adds to the overall illusion of voter choice.) But on the issues that matter most to the Establishment Elite, each sponsored candidate is virtually identical in value.

The beauty of this system is its simplicity. The Network scouts potential talent, performs the necessary background checks, and, after conveying its expectations, offers its vital assistance to a handful of candidates. After some “bombast, glitter, and speeches,” the public chooses from the products (party, candidate, and platform) that were put before them.

The Establishment, through their influence within the two major parties, as well as the media, they can pretty much predetermine the Democratic and Republican nominees for President.

For example, Robert A. Taft admitted after his defeat at the 1952 Republican convention that "Every Republican candidate for President since 1936 has been nominated by the Chase National Bank." A good example of how this works, we can look at 1976 when CFR and Trilateral Commission member Jimmy Carter was elected President.

Trivia question: According to a Gallup poll, taken just seven months before Carter was nominated at the Democratic National Convention, what percent of Democratic voters favored him for President? Answer: less than 4 percent.³⁷⁴

Carter was governor of Georgia; few people outside the state even knew who he was. What happened? As Lawrence Shoup noted in his 1980 book *The Carter Presidency and Beyond: What Carter had that his opponents did not* was the acceptance and support of elite sectors of the mass communications media. It was their favorable coverage of Carter and his campaign that gave him an edge, propelling him rocket-like to the top of the opinion polls. This helped Carter win key primary election victories, enabling him to rise from an obscure public figure to President-elect in the short space of 9 months.³⁷⁵

The media blitz included adulatory pieces in the *New York Times*, and a *Wall Street Journal* editorial declaring that Carter was the best Democratic candidate. Before the nominating convention, his picture appeared on the cover of *Time* three times, and *Newsweek* twice. *Time's* cover artists were even instructed to make him look as much as possible like John F. Kennedy.³⁷⁶

The major TV networks inundated the public with his image. How did Carter acquire this media following? It began with a dinner with David Rockefeller –kingmaker of the Establishment –at the latter's Tarrytown, New York estate. Also present was Zbigniew Brzezinski, who helped Rockefeller found the internationalist Trilateral Commission, and whom Carter would later appoint National Security Adviser.

Former Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater said of this meeting:

"David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski found Jimmy Carter to be their ideal candidate. They helped him win the nomination and the presidency. To accomplish this purpose, they mobilized the money power of the Wall Street bankers, the intellectual influence of the academic community –which is subservient to the wealth of the great tax-free foundations –and the media controllers represented in the membership of the CFR and the Trilateral."³⁷⁷

Not surprisingly, Carter got the nomination at the Democratic Convention. But did he win it because **(A)** all across America, sovereign voters spontaneously decided he was the best candidate; or because **(B)** he was picked in a high place, and then packaged and sold through the media?

³⁷⁴ "Jimmy Carter," Wikipedia, www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/JimmyCarter

³⁷⁵ Ibid.

³⁷⁶ Gary Allen, *Jimmy Carter*, Jimmy Carter (Seal Beach, Calif.: '76 Press, 1976), 139.

³⁷⁷ Barry Goldwater, *With No Apologies* (New York: William Morrow, 1979), 286.

Sadly, the answer is the latter. Our so-called representative government is all a carefully crafted illusion: **the Secret Round Table Network** through their influence within the two major parties, as well as the media **chooses the candidates** that we get to vote for; **both political parties**, right and left, **are controlled by the exact same people**; and **the Network's "experts," not the figureheads** placed in official positions of power, **are the ones who ultimately determine government policy**.

Examples of how the Round Table Network's "experts," not the figureheads placed in official positions of power, are the ones who ultimately determine government policy:

(1) The following is an admission by President Obama's National Security Adviser (CFR member) James L Jones at the 45th Munich Conference on Security Policy, in 2009, which provides an example of how members of this Network covertly run the United States behind the scenes:

"Thank you for that wonderful tribute to Henry Kissinger yesterday. Congratulations. As the most recent National Security Advisor of the United States, **I take my daily orders from Dr. Kissinger**, filtered down through General Brent Scowcroft and Sandy Berger, who is also here. We have a chain of command in the National Security Council that exists today."³⁷⁸

This is public confirmation about who actually controls the US government. James Jones was appointed through the democratic process approved by Congress, as a member of the Obama administration, but here he is stating categorically that **he takes his orders daily** from Henry Kissinger via two other **unappointed** and **unelected** individuals, Brent Scowcroft (CFR member, Trilateral Commission member and former member of the George W. Bush administration), and Sandy Berger (member of both the CFR and the secretive Bilderberg group and former member of the Bill Clinton administration)—who are each private citizens. (Kissinger—who hasn't held an official position in government for over 30-years—is a member of the CFR, Trilateral Commission and secretive Bilderberg group). These three have been **given no mandate** whatever by the American people, and yet, as Jones confirms, Kissinger **has direct control over US national security**.

(2) To provide yet another example of individuals formulating and controlling US economic and political policy from behind the scenes, the following is an interview between reporter, Jeremiah Novak, and two unelected/unappointed Trilateral Commission members, Karl Kaiser (Bilderberg group member) and Richard Cooper (member of both the CFR and the secretive Bilderberg group):

NOVAK (the reporter): "Is it true that a private [Trilateral Commission] led by Henry Owen [CFR Member] of the US and made up of [Trilateral Commission] representatives of the US, UK, West Germany, Japan, France and the EEC is coordinating the economic and political policies of the Trilateral countries [which would include the US]?

COOPER: Yes, they have met three times.

³⁷⁸ <http://www.cfr.org/world/remarks-national-security-advisor-jones-45th-munich-conference-security-policy/p18515>

NOVAK (the reporter): Yet, in your recent paper you state that this committee should remain informal because to formalize 'this function might well prove offensive to some of the Trilateral and other countries which do not take part. Who are you afraid of?

KAISER: Many countries in Europe would resent the dominant role that West Germany plays at these [Trilateral Commission] meetings.

COOPER: Many people still live in a world of separate nations [!], and they would resent such coordination [of policy].

NOVAK (the reporter): But this [Trilateral Commission] committee is essential to your whole policy. How can you keep it a secret or fail to try to get popular support [for its decisions on how Trilateral member nations will conduct their economic and political policies]?

COOPER: Well, I guess it's the press' job to publicize it.

NOVAK (the reporter): Yes, but why doesn't President Carter³⁷⁹ come out with it and tell the American people that [U.S.] economic and political power is being coordinated by a [private Trilateral Commission] committee made up of Henry Owen and six others? After all, if [U.S.] policy is being made on a multinational level, the people should know.

COOPER: President Carter and Secretary of State Vance have constantly alluded to this in their speeches.

KAISER: It just hasn't become an issue."³⁸⁰

This exchange shows U.S. economic and political policy being run by an unelected committee of the international private Trilateral Commission—headed by the late David Rockefeller, of which there are only 87 members of the Trilateral Commission who live in America.³⁸¹

Syndicated columnist Edith Kermit Roosevelt, granddaughter of President Theodore Roosevelt, penned an accurate, though restrained, description of this reality:

“The word “Establishment” is a general term for the power elite in international finance, business, the professions and government, largely from the northeast, who wield most of the power **regardless of who is in the White House**. Most people are unaware of the existence of this “legitimate Mafia.” Yet the power of the Establishment makes itself felt from the professor who seeks a foundation

³⁷⁹ President Carter was a member of both the CFR and the Trilateral Commission

³⁸⁰ "Trilateralism: The Trilateral Commission and Elite Planning for World Management," ed. by Holly Sklar, 1980. South End Press, Boston. Pages 192–3.

³⁸¹ Four years before birthing the Trilateral Commission with his boss, David Rockefeller, Zbigniew Brzezinski wrote: "[The] nation state as a fundamental unit of man's organized life has ceased to be the principal creative force. International banks and multinational corporations are acting and planning in terms that are far in advance of the political concepts of the nation state."

grant, to the candidate for a cabinet post or State Department job. It affects the nation's policies in almost every area."³⁸²

As Roosevelt makes explicitly clear "regardless of who is in the White House", it doesn't matter whether the President is Democrat or Republican; the real rulers in Washington are invisible, and exercise power from behind the scenes.

The existence of a secret Establishment that pulls the strings of our elected officials was also described by author Arthur Miller in the Rockefeller Foundation funded book *The Secret Constitution and The Need For Constitutional Change*:

"...those who formally rule **take their signals and commands, not from the electorate** as a body, but from a small group of men (plus a few women). This group will be called the Establishment. It exists even though that existence is stoutly denied; it is one of the secrets of the American social order. A second secret is the fact that the existence of the Establishment – the ruling class – is not supposed to be discussed."³⁸³

Lewis Lapham, American Writer, Editor of Harper's Magazine, and Host and Author of a weekly PBS series admits that the political game is rigged:

"The shaping of the will of Congress and the choosing of the American president has become a privilege reserved to the country's equestrian classes, a.k.a. the 20% of the population that holds 93% of the wealth, the happy few who run the corporations and the banks, own and operate the news and entertainment media, compose the laws and govern the universities, control the philanthropic foundations, the policy institutes, the casinos, and the sports arenas."

Dan Smoot, former FBI agent with time spent in the FBI's Communist Investigation Branch, had this to say about the reality of our political process:

"The unseen who took control of government ...[t]heir tentacles of power are wrapped around levers of political control in Washington; reach into schools, big unions, colleges, churches, civic organizations; dominate communications; have a grip on the prestige and money of big corporations. **For a generation, they have kept voters from effecting any changes at the polls. Voters are limited to the role of choosing between parties to administer policies which they formulate.** They are determined to convert this Republic into a socialist province of a one-world socialist system."³⁸⁴

Quigley provides further details into how this takeover was carried out:

³⁸² Edith Kermit Roosevelt, "Elite Clique Holds Power in U.S.," Indianapolis News, December 23, 1961, 6.

³⁸³ *The Secret Constitution and The Need For Constitutional Change*, Greenwood Press, New York, 1987, prologue, p. 3

³⁸⁴ Dan Smoot, *The Invisible Government*, 1962

“To [J.P.] Morgan all political parties were simply organizations to be used, and the firm always was careful to keep a foot in all camps. Morgan himself, Dwight Morrow [CFR member], and other partners were allied with Republicans; Russell C. Leffingwell [CFR member] was allied with the Democrats; Grayson Murphy [CFR member] was allied with the extreme Right; and Thomas W. Lamont [CFR member] was allied with the Left...”³⁸⁵

“...they expected that they would be able to control both political parties equally. Indeed, some of them intended to contribute to both and allow an alternation of the two parties in public office in order to conceal their own influence, inhibit any exhibition of independence by politicians, and allow the (voters) to believe that they were exercising their own free choice.”³⁸⁶

“they continued to contribute to some extent to both parties and did not cease their efforts to control both. In fact on two occasions, in 1904 and in 1924, J.P. Morgan was able to sit back with a feeling of satisfaction to watch a presidential election in which the candidates of both parties were in his sphere of influence...Usually, Morgan had to share his political influence with other sectors of the business oligarchy, especially with Rockefeller interest (as was done, for example, by dividing the ticket between them in 1900 and in 1920.)”³⁸⁷

To sum up the hijacking of American Politics, the Round Table Network maintains a monopoly of power by maintaining control of the political system of the countries they control. In the U.S. this is done in part by ensuring only two major parties (both of which they control) where the public are lead to believe they have a say and minor competition among lower level politicians is allowed, but at the top only those that are approved and properly vetted are allowed to ascend to the top.

To summarize the substance of this problem

We in America have chosen to accept a fairly obvious falsehood: that the government is an instrument of the people, that it is subject to the will of the governed, and nobody (inside or outside of government) is above the law. We do not understand how we're being manipulated. We see only the image of government that the “true ruling power” wants us to see. And if we continue turning exclusively to the same ruling power for all of our information, our perception will never change.

To most of us, the idea of a highly organized shadow government, operating at the direct expense of the governed, is laughed off without investigation. We might passionately believe that Republicans are corrupt and only the Democrats can save us, or that Democrats are corrupt and only Republicans can save us, but we have yet to recognize the deeper truth: neither Republicans nor Democrats are ever going to save us. Both sides are funded and maintained by the same ruling class to create the illusion of choice. The Right Wing and the Left Wing are both wings of the same ugly power-seeking bird.

³⁸⁵ Tragedy and Hope, page 945

³⁸⁶ Tragedy and Hope, page 73

³⁸⁷ Tragedy and Hope, page 74

XII
THE UNTOLD HISTORY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

This chapter will analyze the historical record to gain an understanding of the purpose and operations of the United Nations. There is probably no better way to understanding what the United Nations stands for than to know the hidden history of the Congo; what follows is the fascinating story of the tiny nation of Katanga:

“If the Congo does go Communist, it will not be because of Soviet strength or because the Congolese people want Communism; it will be because of UN policy in the Congo and because of the perverse following that induces us to support this policy with our prestige and our money.” –Senator Thomas Dodd, November 1962

This is the story of how the U. N., from 1960 to 1962, waged an unprovoked war against the peaceful state of Katanga and forced it under the control of the Communist state of the Central Congo. Top U.N. personnel boasted in their public speeches and memoirs of how they pretended to be preserving law and order while actually carrying out a military operation to crush the tiny nation, all in the name of peace. The great irony in this was that the free world was told – and the American people firmly believed – that the U.N. army had been sent to the Congo to “protect it from Communism.”

This chapter reveals the broken promises which the UN made to Moise Tshombe in order to deceive him, and to turn over to the central government the only province of the Congo where law and order had prevailed and where freedom was the watchword of its leaders. It also shows the Communist infiltration into the personnel at the UN, and exposes the treachery and subversion that flourishes there. The reason this story needs to be told after all these years is because the best way to envision the future is to know the past.

It was December 12, 1961. Christmas was coming to Katanga. Smith Hempstone, African correspondent for the Chicago News, reported from Elisabethville:

“United Nations jets next turned their attention to the center of the city. Screaming in at treetop level while excited soldiers and white civilians popped away at them with anything from 22 pistols to submachine guns, they blasted the post office and radio station, severing Katanga's communications with the outside world. One came to the conclusion that the United Nations' action was intended to make it more difficult for correspondents to let the world know what was going on in Katanga, since the only way press dispatches could be filed was to drive them 150 miles to Northern Rhodesia over a road studded with tribal roadblocks and subject to United Nations air attacks. By December 12, 1961 . . . mortar shells hailed down on the center of the city as the softening up process began Among the "military objectives" hit: a beauty shop, the apartment of the French consul, Sabena Airways office, the Roman Catholic Cathedral, the Elisabethville museum.”³⁸⁸

The forty–six civilian doctors of Elisabethville unanimously issued a joint report on the United Nations actions against Katanga which included the following account of the December 12, 1961, bombing of the Shinkolobwe hospital:

³⁸⁸ Smith Hempstone, *Rebels, Mercenaries and Dividends* (New York, Frederic A. Praeger, Inc., 1962), pp. 190–193. Smith Hempstone

"The Shinkolobwe hospital is visibly marked with an enormous red cross on the roof of the administrative pavilion.

At about 8 a.m. two aeroplanes flew over the hospital twice at very low altitude; at about 9:30 a.m. the aeroplanes started machine-gunning. . . the market square, and then the school and the hospital in which there were about 300 patients and their families.

The administrative building, the left wing of the four pavilions and the household buildings . . . were bombed and show hundreds of points of impact made by the machine-gun bullets.

In the maternity, roof, ceilings, walls, beds, tables and chairs are riddled with bullets; a bomb exploded in another pavilion which was luckily unoccupied; the roof, the ceiling, half of the walls and the furniture have been blasted and shattered...The blood from the wounded makes the buildings look like a battlefield.

In the maternity, four Katangan women who had just been delivered and one newborn child are wounded, a visiting child of four years old is killed; two men and one child are killed.

Out of the 300 patients, 240 fled into the bush, refusing to be evacuated to any other hospital, for they say . . . "the UNO prefers to aim at the hospitals and we would henceforth no longer feel safe there."³⁸⁹

Professor Ernest van den Haag made a personal visit to the Congo to witness firsthand the events and conditions there. In commenting on the United Nations statement that the only civilians wounded in Katanga were combatants in the resistance, he said:

"It is hard to speak, as I did, with a mother whose husband was killed at home in her presence with bayonets by UN soldiers. She was in the hospital to help take care of her six-year-old child, severely wounded by United Nations bayonets. A child's bayonet wounds are hardly due to having been suspected of being mercenary or combatant."³⁹⁰

To better understand the situation in Katanga we need only go back a few years in time to late-1950 when the worldwide Communist drive of "anti-colonialism" had reached an all-time high. As defined by the Communists, this drive to break away all colonial holdings from non-Communist countries like Belgium, Portugal, France, and England, of course, was not out of humanitarian instincts. Their purpose was twofold. First, they knew that breaking away these colonial holdings would unavoidably weaken the non-Communist countries that had them and depended on them for much of their economic viability and, to some extent, for their military national security. The second

³⁸⁹ 46 Angry Men (Belmont, Mass., American Opinion, 1962), pp. 60-63; originally published by T. Vleurinck, 96 Avenue de Broqueville, Bruxelles 15, 1962.

³⁹⁰ Ernest van den Haag, The War in Katanga (New York, American Committee for Aid to Katanga Freedom Fighters, 1962), p. 11.

reason was that a newly-emergent government with its inexperienced leadership is relatively easy to infiltrate and subvert to the cause of international Communism. So, in one fell swoop the Communists' program of anti-colonialism not only weakened their enemies but also provided them with golden opportunities to capture still more of the earth's terrain and population. Needless to say, the Communists were not interested in discussing the granting of independence to their own colonial holdings, the captive nations behind the iron curtain.³⁹¹

In keeping with the prevailing mood, Communist and Afro-Asian delegates at the United Nations had initiated a series of resolutions calling for the immediate independence of the Belgian Congo. The United States also went on record in favor of this position and exerted no small amount of pressure on the Belgian government to comply. Finally, after a few sporadic anti-colonial demonstrations in the Congo, Belgium yielded to international pressure and, with the support of Belgian business interests and over 6,000 Belgian troops, the Congo was granted its independence, on June 30, 1960.³⁹²

Congolese Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba

At the time of dissolution, Patrice Lumumba was the Prime Minister of the regime's central government. He was a deranged and degenerate dope addict; he was a willing agent of the Communists; he worked tirelessly to bring chaos, anarchy and bloodshed to the Congo as the necessary first stage toward his ultimate goal of complete and unlimited dictatorship with himself nominally at the top and with Communist power to back him up. It was well known that for at least two years the Soviets had been supplying Lumumba with arms, ammunition, military vehicles and other necessary supplies to insure an "appropriate spontaneous" uprising of the people against their "colonial-imperialist masters." In addition to the hardware, they provided \$400,000 a month with which to buy followers and provide them with the little extras that insure loyalty, such as cars, extravagant parties, and women. Lumumba's Communist backing was widely acknowledged and had been described in detail in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.³⁹³

Writing in the Brooklyn Tablet on April 15, 1961, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen said:

"Lumumba set up a Communist organization among his fellow tribesmen, the Batetelas, making them believe that he was the incarnation of his ancestors. During the elections, Lumumba's troops destroyed most of the ballot boxes of the other candidates...The plans for the Communist revolution in the Congo were prepared in Prague, and in the first three months, Lumumba carried out the first three points of the plan: to organize mutiny in the army; put the blame on the Belgians; organize a terrorist regime."³⁹⁴

³⁹¹ Stalin, A Collection of Articles on the National Question (October 1920), author's preface. Republished in Selected Works (1953), vol. 4, pp. 385-386.

³⁹² Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (August 3, 1962). Also, Congressman Donald C. Bruce, Congressional Record (September 12, 1962).

³⁹³ Ibid.

³⁹⁴ Statement by Bishop Fulton J. Sheen in the Tablet (Brooklyn, April 15, 1961). Entered in the Congressional Record by Congressman Donald C. Bruce (September 12, 1962).

Although few Americans knew it at the time (or know it even now) evidence of Communist support for Lumumba was so plentiful and undeniable that U.N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold felt obliged to reassure the non-Communist world that Soviet aid to Lumumba was actually in support of United Nations policy, and therefore presumably quite all right.³⁹⁵

Even Conor Cruise O'Brien, chief United Nations representative in Katanga, admitted that the Soviets had given Lumumba 100 trucks, 29 transport planes and 200 technicians.³⁹⁶ These figures, of course, were an underestimation. For one thing, they did not include the more than two hundred Russian and Czechoslovakian "diplomats" who were by then swarming all over the Congo.³⁹⁷ And finally, as revealed later by Colonel Joseph Mobutu, who had been serving under Lumumba, communist China had promised Lumumba \$2,800,000 in aid.³⁹⁸

Lumumba had written: "if necessary, I shall not hesitate to call in the DEVIL to save the country...I am convinced that with the unreserved support of the Soviets, I shall win the day in spite of everything!"³⁹⁹

Joseph Yav, a former Lumumba associate and economics minister of his government until July 17, 1960, made the following statement to Philippa Schuyler, an American reporter in the Congo at the time of independence:

"Yes, Lumumba is a Communist! I know it. I have proof. This does not mean Lumumba understands the ideological theories of Communism or its intellectual background. He's never read Das Kapital. He went Red not for mental convictions but because he was bought. On his visit to Russia and East Germany, he was given money, presents, girls and lavish hospitality. He never looked behind the glitter to see the real foundation of these slave states."⁴⁰⁰

Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev even changed the name of the Peoples Friendship University near Moscow to the Patrice Lumumba Friendship University on February 22, 1961 in honor of this "great African leader."⁴⁰¹

President Moise Tshombe

Moise Tshombe was the first democratically elected President of Katanga. As the son of a successful African merchant, had earned a college degree, was a devout Christian,

³⁹⁵ Hempstone, pp. 123.

³⁹⁶ Conor Cruise O'Brien, *To Katanga and Back* (New York, Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1962), p. 93.

³⁹⁷ Lessing, p. 142.

³⁹⁸ 10 "Bare Red Plot by Lumumba," *Chicago Tribune* (November 2, 1960)

³⁹⁹ *Serious and Irrevocable Decisions Reached by the Government of the Republic of the Congo*, UN document (A/4711/ADD 2 (March 20, 1961), pp. 41-42.

⁴⁰⁰ Philippa Schuyler, *Who Killed the Congo?* (New York, The Devin-Adair Company, 1962), p. 154. Philippa Schuyler has been a news correspondent for UPI, the *New York Mirror*, *Spadea Syndicate*, and the *Manchester, New Hampshire, Union Leader*.

⁴⁰¹ Lessing, pp. 110-111.

and had the overwhelming support and respect of the people who elected him to the presidency of Katanga. Not only was he a staunch anti-Communist, he was an ardent advocate of the concepts of limited government and the free enterprise system. He was a student of history and a great admirer of the success of western ideals. He fully understood the wisdom of the traditional American political system of checks and balances with a further division of power between the Federal Government and the states. Explaining his views, he said: "We would like something rather on the American model. We are willing to have a federal president and to give the central government control of the army, the customs and that sort of thing."⁴⁰²

With this background in mind, it is not hard to see why Tshombe was anathema to the Communists. Khrushchev ranted, "Tshombe is a turncoat, a traitor to the interests of the Congolese people."⁴⁰³ It is interesting to note that despite his character and pro-western ideals, Tshombe was also anathema to U.S. officials. While wining and dining almost every Communist dictator on the face of the earth from Khrushchev to Tito to Castro to Lumumba, the U.S. State Department flatly refused to grant a visa for Tshombe to enter the United States.⁴⁰⁴ It is also noteworthy that he was almost universally depicted by the media as "shrewd," "a Belgian puppet," "opportunistic," and the usual journalistic innuendoes carefully designed to turn public opinion against a person about whom nothing specifically bad can be found.

The Crisis in the Congo

Shortly after the dissolution of the Belgian Congo in June, 1960, Katanga President Moise Tshombe proclaimed Katanga an independent and autonomous nation. The Katangese government went on to appeal for Belgium military aid to support their unilateral declaration of independence. Tshombe was also seeking support and recognition from the United States for his cause, as he felt that they shared a common concern for exploitation of the Congo Crisis by the Soviets who were at the time backing the Congolese central government under Prime Minister Lumumba.

Even after the United Nations had initiated a bloody war against Katanga to force it to abandon this position of independence, Tshombe held firm. Returning to Katanga after the December United Nations attack, he said, "Katanga must be unified with its brothers in the Congo but remain sufficiently free so that its fate will not be sealed on the day the shadow of Communism spreads over this country."⁴⁰⁵

It did not take very long but a few days after Katalanga's declaration of independence before chaos ensued in the streets. The Congolese army mutinied against its Belgian officers. Lumumba reacted immediately by discharging the officers and expelling them from the country. Devoid of professional military command and whipped up by Lumumba and his followers, the Congolese army went on a spree of plunder, murder and rape. European residents fled in terror by the thousands leaving behind their homes, their possessions, their businesses, and everything they had worked for.

⁴⁰² As quoted by Hempstone, p. 95.

⁴⁰³ As quoted by Hempstone, p. 68.

⁴⁰⁴ Visa Procedures of Department of State, report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (also referred to in footnotes and text as the SISS) (August 6, 1962).

⁴⁰⁵ As quoted by Hempstone, p. 221. Also, as quoted by Schuyler, p. 293.

Few Americans understood what was going on. The American media did not provide insight into why this chaos had happened or who had triggered it. It was made to appear as something that just happened. Newswoman Philippa Schuyler shed a little light on how it "just happened" when she reported:

"They had been maliciously egged on to start the disorder. In the wee hours of July 9, someone rushed into the barracks shouting, "Come and fight! The whites are about to attack you! You're about to be killed!"

No one was attacking the soldiers. It was a deliberate lie, with frightful consequences."⁴⁰⁶

The Reverend Mark Poole of the Luluabourg Presbyterian Mission and other missionaries in the Congo confirmed that the outbreaks of violence were undoubtedly Communist inspired and that they were too widespread and well coordinated to have just happened by chance.⁴⁰⁷

As soon as word of the chaos reached Brussels, Belgium ordered its troops back to the Congo to protect the lives and property of its citizens there. In a fit of rage Lumumba officially declared war on Belgium and called on the United Nations for military help against Belgian intervention. The United Nations complied. At the outset, however, Belgium called on its NATO friend, the United States, for help so that it could not be accused of trying to perpetuate its influence in its former possession. Washington refused, saying it would rather act through the United Nations. Soviet Premier Khrushchev lashed out against the Belgians, calling them "criminal aggressors." The very same day, July 14, 1960, the United States delegation at the United Nations sided with the Soviets in a resolution stoutly condemning Belgium, demanding immediate withdrawal of her troops, and authorizing the United Nations to send troops of its own to assist Lumumba.⁴⁰⁸ Within four days, the first four thousand United Nations troops were flown into the Congo by U.S. Air Force planes. Many additional thousands were on the way. By July 23 most of the Belgian troops had withdrawn. The territory was now in the hands of Lumumba's mutinous army and the United Nations "peace-keeping" forces.

The plunder and rape continued and spread. Journalist Smith Hempstone reported:

"Not only was the United Nations singularly ineffective in reestablishing order in these regions but it did little to assist in the evacuation of terrified white women and children from these provinces. The United Nations had planes available to evacuate to Stanleyville Gizengists [supporters of the Communist Antoine Gizenga] who felt themselves in danger in areas under the control of the Leopoldville Government. But it showed little interest in evacuating whites from Stanleyville...If a Lumumbist was maltreated, a general outcry could be expected from the Communist bloc, the Afro-Asian nations, and from liberal

⁴⁰⁶ Schuyler, p. 238.

⁴⁰⁷ Schuyler, p. 238.

⁴⁰⁸ UN document S/4387.

circles in Britain and America. If a white woman was killed or molested. . .it made little difference."⁴⁰⁹

Newswoman Schuyler reported:

"...a uniformed rabble was ruling Stanleyville—there was continual extortion, brawling, beating and arbitrary arrests. Portuguese and Greeks had to pay as much as \$60 to drunken soldiers to avoid arrest. Passengers arriving at Stanleyville's airport were met with a bayonet in the stomach, while Congolese loafers would scream, "We are the masters!" Congolese seized European cars right and left while UN Colonel Yohanna Chites said he could not intervene."⁴¹⁰

The following account appeared in the New York Daily News under the heading "Congo Rebels Attack UN Train, Slay Kids":

"Hundreds of rebel Baluba tribesmen yesterday massacred at least 20 Africans in three attacks on a UN guarded train taking school children home for a New Year's vacation. Scores of others were injured and many passengers kidnapped by rebels after the attacks in Southern Katanga...The train left Elisabethville . . . with some 300 passengers, including 100 children, and a strong guard of UN troops. But, when it reached Kamina . . . in western Katanga, only 40 people were aboard. . . . At Luena, three passengers were killed, many were kidnapped and the station was pillaged. Several African women passengers . . . were raped. At Bukama, waves of tribesmen attacked the train again with spears, clubs, rifles, bows and arrows and machetes, killing 17 passengers and kidnapping many more. A spokesman said that the 17 persons who died at Bukama "were killed under the eyes of the UN."

Roger Nonkel, the assistant high commissioner of Sankuru in Kasai province, stated:

"The UN are unable to restore order, and what is more, they are not even trying. In August, I asked help for Lusambo from Colonel Lasmar [chief of UN troops in Kasai]...I told him that with fifty UN soldiers I could prevent war between the Batetela [Lumumba's tribe].... and the Baluba. He answered me coldly: "Let them kill themselves."⁴¹¹

The Communist plan for taking over the Congo was progressing as planned

Step one: Capture control of the leadership at the top. Step two: Bring about utter and complete chaos to justify the harsh police-state measures which must be used to establish firm dictatorial rule. Step three: Put the blame on non-Communists. Step four: Maneuver as many non-Communists as possible into actually doing the dirty work for them. Now came the visible beginnings of step number five, the police-state measures themselves.

⁴⁰⁹ Hempstone, p. 134.

⁴¹⁰ Schuyler, p. 238.

⁴¹¹ Schuyler, p. 189-190.

On August 2, 1960, the Congolese central government decreed that any Belgian business which had been abandoned during the mayhem would be confiscated by the state unless reclaimed within eight days. The Congo's largest and most influential newspaper *Le Courier d'Afrique* was seized by the government, forced to shut down, and its editor was thrown in jail for printing critical remarks about Lumumba. The editor was finally expelled to Belgium and the paper resumed operation with a more "acceptable" editorial policy.⁴¹²

Lumumba moved swiftly to consolidate his totalitarian control. On September 15 he issued the following lengthy and highly revealing directive to the heads of the various provinces throughout the Congo:

1. "Establish an absolute dictatorship and apply it in all its forms.
2. Terrorism, essential to subdue the population.
3. Proceed systematically, using the army, to arrest all members of the opposition. I will be personally responsible for those at Leopoldville including the Head of State and his close supporters. A few weeks ago, in view of the present situation in Katanga and Sud-Kasai, I sent the National Army to arrest Tshombe and Kalonji and even to kill them if possible.
4. Imprison the ministers, deputies and senators, who sometimes abuse their parliamentary immunity. In such a case I should be glad if you would not spare them but arrest them all without pity and treat them with ten times more severity than ordinary individuals.
5. Revive the system of flogging and give the rebels 10 lashes, morning and evening, for a maximum of 7 consecutive days. Double the number in the case of ministers, senators, and deputies, reducing the number gradually according to the condition of each individual.
6. Inflict profound humiliations on the people thus arrested, in addition to the obligatory treatment described above. For example, strip them in public, if possible in the presence of their wives and children. Make them carry heavy loads and force them to walk about in that state. In case of such a walk, however, drawers may be worn.
7. In view of the seriousness of the situation of the country, which is in danger of sinking into anarchy, it would be well to imprison repeated offenders in underground cells or prisons for at least six months, never allowing them out to breathe fresh air. If some of them succumb as a result of certain atrocities, which is possible and desirable, the truth should not be divulged but it should be announced, for instance, that Mr. X has escaped and cannot be found.
8. Those who do not succumb in prison should not be released for at least a year. In this case they shall be exiled to a country to be determined by me in

⁴¹² Schuyler, p. 231.

agreement with certain foreign countries which have already signified their agreement in principle.

Some of the provincial presidents will say that the measures described are severe. In reply I would point out to them that certain politicians have attained power by means of dictatorship. Moreover, the measures of execution that I have indicated above constitute only the first stage of the basic regime that we hope will succeed in the Congo. The second stage will be to destroy anyone who criticizes us.

In conclusion, I would point out that this letter should be communicated only to those authorities under your orders in whom you have entire confidence.

(signed) P. LUMUMBA
Prime Minister⁴¹³

A few months later, Lumumba issued a follow-up memorandum which said: "Get to work immediately and have courage. Long live the Soviet Union! Long live Khrushchev!"⁴¹⁴

When Lumumba came to the United States he was royally received on behalf of the American people by President Eisenhower (CFR member) who even had him stay in the official presidential guest house. He conferred with Henry Cabot Lodge (CFR member), Dag Hammarskjold and Christian Herter (CFR member), then our secretary of state.⁴¹⁵ And a few weeks later, Eisenhower announced that he had sent the first five million of an expected 100 million dollars to Lumumba to help the Congo meet its most pressing needs.⁴¹⁶

Katanga: Succeeding from Chaos

"I am seceding from chaos!"

With these words, Moise Tshombe declared that his province of Katanga wanted no further part of the Communist-dominated central government. He requested Belgium to return her troops to the province, to subdue the mutinous Congolese army, and to restore civil order. This they did with little difficulty. Tshombe appointed a Belgian major to reorganize the army and reestablish military discipline. With experienced European officers predominantly in charge, a whole new army was recruited. Of the original 2,800 mutinous soldiers, only 300 were allowed to remain.⁴¹⁷

⁴¹³ Situation in the Republic of the Congo, report of the UN Conciliation Commission for the Congo, UN document A/4711/ADD 2 (March 20, 1961), pp. 42-46.

⁴¹⁴ "Bare Red Plot by Lumumba," Chicago Tribune (November 2, 1960).

⁴¹⁵ New York Times (July 27, 1960), p. 1. Also, Schuyler, p. 222. Also, Newsweek (August 22, 1960), p. 40.

⁴¹⁶ "Lumumba Gets Pledge of U.S. Aid," Los Angeles Examiner (July 28, 1960), sec. 1, p.16. Also, "Added U.S. Funds Voted for Congo," Los Angeles Examiner (August 17, 1960), sec. 1, p. 7. Also, Department of State Bulletin (October 3, 1960), pp. 510, 530; and (October 10, 1960), p. 588.

⁴¹⁷ Hempstone, pp. 107-110.

Within a few days, life had returned to normal throughout most of Katanga. Businesses resumed operation and civilians once again walked the streets with no fear of wanton violence. As one eyewitness observer described it: "Elisabethville, a bastion of anti-Communism in a sea of Congo leftist terror, was calm and functioning smoothly in late August."⁴¹⁸

As early as July 21, 1960, Patrick O'Donovan reported in the New York Herald Tribune:

"There is good order in Elisabethville. The streets are patrolled by black and white soldiers together...There is almost no local opposition to Tshombe's plans."

One of the very first acts of the newly independent nation was to discharge all of the communist professors at Elisabethville University who had been attempting to indoctrinate and recruit students on behalf of international Communism. Posters began to appear on the streets: "Katanga, Africa's shield against Communism." And Godefroi Munongo, the interior minister, reflected the views of the government when he stated: "I want my country, Katanga, to be a bastion of anti-Communism in Africa. I detest Communism and will not alter my opposition to it. Katanga will stay independent, no matter what. We shall not give in."⁴¹⁹

As mentioned earlier, Tshombe wanted a federal union and local autonomy somewhat similar to that in America. Commenting on his vision for the future, President Tshombe explained:

"Katanga is nearly as large as France. Our people have a different history, traditions, and outlook from those of the Congo. Every people has the right to its own self-determination. There is no reason why we should be exploited by the Congo. Because we were in the past is no reason why we should be in the future."⁴²⁰

This attitude was even written into the newly established constitution. Article I read:

"The State of Katanga adheres to the principle of the association with the other regions of the former Belgian Congo, provided they themselves are politically organized with respect to law and order."

As we have already seen, however, the central government had other plans—and so did the United Nations.⁴²¹

The deception of the UN

As to what those intentions were, one cannot readily find them in the high-sounding phrases and self-righteous platitudes of official United Nations proclamations. They

⁴¹⁸ Schuyler, p. 17.

⁴¹⁹ Schuyler, p. 172.

⁴²⁰ As quoted by Schuyler, p. 163.

⁴²¹ As quoted by Congressman Donald C. Bruce, Congressional Record (September 12, 1962).

are there, but one has to be experienced in the highly complex art of reading bureaucratese. While most human beings communicate with each other to convey ideas, politicians are prone to use language as a means of concealing ideas. An example of this planned deception is the blatant contradiction between the United Nations public pronouncements regarding Katanga and its actual performance.

On July 14, 1960 (the same day that the Security Council passed the first resolution condemning Belgium and authorizing the use of United Nations troops in the Congo), and again on July 20, Dag Hammarskjold stated the UN's position:

- “1. The UN force could not intervene in the internal affairs of the Congo.
2. It would not be used to settle the Congo's constitutional issue.
3. It would not be used to end Katanga's secession.”⁴²²

In July, Ralph Bunche (CFR member) (as special United Nations representative for Hammarskjold) told Tshombe that the United Nations force "has received strict instructions not to intervene in the internal politics of the country."⁴²³ On August 9 the Security Council passed another resolution which "reaffirms that the UN Congo force will not be a party to, or in any way intervene in, or be used to influence the outcome of, any internal conflict, constitutional or otherwise."⁴²⁴ In speaking specifically about Katanga's secession, Dag Hammarskjold said:

“This is an internal political problem to which the UN as an organization obviously cannot be a party. Nor would the entry of the UN force in Katanga mean any taking of sides in the conflict to which I have just referred. Nor should it be permitted to shift the weight between personalities or groups or schools of thought in a way which would prejudice the solution of the internal political problem.”⁴²⁵

Nothing could have been plainer than that. Yet immediately United Nations troops began to move into position for entry into Katanga. Tshombe was leery of the whole operation and protested to Hammarskjold that since everything was calm and peaceful in his province, there was no need for United Nations "peacekeeping" forces.

On August 12 Hammarskjold personally conveyed his assurances to Tshombe that the United Nations would "not be used on behalf of the central government to force the provisional government of Mr. Tshombe to a specific line of action."⁴²⁶ With these solemn pledges and under Hammarskjold's insistence, Tshombe had no alternative short of armed resistance but to allow UN troops access to Katanga.

They came by the thousands.

⁴²² Hempstone, p. 111. Also, O'Brien, p. 88.

⁴²³ Hempstone, p. 242.

⁴²⁴ UN document S/4426.

⁴²⁵ As quoted by Hempstone, p. 242.

⁴²⁶ Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (August 3, 1962).

As mentioned earlier, Katanga was at peace. There were other places throughout the Congo that were in far greater need of UN forces than Katanga. Kasai province was in the throes of civil war and the countryside was literally red with blood, but the UN sent troops to Katanga. Stanleyville was a nightmare of lawlessness and violence, but the UN sent troops to Katanga. Away from the metropolitan areas the practice of cannibalism was being revived and missionaries were being slaughtered by the score, but the UN sent troops to Katanga. By September 1961 between twelve thousand and fourteen thousand troops, by far the greater portion of the entire United Nations force, had been concentrated inside peaceful Katanga.⁴²⁷ Why were they there?

Tshombe was no fool. He knew that their purpose was anything other than to end Katanga's secession and to bring it back under the central government. In spite of the grim implications of the arrival of UN military might, he somehow managed to keep his composure and even his sense of humor. The first United Nations troops to arrive at Elisabethville's airport on August 12 were supposedly Dag Hammarskjöld's personal bodyguard. When they landed Tshombe greeted them and the accompanying dignitaries by handing them each tourist brochures entitled 'Elisabethville Welcomes You.'⁴²⁸ Then, before anyone could object, the honor guard led by Belgian officers presented the Katangese colors while a band played the newly written Katangese national anthem. What a picture that must have been—United Nations soldiers, officers and dignitaries standing rigidly at attention before a fluttering flag symbolizing the very sovereignty which they had been sent to destroy.

At this point in the drama it becomes necessary to introduce a third character—Conor Cruise O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien was formerly an Irish delegate to the General Assembly of the UN before being requested by Dag Hammarskjöld to join his executive staff in the Secretariat as special advisor on African affairs. From here he was assigned to the Congo where he personally directed the United Nations political operation in Katanga. When it was discovered that he had imported his Irish girl friend to Katanga, and when she found herself unexpectedly in the news as part of an international incident, O'Brien was recalled to New York and allowed to resign. There were other good reasons for getting rid of O'Brien, too. For one thing, he was too outspoken and it soon became obvious that he had to be removed. He was not the first underling in the UN to be thrown to the wolves in order to save the reputation of a higher official.

Fortunately, however, O'Brien decided to write a book about the Katanga affair. It is a treasure of little glimpses into the innermost workings of the mind of an "international servant." He was and is a fierce advocate of the United Nations. Even though he had personally participated in and helped to execute one of the most perfidious schemes ever directed against freedom-loving human beings, he apparently did not realize what he had done, or so he says.

The important point, however, is that O'Brien speaks with authority. He was there. Obviously, a great deal of what he has to say must be taken with a large grain of salt. But what he reveals about both himself and the organization to which he is so strongly committed is, if anything, overly charitable. If O'Brien's words are incriminating in

⁴²⁷ Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (September 8 and 16, 1961). Also, Department of State Bulletin (December 12, 1960), p. 908.

⁴²⁸ Hempstone, pp. 113–114.

spite of his pro-United Nations bias, then they are certainly worthy of our serious consideration. For example, consider O'Brien's description of a meeting of the "Congo club," which is the nickname for his group of top United Nations planners and advisors on the Congo. Among others, Dag Hammarskjold and Ralph Bunche (CFR member) (representing the U.S.) were present:

"The Afro-Asian thesis—that the secession of Katanga would have to be ended, and that the United Nations would have to help actively in ending it—was tacitly accepted round the table, and not less by the Americans than by the others. What mattered most to all of them was that the United Nations should emerge successfully from its Congo ordeal, and it was clearly seen that a condition of success was the speedy removal of the props of Mr. Tshombe's regime, thereby making possible the restoration of the unity of the Congo. The continued existence of the independent state of Katanga was recognized as a threat to the existence of the United Nations and therefore even those who, from the standpoint of their personal political opinions, might have been favourably enough disposed to what Mr. Tshombe represented, were convinced of the necessity of strong measures...This was an example of the victory of an international loyalty over personal predilections. If neutral men are simply men who put the interests of the United Nations first, then Hammarskjold and all around him at that table were neutral men."⁴²⁹

Ignoring for the moment the enlightening definition of UN neutrality, one should really go back and reread this incredible statement several times to fully comprehend the extent of the calm premeditation behind the policy of deliberate deception initiated by these high officials. For months they had been issuing public statements and personal assurances that the United Nations not only had no intentions of interfering in the internal matter of Katanga's secession, but that it had no legal right to do so under the terms of its own Charter. Yet, at the very outset O'Brien, Hammarskjold, Bunche and a host of other top United Nations planners sat around a conference table and quietly worked out plans for removing Mr. Tshombe's democratic government.

Elsewhere in his book O'Brien provided more illumination on the United Nations' total lack of integrity and respect for honesty in its pretended aims when he wrote that Mr. M. Khiary (head of UN civil operations in the Congo):

"...had little patience with legalistic detail, with paragraph this of resolution that, or what the Secretary-General had said in August 1960. He had no patience at all with the theory, often asserted in the early days by Hammarskjold, and never explicitly abandoned, that the United Nations must refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of the Congo. "What are we here for then?" he would ask. "Il faut faire de la politique!" And on the word politique his brown eyes, usually so disconcertingly blank, would flash. He and Mr. Gardiner [another UN official] did "make politics," throwing all semblance of non-intervention to the winds..."⁴³⁰

⁴²⁹ O'Brien, p. 58.

⁴³⁰ O'Brien, p. 189.

The end of Lumumba

While the United Nations was pouring troops into Katanga, things were going from bad to horrible elsewhere in the Congo. On August 4, when Lumumba returned in a Russian plane from his grand tour of Belgium, the United States and England, he found unexpected opposition awaiting. Many of his former associates had decided they no longer wanted to be identified with either him or his politics. On August 10 Lumumba was seized and stoned by an angry mob in Leopoldville and barely escaped with his life. On August 25 more anti-Lumumba demonstrations and riots broke out all over the city.⁴³¹

Meanwhile, a small group of former British army officers from Rhodesia had entered Kasai province and formed a volunteer corps of leaders to train Baluba tribesmen for battle against Lumumba's men. They explained that they were sick of the West doing nothing to effectively fight the Congo's communists.⁴³²

On September 5 Kasavubu, president of the central government and a rather weak-kneed politician (but not a Communist), dismissed Prime Minister Lumumba. Lumumba refused to acknowledge the action and promptly dismissed Kasavubu. At this point the lower house and the senate both convened illegally without a quorum. The house invalidated both dismissals. The senate declared its confidence in Lumumba. Complete confusion and anarchy reigned supreme.

Finally, on September 14 a young army colonel by the name of Joseph Mobutu, using what military power he could muster, picked up the pieces and seized control of the government. Kasavubu threw his support behind him and they appointed a committee of college graduates to run things temporarily. A semblance of order once again returned. The "student council," as they were nicknamed, acting under the leadership of Mobutu and Kasavubu, did a far more effective job of restoring order than the official government under Lumumba had done.

Here was obviously a bad turn of events for the Communists. They had not planned on this. Mobutu promptly ordered all the Russian and Czechoslovakian "diplomats" and "technicians" to pack their bags and leave the country. Seeing power slip from him, Lumumba sought United Nations protection and quietly moved into the Guinean embassy.

It is both interesting and significant that Lumumba chose this particular embassy for asylum. Mobutu had appealed to the United Nations to withdraw the Guinean and Ghanaian contingents from its peace-keeping forces in the Congo because he had found letters in Lumumba's briefcase which clearly linked these troops with the Communists.⁴³³

⁴³¹ Allen P. Merriam, *Congo: Background of Conflict* (Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press, 1961), p. 240.

⁴³² Schuyler, p. 234.

⁴³³ Senator Thomas Dodd, *Congressional Record* (August 3, 1962). Also, Schuyler, pp. 233-234.

It appeared to be common knowledge throughout the Congo that many of the United Nations soldiers were openly pro-Communist. They were apparently selected for that reason. As Philippa Schuyler reported:

“...there have been many complaints from anti-Communists in the Congo that UN soldiers from certain left-leaning nations have been spreading leftist or Communist propaganda or otherwise actively aiding the Red cause.....Some African UN officers I interviewed surprised me by revealing they spoke Russian, had visited Russia, and were openly sympathetic to the Red cause. "The UN opens the doors to Communism" was a comment I heard all over the Congo.”⁴³⁴

Mobutu had good reason to be concerned over the presence of troops from Guinea and Ghana and he was certainly justified, in view of their activities, in requesting the UN to withdraw them. His appeal was duly considered. The next day, the United Nations specifically assigned soldiers from Guinea and Ghana to provide twenty-four-hour protection for Lumumba. The same protection was extended, wherever possible, to Lumumba's followers as well. Conor O'Brien cautiously explained it this way: "During this time, Hammarskjold and Dayal, his representative in Leopoldville . . . resisted . . . Mobutu's demand that Lumumba, who had sought UN protection on September 15th, should be handed over.”⁴³⁵

On September 18 Lumumba left the Guinean embassy in a United Nations car and was taken to his well-guarded residence. He shouted from a balcony to the mob below, "I am not a prisoner! I am still master! He accused Mobutu of being a fascist and promised that he would soon bring back the Communist embassies. That same day, a Lumumbist attempted to assassinate Mobutu who miraculously was not hurt. When Vital Pakasa, the man who organized the attempted assassination, was found and arrested he explained that the Soviets had offered him ten thousand dollars for Mobutu's death.”⁴³⁶

A few weeks later, still under strong United Nations protection, Lumumba was escorted to a gala two-hundred-guest dinner party given by the general from Guinea.”⁴³⁷

By this time, most of Lumumba's close supporters were fleeing to neighboring Stanleyville where another Communist dictator by the name of Antoine Gizenga ruled the roost. Finally, Lumumba decided to make a break for it to rejoin his comrades in Stanleyville. He slipped away from his UN guard and was promptly intercepted and arrested by Colonel Mobutu's forces and deported to Katanga. A few days later, he escaped from his captors. According to the story he was seized by villagers and beaten to death.

It is important to note that practically everyone in the whole Congo hated Lumumba. When Colonel Mobutu and Kasavubu finally had him in their hands, they faced the

⁴³⁴ Schuyler, p. 234.

⁴³⁵ O'Brien, p. 96.

⁴³⁶ Schuyler, pp. 233-235.

⁴³⁷ Schuyler, p. 235.

rather sticky decision of what to do with him. They knew that the UN was doing everything possible to return Lumumba to power. They also knew Lumumba well enough to realize that if this should ever happen they would both be arrested and executed. Obviously, the safest course of action for them was to kill Lumumba or to have someone else do it. Another fact to keep in mind is that when the UN sent a special team of investigators to the Congo to look into the circumstances surrounding Lumumba's death, it was denied entry, not by Katanga, but by the central government.⁴³⁸

Antoine Gizenga

Gizenga was a minor personality in Congolese politics until he was invited to Prague, Czechoslovakia, for Communist cadre training.⁴³⁹ When he returned, he became one of Lumumba's strongest supporters and worked closely with him to implement plans for the Communist take-over of the whole Congo. When Lumumba was arrested and then killed, Gizenga set himself up as Lumumba's successor. He established a Communist regime in the neighboring province of Orientale and gathered all of Lumumba's followers around him. The Soviet and Czechoslovakian diplomats and consular officials who were kicked out of Leopoldville by Colonel Mobutu popped up in the Gizenga stronghold of Stanleyville where they quickly received official accreditation. The Soviets lost no time in announcing to the world that they now recognized Gizenga's regime as the "only legitimate Government of the Congo."⁴⁴⁰

With this background in mind it may still come as a shock to some to recall that at this point the United Nations swung its full support and influence behind Gizenga and did everything it could to hamper Colonel Mobutu and President Kasavubu. This is doubly hard to justify because Mobutu and Kasavubu represented the central government, which had called in the United Nations in the first place. Gizenga's little Communist satellite of Orientale province was just as much secessionist as Katanga province had been. But the United Nations made no effort to end Gizenga's secession. It passed no angry resolutions in the Security Council. It initiated no massive troop movements. In fact, as has been pointed out, it used what few troops it did have in Orientale province to protect Gizenga and his followers. Stewart Alsop, writing in the Saturday Evening Post, described it this way:

"The United Nations policy has been, in essence, to immobilize the forces controlled by the Kasavubu-Mobutu regime...Dayal [United Nations representative in the Congo] has ruled that Mobutu's army should be permitted to make only minor troop movements... With the Kasavubu-Mobutu forces thus effectively hamstrung, and with help from Egyptians and iron curtain money and technicians, Gizenga's rump pro-Communist regime quickly consolidated its position... Gizenga's forces then began moving on neighboring Kivu and Katanga provinces. The troop movements were by no means minor by Congolese standards, but the United Nations did nothing... Mobutu was certainly a sad and harried man when I saw him. If the United Nations under

⁴³⁸ Hempstone, pp. 126, 130.

⁴³⁹ Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (September 22, 1961).

⁴⁴⁰ Schuyler, p. 240.

Dayal had not actively obstructed every move be made, he said, he could have dealt in fairly short order with the Stanleyville dissidents."⁴⁴¹

The restoration of order in the Congo under the leadership of Moise Tshombe

While all this was going on, Moise Tshombe was making efforts of his own to reunite the Congo along the federal lines previously discussed. On February 28, he met with a representative of the central government and one from Kasai province. There was immediate agreement on basic principles and the conference ended with all three signing a mutual defense pact to prevent the establishment of what they referred to as a United Nations "regime of tyranny."⁴⁴² On March 8 Tshombe convened a second conference, this time expanded to include virtually every Congolese leader of importance except the Communist Gizenga. Complete agreement was reached in record time. At the conclusion of the third day, the conferees issued a communiqué revealing that they all endorsed Tshombe's basic plan calling for a "community of Congolese states." There was to be a central government at Leopoldville in a neutral zone similar to the District of Columbia. Kasavubu was to remain president, serving on a council of states made up of the presidents of the member states. Foreign policy, a general internal policy, currency and military affairs would come under jurisdiction of this council of states. There were to be no customs or immigration barriers between the states.

It was obviously fashioned very closely after the American pattern of government. In a final telegram to Dag Hammarskjold, the Congolese leaders warned that the dispatch of more UN troops to the Congo would "aggravate tension" between the United Nations and the Congolese population. Tshombe said at the conclusion of the conference, "We have resolved our problems ourselves and now we want both West and East to leave us alone." The Soviet news agency Tass responded by denouncing the meeting as "a conference of puppets and traitors."⁴⁴³

Here was a giant step toward unity and the restoration of order in the Congo. The United Nations, however, was not pleased. For one thing, it was upset over the form of the new union, maintaining that it was much too decentralized. For another, its man Gizenga was not at the conference. Consequently, the UN ignored the whole thing, as though pretending the conference never took place.

The imprisonment of Moise Tshombe

United Nations troops and armaments continued to roll into the Congo—most of them to Katanga—just as rapidly as possible. Congolese leaders began to see the handwriting on the wall. Few of them had the strength of conviction that Tshombe possessed, and the weaker ones began to wonder if perhaps it might not be safer to go along with whatever the United Nations wanted. Finally, on April 17, 1961, the United Nations, in spite of its promise not to intervene in the internal affairs of the Congo, pressured Kasavubu into signing an agreement which directly repudiated the principles agreed upon by the Congolese leaders. But Tshombe did not find this out until six days later when he arrived at a third conference of Congolese leaders. The

⁴⁴¹ Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (September 8, 1961). Also, O'Brien, pp. 96, 99.

⁴⁴² Hempstone, p. 134.

⁴⁴³ Ibid., pp. 134–139. Also, O'Brien, p. 98.

atmosphere had changed completely. Kasavubu and some of the others no longer spoke of a confederation of states. Their demands were now identical with those of the United Nations. Feeling completely betrayed, Tshombe walked out of the conference and prepared to return to Katanga. As he arrived at the airport, however, he was arrested without any pretense of legality and thrown into prison. A few days later, Tshombe was formally charged on four counts of high 'treason, two of which were punishable by death.⁴⁴⁴

Tshombe was kept in prison for two months. At no time was he allowed to see his attorney. He apparently was not subjected to physical torture, but he was, nevertheless, kept in solitary confinement. He was given no exercise, nothing to read, and no one with whom to talk. A few months previously the United Nations had provided extravagant military protection for Patrice Lumumba and had loudly protested when he was arrested by Colonel Mobutu's men. Now that Tshombe was in jail, however, things were different. There were no protests or offers of protection. In fact, the world's self-proclaimed champions of justice and human rights remained strangely silent.

The enemies of Katanga expected Tshombe's arrest to set off a power struggle among his supporters back home. They reasoned hopefully that a new shuffle would possibly bring to the top someone more pliable and more willing to go along with United Nations policies. They were wrong on two counts. First of all, the strong man in the number two spot and the most likely to take Tshombe's place was Godefroi Munongo who was, if anything, more like Tshombe than Tshombe himself. Also, Tshombe had earned such complete respect and loyalty from his followers that the expected power struggle never happened. His cabinet and parliament closed ranks in his absence and proclaimed their solidarity. Posters began appearing on the streets of Elisabethville with huge pictures of Tshombe and the words "He suffers for us. Let us be worthy of him."

It was fortunate for Tshombe that Lumumba was no longer top wheel in the central government. Otherwise, he would never have been seen again. But Kasavubu, even though he was now dancing to the UN tune, was not a vicious person. He was merely a weak politician who wanted to be on the winning side.

Tshombe, however, still maintained the loyalty of his followers, and with the personal intervention of Colonel Mobutu he was finally released on June 22. Joyous mayhem broke out in Katanga when the news was received. A few days later, he was back at work with more determination than ever. There was an ominous note of anticipated tragedy in Tshombe's voice as he addressed the national assembly: "We shall see to it that the Katangese Nation shall endure. Let the enemies of Katanga know that they have to deal with a people."⁴⁴⁵

More hypocrisy and deception

On August 2, 1961, the Congolese parliament approved Communist Cyrille Adoula as the new premier. One of his first official acts was to invite all the Russian and Czech diplomats to return their Communist embassies to Leopoldville—which they did. Next,

⁴⁴⁴ Hempstone, pp. 143–147. Also, O'Brien, pp. 99, 127.

⁴⁴⁵ O'Brien, p. 115.

it was announced that Antoine Gizenga, leader of the Communist faction in Stanleyville, had been appointed to the number two spot of vice-premier. It is not clear just how much Adoula had to do with this appointment since Mr. Sture Linner (United Nations representative in Leopoldville) has publicly claimed personal credit for persuading Gizenga to accept the position.⁴⁴⁶ Nevertheless, on August 16 Adoula visited Gizenga in Stanleyville to work out plans for their new government. A few days later they both spoke publicly and embraced each other for news photographers. Gizenga announced that he was dissolving his provisional government in favor of the new coalition and added, "The government will have to follow the Lumumba line . . ."⁴⁴⁷ Soon afterward, Moscow radio announced that the Adoula regime would put into operation "all decisions previously made by Lumumba's government."⁴⁴⁸

The position of minister of the interior—which includes complete control of the police—was filled by another Prague-trained Communist, Christophe Gbenye. Gbenye had previously served under Gizenga and was the man who was directly responsible for instigating the murder, rape and terrorization of European residents in Orientale province.⁴⁴⁹

Counting heavily on the UN to bring Katanga's secession to an end, the central government appointed Egide Bochely-Davidson as the chief administrator of Katanga province. Bochely-Davidson was not only a Communist, but a member of the Soviet secret police.⁴⁵⁰ As the Newark Star-Ledger explained on September 24, 1961:

"The Reds may have . . . made a deal by which a Communist would succeed Tshombe as boss of Katanga. The central government of the Congo republic recently named Egide Bochely-Davidson—a Moscow-trained agent—as chief administrator of Katanga province. He was supposed to take over the provincial government with the support of United Nations troops... If Bochely-Davidson can consolidate his position in Katanga, the Reds will be one step closer to victory in the Congo—with the aid of American dollars, United Nations soldiers, and the late Dag Hammarskjöld."

The Moscow Times gloated:

"On August 2nd, a new government was formed in the Congo composed of 27 ministers and 17 state secretaries. Cyrille Adoula was appointed prime-minister. According to the Stanleyville newspaper, Uhuru, the members of political parties of the national bloc which was headed by Patrice Lumumba have 23 seats in the government, or an absolute majority. The composition of this new cabinet proves that adventurous efforts to liquidate the government of Lumumba

⁴⁴⁶ Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (August 3, 1962).

⁴⁴⁷ Schuyler, p. 268.

⁴⁴⁸ Lessing, p. 143.

⁴⁴⁹ Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (September 8, 1961).

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid., (September 16, 1961).

completely failed. The decision of the parliament commits the new government to carry out all decisions made earlier by the Lumumba Government."⁴⁵¹

When addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations, Adoula was careful to let everyone know exactly where he stood. He referred to the late Lumumba as his "national hero" and to Gizenga as his "good friend."⁴⁵²

This was the government that high officials in the UN and in Washington were piously describing as "moderate." The same State Department that refused to allow Tshombe to visit the United States and even went as far as to cancel the visa of the head of the Katanga Information Service in this country, rolled out the red carpet for Adoula. The following statement by G. Mennen Williams, State Department spokesman for African affairs, is typical of the kind of black-is-white pronouncements that are all too common from State Department officials:

"A moderate parliamentary central government under Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula has been formed, and it is operating effectively and supported broadly everywhere except in Katanga. The pretensions of the opposition Orientale province government have been ended and Gizenga has been effectively neutralized. The Communists have been barred from continuing their direct support of left-wing elements in the Congo....If present means do not succeed, the Adoula government may be replaced by a radical one, or, as an alternative, and the Adoula government may be obliged to seek help from others than those now helping them. This would mean, in all likelihood, help from more radical sources. The net result would be to discredit the UN and the U.S. and open the possibility of chaos in the Congo—chaos which would invite Communist intervention in the heart of Africa. This alternative the world cannot contemplate with equanimity."⁴⁵³

At about the same time, Mr. George Ball (CFR member), undersecretary of state, solemnly told a Los Angeles audience that:

"Katanga's independence "can only place in jeopardy the success of our efforts in the Congo as a whole, threaten the entire Congo with chaos and civil war, and lead to the establishment of a Communist base in the heart of Central Africa. The armed secession in Katanga plays into the hands of the Communists. This is a fact that all Americans should ponder."⁴⁵⁴

While the world mourned the death of Lumumba, the United Nations expressed its own anger and concern by passing a resolution on February 21, 1961, which said:

"The Security Council . . . having learned with deep regret the announcement of the killing of the Congolese leader, Mr. Patrice Lumumba . . . urges that

⁴⁵¹ Article entered in the Congressional Record by Senator Thomas Dodd (September 13, 1961). Also, "Stevenson Answers Critics on Congo," Los Angeles Times (February 10, 1963).

⁴⁵² "Adoula Receives Royal Welcome," the Tablet (Brooklyn, February 17, 1962).

⁴⁵³ Department of State Bulletin (November 26, 1962), pp. 804–806.

⁴⁵⁴ Department of State press release #893 (December 19, 1961).

measures be taken for the immediate withdrawal and evacuation from the Congo of all Belgian and other foreign military and paramilitary personnel and political advisors not under United Nations command....”

This was obviously aimed at Katanga since that was the only province in the whole Congo with appreciable numbers of European military officers.

There are several interesting and revealing aspects to that resolution. First, there was the honorable mention of Lumumba, whose demise was the occasion of "deep regret" for the Security Council. Secondly, there was the outright intrusion of the UN into internal affairs of Katanga on the bold-faced assertion that it had a right to tell Katanga what it could or could not do. Nothing in the United Nations Charter gives the UN authority to dictate to a country who may or may not be employed by that country in its own army. This is clearly an internal affair of the Congo. Yet paradoxically the same resolution reaffirmed that "the United Nations force in the Congo will not be a party to or in any way intervene in or be used to influence the outcome of any internal conflict, constitutional or otherwise." It went even further and acknowledged that "the solution of the problem of the Congo lies in the hands of the Congolese people themselves without any interference from outside . . ."

In the light of subsequent United Nations intervention in the Congo, one can only be astounded at the extent of hypocrisy displayed by UN officials. But hidden away in the language of bureaucratese is an indication of the UN's true, and not-so-honorable, intentions toward the Congo. In the very same resolution, the UN authorized itself to employ "the use of force, if necessary, in the last resort." There it was—the first glimpse—the clear and unmistakable outline of the mailed fist beneath the velvet glove.

Promising not to interfere in Katanga and at the very same time authorizing the use of force to interfere is the kind of double-talk that politicians through the ages have used to make their grab for unlimited power appear to be legal and proper. These pronouncements do not happen accidentally, nor are they the result of ignorance and incompetence. They are the mark of corrupt political skill, the product of unlimited cynicism tempered by years of experience. The men who have mastered this skill are proud of their accomplishment and are quick to admire it in others. Conor O'Brien was such a man. Expressing his unqualified approval of the United Nations resolution, he wrote:

“The contradictions and equivocations in that mandate allowed them a good deal of leeway, and this, as I have mentioned, Hammarskjold was adept at using. Sometimes, as I heard some feat of interpretation, some especially refined harmonization of S/4426 paragraph 4 with A/Res. 1474 paragraph 2, and noted how neatly it fitted the political needs of the moment, I was reminded of an excellent formula invented by a Central American chairman of the first committee, when he found it desirable to stretch the rules a little for the benefit of Mr. Cabot Lodge (CFR member):” "Under the rule," he said, "it would seem that the delegate is not permitted to speak at this stage. I shall, however, interpret the rule in the spirit of the principles of philosophical jurisprudence. I give the floor to the representative of the United States."

"The men round the table on the 38th floor (the "Congo club") were often inspired by the spirit of philosophical jurisprudence, and indeed the Congo operation, if it were to be carried on at all, demanded such a spirit."⁴⁵⁵

Operation Rumpunch

At four o'clock in the morning on August 28 while Elisabethville slept in peace, the United Nations, exercising its philosophical jurisprudence, launched a surprise attack on the city. In the early hours of morning darkness it took over all communications centers, put a blockade around the foreign minister's residence, surrounded the barracks of the Katangese army, and arrested over four hundred European officers and noncoms.

Simultaneously it began arresting and expelling from the country hundreds of other European residents who were suspected of being technicians or advisors. There was practically no resistance, since, as it was learned later, the Belgian officers who were on loan to Tshombe's army were under orders from their government not to fire on United Nations troops.⁴⁵⁶ In one fell swoop, Katanga's army was decapitated of its professional leadership. Soldiers and civilians alike were taken from their families at bayonet point, rounded up in detention centers, and expelled from the country, often with nothing but the clothes on their backs. There were no charges brought against them, no hearings, no habeas corpus, no right of appeal, no opportunity to put their personal affairs in order. It was a police-state operation.⁴⁵⁷

Time magazine described it this way:

"The 11,600 black Katangese troops remained passive, possibly because UN soldiers staged furious public bayonet drills and small arms exercises in a pointed show of power. Remarkd one senior . . . UN officer: "We have these soldiers scared witless."⁴⁵⁸

The forty-six civilian doctors of Elisabethville shed further light on the action when they reported:

"Hundreds of houses were searched by the men of the UNO without result, dozens of European civilians arrested and threatened with the foulest brutalities if they did not admit having helped, sheltered or simply known "mercenaries" or volunteers."

Operation Rumpunch (the UN code name for the August attack) was a success. Only a handful of European officers remained in the Katangese army. The mercenaries, as the UN called them, had been expelled.

As seen, the UN—in the beginning, at least—justified its action against Katanga on the claim that it had to remove Tshombe's mercenaries. Aside from the fact that the

⁴⁵⁵ O'Brien, p. 61.

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 221.

⁴⁵⁷ 46 Angry Men, pp. 44–45.

⁴⁵⁸ Article entered in the Congressional Record by Senator Thomas Dodd (September 8, 1961).

composition of the Katangese army is not the concern of the UN, United Nations troops themselves were mercenaries of the first order. Irish, Swedish, Italian, Ethiopian and Gurkha troops were fighting as hired agents of the UN. If the mercenary issue was a real one, why did not the United Nations insist that the Indonesian Communist Kwame Nkrumah get rid of the British officers in his army? The truth of the matter is that the whole mercenary issue was nothing but an excuse for the United Nations to initiate military action against Katanga with the ultimate objective of bringing it under the control of the Communist-dominated central government. By removing the professional leadership from Katanga's army, the UN not only reduced the chances of effective military opposition to its own future plans, but also greatly enhanced the return of civil disorder and chaos to Katanga province—the very thing that it professed to be there to prevent.

At any rate, Tshombe did not throw in the towel as the UN apparently expected. Katanga did not fall apart. Tshombe had been expecting something like this and had initiated a crash program to train African officers and noncoms for effective leadership. The program was far from complete, but sufficient progress had been made to enable Katanga to stand firm in its determination to remain independent. Tshombe appointed a Colonel Muké as commander of the army, and Katanga now had not only an African president and an African government but an African commander as well. It soon became obvious that if Katanga were to topple, even stronger measures would have to be taken.

On the morning of September 11, Conor O'Brien met with Moise Tshombe and once again gave his personal assurances that the United Nations had no intentions of intervening in the internal affairs of Katanga or of using force in the settlement of any issue.⁴⁵⁹ That very same day, however, he met in secret with other UN officials and helped lay detailed plans for another surprise military attack on Elisabethville. The following is O'Brien's own description of those plans:

“As regards Tshombe, we were to arrest him only in the last resort. His residence was to be cut off, the entries and exits to it sealed, and then I was to parley with him, making it clear that his only hope lay in cooperating with the United Nations, and in peacefully liquidating the secession of Katanga. Meanwhile, UN forces were to secure the post office and the radio studios and transmitters, and to raid the offices of sûreté and ministry of information and remove the files. Europeans and senior African personnel working in these departments were to be apprehended if possible. The flag of the Republic of the Congo should be run up at the earliest appropriate moment on public buildings and on UN buildings; we had a supply of these flags which Michel Tombelaine had recently brought back from Leopoldville. The central government would send down a commissaire d'état to take over authority, in cooperation with Tshombe if possible, in cooperation with the United Nations in any case....

We all knew, of course, that the mercenaries still at large would be likely to undertake some action, but we did not take this very seriously because of their small numbers....

⁴⁵⁹ Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (September 16, 1961). Also, Sturdza, p. 39.

As regards the timing, Khiary said that the operation should be carried out either before three o'clock on the afternoon of Wednesday, September 13th—the time that Hammarskjold was due to arrive in Leopoldville—or after Hammarskjold's departure, estimated for three days later. Hammarskjold had given authority for these operations, but it would be embarrassing for him if fighting were actually going on in Katanga while he was in Leopoldville....

Khiary asked how long, if fighting did break out, it would take to bring the situation under control. Raja [UN military commander] said that the points where there was a danger of resistance were the post office and the radio studio. Even if this were determined resistance, it could be ended in, at most, two hours. In this, Raja's prediction was perfectly correct.

In the light of my insistence on urgency, and Raja's assurance of the duration of possible resistance, Khiary agreed that the operations should be carried out early on the morning of September 13th."⁴⁶⁰

Operation Morthor

Operation Morthor, as it was called, went off according to schedule. Once again moving under cover of early morning darkness the United Nations "peace-keepers" stormed the communication and transportation nerve centers of Elisabethville. Within hours the UN-controlled radio station announced, "The secession is over! Arrest the whites! The secession is over! Arrest the whites!"⁴⁶¹

Egide Bochely-Davidson, the Communist who had been appointed by the central government to administer Katanga province, was flown by UN plane to Elisabethville's airport to take control just as soon as the fighting stopped in the center of the city.⁴⁶²

At this point, however, Operation Morthor began to fall apart. Katangese troops launched a counterattack on all fronts as full scale fighting spread to practically every sector of the city. Control of the radio station moved back and forth between forces as one of the obviously important military objectives. Bochely-Davidson impatiently paced up and down at the airport as the distant sound of machine-gun chatter and mortar explosions grew louder by the minute. This time Katanga was fighting back. American newspapers carried the following account:

"The battle for Elisabethville exploded into full war today, with casualties estimated in excess of 1,000. The UN declared martial law and . . . Michel Tombelaine of France, deputy UN civilian commander, announced over the UN controlled radio that any civilians found in illegal possession of arms will be summarily executed."⁴⁶³

⁴⁶⁰ O'Brien, pp. 249-251.

⁴⁶¹ Ibid., p. 282. When this was called to their attention at a later date, UN officials in Katanga apologized and said that they had made a mistake and meant to say "white officers."

⁴⁶² UN document S/4417/ADD 6 (August 12, 1960), pp. 3-4. Also, UN document A/4711/ADD 2 (March 20, 1961), pp. 62, 68, 73. Also, van den Haag, p. 22.

⁴⁶³ Newspaper article entered in the Congressional Record by Senator Thomas Dodd (September 16, 1961).

Michel Tombelaine was identified as a member of the French Communist party by a subcommittee of the United States Senate on August 6, 1962.⁴⁶⁴

In an effort to capture and control the post office, the United Nations set up strategic military positions under the protection of a large hospital which they had conveniently established across the street. To their credit, the United Nations doctors there finally resigned en masse, stating "the building was being turned into a support fortress."⁴⁶⁵

The forty-six civilian doctors of Elisabethville reported:

"The hospital of the Italian Red Cross, which is situated behind the post office and opposite the Banque du Congo, was militarised by the UNO. The personnel of this hospital wore the uniforms of the UNO. Already before September 13, 1961 [when the attack began], this hospital was in a state of armed defence: sandbags, shelters for riflemen and machine-gunners . . .

...on the morning of September 13th, the alleged defences were really used as combat stations from which, at the beginning of the attack on the post office by the mercenaries of the UNO, a well-sustained fire helped the massacre of the defenders of this public building."⁴⁶⁶

UPI correspondent Ray Moloney drove a hundred miles to Bancroft in Northern Rhodesia to file the following eyewitness account:

"I watched the counterattack from inside the UN Red Cross hospital which had machine guns set up along the terrace. United Nations troops were firing from the hospital in the shadow of a giant Red Cross flag....

I also saw UN troops fire on a Katangese ambulance as it tried to reach the twitching bodies of unarmed Katangese police who were ripped to pieces by UN machine-gun bullets after the cease fire sounded."⁴⁶⁷

Frustrated in its anticipation of an easy victory, the United Nations began to turn Operation Morthor into Operation Terror. Blue-helmeted soldiers displaying the UN emblem of peace fired wantonly at civilians, ambulances, automobiles—anything that moved. Beginning on September 18 and continuing several times daily, UN convoys traveling along the Boulevard Rhine Elisabeth and Avenue Stanley fired machine guns at virtually every home they passed. The one dwelling that received the most punishment of all was the home of a Dr. and Mrs. Szeles, Hungarian refugees who fled from similar treatment at the hands of the Communists in 1948. His home was clearly identified by an enormous Red Cross flag. Several ambulances were usually

⁴⁶⁴ Visa Procedures of Department of State, report to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary (August 6, 1962), p. 28.

⁴⁶⁵ Newspaper article entered in the Congressional Record by Senator Thomas Dodd (September 16, 1961).

⁴⁶⁶ 46 Angry Men, pp. 68-69.

⁴⁶⁷ Newspaper article entered in the Congressional Record by Senator Thomas Dodd (September 16, 1961).

parked in front. For days on end UN troops machine-gunned this house twice a day—as convoys were deployed in the morning and when they returned in the late afternoon. On one occasion hand grenades were thrown in the windows. Mrs. Szeles, who had sought shelter in the corridor, was badly wounded by the explosions. Dr. Szeles counted 355 bullet holes in the walls of his home. All the windows were broken, the furniture smashed to pieces, the whole house reduced to shambles. Fleeing from Communist terror in Hungary at the age of fifty, Dr. Szeles came to Katanga to start a new life. Ten years later, at the age of sixty, he was once again deprived of his home—thanks to the organization that was supposedly created "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."⁴⁶⁸

At the height of the UN attack on Elisabethville, Mr. Georges Olivet, the Swiss international Red Cross representative there, cabled an appeal to his Geneva office to persuade the United Nations to stop firing on Red Cross vehicles. A few days later he disappeared while on a mercy mission to UN headquarters. It was not until eleven days afterward that his wrecked ambulance was found. It had been bit with bazooka rockets and machine-gunned by United Nations troops. When the Red Cross asked for an official investigation into this matter, the United Nations—which had launched an extensive investigation of Lumumba's death—denied the request on the basis that it did not have "adequate legal or technical resources."⁴⁶⁹

The Roman Catholic bishop of Elisabethville accused the United Nations of "sacrilegious profanities" and revealed that their troops had deliberately destroyed and looted churches and had wantonly murdered innocent civilians.⁴⁷⁰

More than ninety percent of the buildings bombed by UN aircraft were strictly civilian structures with no possible military value.

The Communist press around the world was jubilant. Even in Rome the Social Democratic *La Guistizia* said that the UN had succeeded "in bringing back peace," and the Communist newspaper *L'Unità* called Operation Morthor "a hard defeat for the colonialists and their agents."⁴⁷¹

Miraculously, Katanga held the UN at bay. News correspondent Peter Younghusband gave the following eyewitness report in an article datelined Elisabethville, September 15, 1961:

"Katanga Province President Tshombe said yesterday that he and his people will fight "to the last drop of blood" to keep Katanga independent. I spoke to Tshombe in a small villa situated in the grounds of his official residence. Mortar shell explosions and machine-gun fire could be heard throughout the city. I was astonished when a Belgian settler told me that Tshombe was not in hiding as reported Tuesday, but was still in his residence and offered to take me there. I

⁴⁶⁸ 46 *Angry Men*, pp. 48–51.

⁴⁶⁹ Hempstone, p. 224.

⁴⁷⁰ *The Tidings* (Los Angeles, January 11, 1963), p. 1.

⁴⁷¹ "UN Action in Katanga Stirs Dismay in Europe," London newspaper article entered in the Congressional Record by Senator Thomas Dodd (September 16, 1961).

went and found the residence heavily defended by troops with machine guns in the gardens and armored cars in the road outside.”

The president, haggard and eyes bloodshot from lack of sleep, said, "Did you think I would run away when my soldiers are fighting and dying for their country? We will fight to the bitter end and, if necessary, the last battle will be here in my home, and I will be part of it."

“President Tshombe said he was prepared to negotiate with the UN for a cease-fire if they would withdraw from the center of the city and refrain from attacking his troops and leave him to settle his affairs with the central Congo government in his own time. "They have lied to me and have murdered my people," he said. "I appeal to the free world—to Britain, to France, to America—to all nations who treasure the principles of freedom and the right of a people to self-determination to bring this terrible thing to an end." . . . Elisabethville is a terror town of shattered buildings and deserted streets, where bullets whine and ricochet Belgian settlers who armed themselves to the teeth and joined the Katanga army in the fight for Katanga's freedom include former war veterans and police officers. Other civilians organized food and water supplies to the troops. All Elisabethville's hospitals are filled with wounded. I visited the Katanga radio station, which is now nothing more than a blackened shell of a building, doorless and windowless with smashed radio equipment, furniture, telephones, steel helmets and boots all lying in a jumbled mess. Outside, I counted thirteen corpses still lying in the grass nearby, all Katanga police and all, inexplicably, shot in the back. UN troops yesterday again fired on a Katanga army ambulance displaying Red Crosses, seriously wounding the African driver and two white nurses.”⁴⁷²

Tshombe, speaking to his people over a hidden transmitter that identified itself as "Radio Free Katanga," called for total resistance—"a fight to the last round of ammunition." Five thousand Baluba warriors responded by joining the Katangese soldiers. Several hundred Bayeke warriors also came into the fight. White residents took up arms and fought side-by-side with their African neighbors. They were not mercenaries. Nobody paid them. They volunteered to fight for the simple reason that the United Nations was destroying their homes and killing their loved ones.

Finally, the tide began to turn. The UN had prematurely announced to the world that the secession was over. It was now in serious danger of having its forces completely annihilated because of the unexpected determination of the Katangese people to maintain their independence. As supplies and morale began to run low, it became obvious that the UN had made the fatal mistake of believing its own propaganda. It had asserted that Tshombe was a mere puppet of the Belgians and that he was supported in power only by a few mercenaries against the true will of his people. It maintained that his government would collapse at the first blow. It was now paying the price of self-deception. Things were going so badly for the United Nations that by September 17 its whole company A was cut off, badly beaten, and forced to surrender. With Operation Morthor on the verge of total collapse, the UN finally agreed to a face-saving cease-fire. On September 20, just one week after the United Nations had

⁴⁷² "All Out War in Katanga," newspaper article entered in the Congressional Record by Senator Thomas Dodd (September 16, 1961).

launched its unprovoked attack, peace once again returned to Katanga; its green and white flag still fluttered proudly to proclaim that Katanga remained free.

The only thing more incredible than the United Nations military action in Katanga is the way in which it tried to justify that action. If things had gone according to schedule there would have been little trouble. Press releases would have simply stated that Tshombe had been replaced by "moderate" Bochely-Davidson and that after a light exchange of gunfire "secessionist" Katanga had been brought back under the central government. The United States President would have sent his congratulations to Dag Hammarskjold and State Department officials would have expressed great satisfaction with this victory over Communism. But as it turned out, the situation had "escalated," and there were just too many newspaper reporters willing to make that hundred-mile trek to Northern Rhodesia to get the true story out to the world.⁴⁷³

At one point, the UN explained that it had initiated military action at the request of the central government. An official spokesman elaborated: "The UN motive in complying with the request was to avoid the alternative—invasion of northern Katanga by central government troops and a prolonged civil war."⁴⁷⁴ In other words, the central Government was preparing to attack Katanga; but that would have been civil war. Therefore, the UN attacked Katanga to save the central Government the trouble!

As the fighting spread, it became apparent that the United Nations needed another story. As a result, it was decided to announce that the UN had nothing to do with starting the action at all—that it was merely defending itself against Katangese aggression. And so, on September 16, three days after the United Nations had stated it had initiated the action "at the request of the central government," Dag Hammarskjold, at a press conference, told this fantastic story:

"In the early hours of September 13th . . . an alert was set since arson was discovered at the UN garage. As the UN troops were proceeding toward the garage premises, fire was opened on them from the building where a number of foreign officers are known to be staying. UN troops were subsequently also resisted and fired at as they, were deploying toward key points or while they were guarding installations in the City."⁴⁷⁵

⁴⁷³ In addition to news reporters, of course, there were many prominent individuals who independently came to Katanga to conduct their own personal investigations. One such observer was Lord Bertrand Russell, a strong supporter of the United Nations. Not only did he confirm the stories of UN atrocities, but the following excerpt from his report presents an interesting sidelight on the way in which UN officials were becoming overwhelmed by the dilemma of so many impartial observers: "Next day by appointment I saw General Yakub . . . I told the general that I had been collecting evidence regarding the alleged reports of murder of innocent civilians in Elisabethville by United Nations troops, and that I wanted to ask him some questions. He said that 'No offense has been committed; there are only rumors.' I told him that I had not come to argue whether such offenses had been committed, but merely to ask whether any inquiry had been set on foot to find out whether there was any foundation to such an allegation...The general would say nothing; he just sat and stared at me." As quoted by Sturdza, p. 26.

⁴⁷⁴ "UN Troops Seize Katanga in an Eight Hour Street Battle," New York Times (September 14, 1961). Also, Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (September 16, 1961). Also, Visa Procedures of Department of State, report to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary (August 6, 1962), p. 16.

⁴⁷⁵ UN document S/4940. Also, O'Brien, p. 264.

In the words of Conor O'Brien, the man who helped plan the attack:

"I have no idea what the source for the "arson" statement may be. No such fire was ever reported by me, or to me, or ever referred to in my presence. Nor is there any reference to such a phenomenon in the military "situation report." Some days before, an empty UN vehicle was upset and damaged by the "spontaneous demonstrators" outside a garage in the town (properly speaking, there was no "UN garage"). This incident, the nearest known to me to the "arson alarm," was no longer present to our minds on the morning of September 13th."⁴⁷⁶

Just for the record, Operation Morthor comes from a Hindi word. Morthor does not mean "Sound the alarm; there is arson in the garage" or "Let us now assist the authorities to prevent civil war." It means smash!

The defeat of the United Nations in Katanga was met with anguished cries from the world Communist press. Tass, the Soviet news agency, said that the cease-fire agreement with "colonialist puppet Tshombe" evoked only a feeling of "indignation." The Tass writer, V. Kharokov, complained that what had been a promising UN operation to end Katanga's secession had turned out to be "a total flop."⁴⁷⁷

A country that would not give up its fight for independence

The Communists, however, were unduly concerned, for the UN was not giving up yet. It was using the cease-fire merely as a means of building up its strength for a renewed attack. Immediately, additional troops began to arrive on the scene: The first four of fourteen UN jets landed at Leopoldville. The buildup was both extensive and rapid. Finally, on November 24, 1961, the Security Council swung into action once again. It passed another resolution strongly condemning Katanga for its continued use of mercenaries and then authorized the further use of force to bring it under the control of the central government. The velvet glove was now completely off. This amounted to a declaration of war against Katanga. Tshombe was quick to realize this and, addressing a crowd of eight thousand cheering Africans two days later, he said that the United Nations would soon "undertake war on our territory....Tomorrow or the day after, there will be a trial of strength. Let us prepare for it. Let Katanga fighters arise at the given moment in every street, every lane, every road and every village. I will give you the signal at the opportune time."⁴⁷⁸

Minister of the Interior Munongo later echoed Tshombe's sentiment when he proclaimed:

"We are all here, resolved to fight and die if necessary. The UN may take our cities. There will remain our villages and the bush. All the tribal chiefs are

⁴⁷⁶ O'Brien, pp. 265-266.

⁴⁷⁷ "Moscow Scores Capitulation," New York Times (September 21, 1961). Entered in the Congressional Record by Senator Thomas Dodd (September 22, 1961).

⁴⁷⁸ Hempstone, p. 182.

alerted. We are savages; we are Negroes. So be it! We shall fight like savages with our arrows."⁴⁷⁹

While the UN military buildup was taking place, troops of the central government began to move into position to invade the regions of northern Katanga. Since this would be civil war, and since the UN said it was in the Congo to prevent civil war, one might expect the peace-keepers to do something about it. They did. They provided large quantities of supplies and helped transport the central government troops into Katanga. The UN referred to this as a "police action." The chief UN representative in the Congo, Sture Linner, further explained that any move on the part of Tshombe to secure his defensive military position along Katanga's borders would be considered an act of civil war and that the UN would take action to prevent it.⁴⁸⁰

What kind of troops were these that the UN brought into Katanga and sustained with supplies and jet air cover? They were mostly the same mutinous bunch that had been on the rampage for many months. Their numbers included several thousand of those whom Tshombe had kicked out of his army and who had since reenlisted in Leopoldville. The rest were from Gizenga's former Communist stronghold of Stanleyville.⁴⁸¹

Turning southward, these soldiers put whole villages to the torch, slaughtered women and children, and sent over ten thousand families fleeing in panic. Anyone, black or white, who was found to be armed with even a penknife was killed on the spot. Risking her life to visit the terror zone, newswoman Philippa Schuyler reported:

"As this story goes to press, the wild, chaotic Congolese National Army is advancing from the north into Katanga, moving ever southward, ravaging wherever they go, like a diabolic visitation of locusts. The UN is not stopping their advance. These are wild barbarians, like the fifth century Gauls advancing on Rome, determined to annihilate the bastion of civilization that remains in Katanga. Sacked by the barbarians, the remainder of the Congo has already entered the Dark Ages; helped by the UN, these barbaric hordes wish also to plunge Katanga into desolation, ignorance and misery."⁴⁸²

But once again, Katanga overcame the impossible odds and finally pushed the invaders back. Order was restored to the territory. By November the invaders were in full retreat—looting and pillaging as they went.

By now the UN had completed its own military buildup for a renewed assault on Elisabethville. Seeing that the central government could not subdue Tshombe, the United Nations issued a few more promises not to intervene in the internal affairs of Katanga and began to draw up plans for its next attack. It came on December 5, just three weeks before Christmas.

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 188.

⁴⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 149.

⁴⁸¹ Senator Thomas Dodd, Congressional Record (January 25, 1962).

⁴⁸² Philippa Schuyler, *Who Killed the Congo?* (New York, The Devin-Adair Company, 1962), pp. 295–296.

From this point the story becomes tragically monotonous. Once again the United Nations unleashed a reign of terror, death and destruction on peaceful Elisabethville. Once again the primary targets were hospitals, churches, homes, ambulances and shops. Once again the victims were civilians—men, women and children. And, once again, the Secretary-General insisted that the United Nations was merely fighting back as the innocent victim of Katanga's aggression. The only changes were that Conor O'Brien had been recalled and the new UN Secretary-General, U Thant, was now issuing the contradictory statements instead of Dag Hammarskjöld. Thant stated on December 12 that the goal of the United Nations military operations in Katanga was merely to "regain and assure our freedom of movement to restore law and order, and to insure that, for the future, UN forces and officials in Katanga are not subject to attacks." Yet, just five days later, when Tshombe was calling for a cease-fire, Thant declared, "For us to stop short of our objectives at the present stage would be a serious setback for the UN."⁴⁸³

While the United Nations was pursuing its objectives, the forty-six civilian doctors of Elisabethville sent an electrifying telegram to President Kennedy, Pope John, and some fourteen other leading dignitaries around the world:

"SOS TO THE MORAL CONSCIENCE OF THE WORLD--stop--IMPLORE YOU TO INTERVENE WITH ALL YOUR AUTHORITY TO STOP THE TERRORIST BOMBARDMENT OF HOSPITALS AND CIVILIAN POPULATIONS BY UNO ON OUR HONOUR AS PHYSICIANS WE DECLARE AS LIES THE DENIALS OF UNO SECRETARY-GENERAL--stop--INSIST UPON INQUIRY HERE BY HIGH MAGISTRATES AND PRESIDENTS OF MEDICAL ORDERS OF ALL CIVILISED NATIONS--stop--ONLY MEANS OF CONVINCING THE WORLD OF INCONCEIVABLE ACTIONS OF UNO ALAS DISHONORED--stop--INSIST UPON CREATION INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNE COMPETENT JUDGE CRIMES AND MISDEEDS UNO PERSONNEL WHO BENEFIT FROM IMMUNITY CONTRARY TO NATURAL LAW."⁴⁸⁴

At the height of the sacking of Elisabethville, Tshombe personally appealed to the United States to use its influence to put an end to the destruction of the city. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai Stevenson [CFR member] replied that "the U.S. is very pleased with the plans of the Secretary-General to bring Katanga under control."⁴⁸⁵ Secretary of State Dean Rusk [CFR member] explained to the unsuspecting public that the U.S. was backing the UN action "to save the Congo from the Communists."⁴⁸⁶ And on December 13, twenty-seven U.S. Globemasters flew additional UN troops, artillery and armored cars right into Elisabethville.⁴⁸⁷

The next day Mr. Jules Cousin, administrative director for one of Katanga's largest mining companies, sent a bitter message to President Kennedy describing the United Nations' blind "killing and wounding—even in the hospitals." He stated that since the

⁴⁸³ Hempstone, p. 206.

⁴⁸⁴ 46 Angry Men, pp. 91-92.

⁴⁸⁵ Congressman Donald C. Bruce, Congressional Record (September 12, 1962).

⁴⁸⁶ "Rusk Says Congo Unity Is Goal," Chicago Tribune (December 9, 1961). Also, Schuyler, p. 294.

⁴⁸⁷ Hempstone, pp. 189, 194.

United States had continued to finance and support this carnage he was returning with disgust the Medal of Freedom awarded to him by the United States in 1946.⁴⁸⁸

That same day, December 14, a full-page advertisement was run in the New York Times protesting the bombing of Katanga, which had "committed no aggression except wanting to be free of a Communist-controlled central government." The State Department replied by accusing the sponsors of the ad of taking bribes from the Katanga Information Service in New York.⁴⁸⁹ Adlai Stevenson (CFR member) said further.

"The object of the United States in supporting the United Nations during this long and trying period has been to advance American policy in Africa...It seems to me that our policy and UN policy have coincided exactly in the Congo. I wish many Americans would think of that when they complain about what has been done there."⁴⁹⁰

And so it went. The great and powerful United Nations—the "last best hope for peace," the "moral conscience of the world"—pitted against tiny Katanga, a country that would not give up. Again and again, Katanga held firm. Finally another cease-fire was called.

Almost a year went by while the United Nations went through the motions of conciliation and pondered its next move. Matters were complicated by the Congo war lasting longer and costing far more than expected. It put the United Nations into debt. A further financial complication arose when Soviet Russia refused to pay its share of the cost. This, of course, made it appear as if the Communists were really quite unhappy over the UN Congo policy.

The American taxpayer was simply told that the Congo operation was anti Communist while he was being relieved of several hundred million more dollars.⁴⁹¹

On October 12, 1962, the American Committee for Aid to Katanga Freedom Fighters revealed a highly confidential memorandum which had been circulated among top United Nations officials. The memorandum put forth a very precise and intricate timetable for renewed military aggression against Katanga. It also predicted that the United States would go along with these plans in spite of rising public opposition at the grass roots. It declared:

"The U.S. will judge itself bound, as in the past, by UN decisions and will supply the necessary transport aircraft and, later on, helicopters...Washington would like to work out a compromise; but the State Department has based its policy

⁴⁸⁸ "Mining Aid in Katanga Hands Back U.S. Medal," New York Times (December 14, 1961).

⁴⁸⁹ Schuyler, p. 293.

⁴⁹⁰ "Stevenson Answers Critics on Congo," Los Angeles Times (February 10, 1963).

⁴⁹¹ See congressional debate on budget request, Congressional Record (September 12, 1962). Also, Purchase of UN Bonds, hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (February 6–9, 1962), pp. 1–180. Also, report of the House Committee on Foreign Relations regarding the purchase of UN bonds, House report #2176 (August 10, 1962), pp. 14–22. Also, Congressman Otto Passman, Congressional Record (September 20, 1962), p. 20156; and (October 6, 1962), pp. 22712, 22715.

on the UN and will in no circumstances disregard its obligations to the UN decision.”

The UN suddenly released a press report describing a letter said to have been signed by eight important tribal chiefs in Katanga. The letter branded Tshombe as a traitor, asked for his immediate arrest, demanded that troops be sent to crush Tshombe's resistance, and highly praised the United Nations. While most newsmen took the report at face value, Michael Padev of the daily Arizona Republic thought that the whole matter seemed too slick and decided to check further. As a result, it was revealed that the whole story was completely fabricated by the United Nations. After giving assurances that the letter was authentic and promising to provide the press with photostatic copies, UN press officers later backed down and admitted that they did not have the letter but that it had been seen. Finally, when word reached Katanga all but one of the chiefs who supposedly signed the letter telegraphed angry denials saying, "Everything the UN published was a campaign of lies." One chief, Kasengo Nyembo, stated that he had been recently approached by the UN to make an anti-Tshombe statement but had refused. The United Nations quietly dropped the issue.⁴⁹²

Finally, on December 29, 1962, the United Nations delivered its final attack on Katanga. As Time magazine reported:

“The sound of Christmas in Katanga Province was the thunk of mortar shells and the rattle of machine-guns...Blue-helmeted UN soldiers swarmed through Elisabethville, seized roadblocks on the highways. Swedish UN Saab jets swooped low over Katanga's airfield at Kolwezi, destroying four planes on the ground and setting oil tanks ablaze...From Manhattan UN headquarters, orders were flashed to the 12,000 man UN force in Katanga: "Take all necessary action in self-defense and to restore order." . . . Secretary-General U Thant says he is convinced that unless Tshombe is subdued soon, Premier Cyrille Adoula's Central Government in Leopoldville will collapse.”⁴⁹³

With a fresh supply of American money and military support Robert Gardner, the new UN chief officer in the Congo, confidently declared: "We are not going to make the mistake this time of stopping short...This is going to be as decisive as we can make it.”⁴⁹⁴

One month later, after having captured control of Elisabethville, Kamina and Kipushi, the United Nations finally seized Kolwezi—a city of seventy thousand and Tshombe's last stronghold. An hour before UN troops entered the center of the city, Tshombe made a dramatic farewell speech to his soldiers. About two thousand of them gathered in the market square. Standing in a drizzling rain, Tshombe told his men: "You have fought bravely against the enemy three times in the past two and one-half years. The odds have become overwhelming against you.”⁴⁹⁵

⁴⁹² "Charges UN Hit Tshombe with Big Lie," Chicago Tribune (January 20, 1963).

⁴⁹³ Time (January 4, 1963), p. 12.

⁴⁹⁴ New York Times, west. ed. (December 31, 1962), p. 1.

⁴⁹⁵ New York Times, west. ed. (January 22, 1963), p. 1.

A few minutes later Katanga's independence was ground into the mud by United Nations boots. The last flame of freedom in the Congo flickered and died.

A LOOK AT THE RECORD OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Let us examine the record of the UN to see if the vigorous action that the United Nations took against the anti-Communists in the Congo was an accident:

In 1952 the free trade union committee of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) brought to the attention of the UN the fact that the Communists in Red China had committed between fourteen- and twenty-million political murders. The United Nations listened but took no action. In 1953 the United Nations Economic and Social Council was asked to discuss the rise of slave labor in the USSR. The council would not discuss the matter and removed it from the agenda. When Red China conquered the independent nation of Tibet, set about systematically destroying its race and its culture, and proceeded to murder over fifty thousand Buddhists, the United Nations looked the other way. Years afterward it passed a vague resolution which started off by praising the principles of its own Charter and then called for "respect for the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people and for their distinctive cultural and religious life." The resolution did not even mention the name of the aggressor.

When Soviet tanks moved in to crush the Hungarian Revolution, the UN suddenly ceased its talk about "self-determination," "anti-colonialism" and "the peace and security of man." As a matter of fact, throughout the blood bath, the Hungarian delegates from the Communist regime continued to attend United Nations meetings, to vote, and to enjoy all the respect and privileges of membership without one word of protest from the other countries. When the UN committee which had investigated the Communist suppression of freedom in Hungary finally submitted its report to the General Assembly, the United Nations was suddenly too busy to consider it. When the item came up on the 1960 agenda, we find the following official explanation of what happened: "The press of other business prevented the Assembly's consideration of the item on Hungary."⁴⁹⁶ As the Wall Street Journal editorialized on September 19, 1960: "Abdication of the UN's professed moral purpose is looming; it follows logically from the prevailing double standard at the UN which indicted the West for Suez and Lebanon, but was indifferent to the Communist rape of Tibet and Hungary."

The United Nations has always loudly professed the right of self-determination as a basic right. The Charter proclaims "respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination." In 1955 the social commission of UNESCO declared: "All peoples and all nations shall have the right of self-determination—namely, the right freely to determine their political, economic and cultural status." But when anti-Communist Katanga applied for some of that self-determination, the UN forbid it. At the very time that it was denying this right to Katanga, the United Nations admitted Communist-controlled Outer Mongolia to the ranks of peace-loving nations. It recognized Syria's independence and admitted it to the UN when it seceded from the United Arab Republic. It did the same when Senegal broke away from the Mali Federation; Pakistan from India; Sudan from Egypt. While the United Nations was insisting that the Congo could not function economically without Katanga, it cut up an area about one tenth the

⁴⁹⁶ U.S. Participation in the UN: Report by the President to the Congress for the Year 1960, p. 68.

size of Katanga and created two whole new nations; the Kingdom of Ruanda and the Republic of Burundi.

At the very time that the Security Council was condemning Portugal for defending its citizens against Communist-inspired atrocities in Portuguese Angola, it refused to take any action whatsoever in a clear cut case of unprovoked aggression against Portuguese Goa by pro-Communist Nehru of India.⁴⁹⁷ When the Soviets were butchering civilians in Afghanistan in the 1970s and 1980s, when Chechnya was brutalized by the Russians in the 1990s, the UN did nothing! But the UN declared tiny Katanga "a threat to international peace". The UN embraces Communist China – history's most murderous criminal regime. In 1949, anti-Communist Nationalist China, one of the UN's founding members, was forced from the mainland to Taiwan by the Communists. In 1971, the UN expelled Taiwan and embraced the brutal Red Chinese government – a communist government responsible for over 65 million murders. World Bank "aid" funds went to brutal Marxist dictator Mengistu while he was causing large-scale starvation and death in Ethiopia; to Tanzanian dictator Julius Nyerere as he drove peasants off their land and burned their huts; and to the Vietnamese Communists, sending thousands of boat people into the sea. The list is endless. The United Nations' actions speak so much.

Communist Control over the United Nations

The degree of Communist control over the United Nations should not be a surprise to anyone either based on the historical record. In 1950 the State Department issued a volume entitled Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation, 1939–45. It described in detail the policies and documents leading up to the creation of the United Nations and named the men who shaped these policies. This and similar official records reveal that the following men were key government figures in UN planning within the U.S. State Department and Treasury Department: Alger Hiss (CFR member), Harry Dexter White, Virginius Frank Coe, Dean Acheson (CFR member), Noel Field, Laurence Duggan (CFR member), Henry Julian Wadleigh, John Carter Vincent, David Weintraub, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, Harold Glasser, Victor Perlo, Irving Kaplan, Solomon Adler, Abraham George Silverman, William L. Ullman and William H. Taylor. With the single exception of Dean Acheson, all of these men have since been identified in sworn testimony as secret Communist agents!

It is truly fantastic history.

As mentioned earlier, Secretary of State Dean Acheson (CFR member) is the only one in this list of State Department and Treasury Department personnel active in UN planning who has not been identified as active with the Communist party. In this connection, however, it is interesting to note the following facts. Early in his political career, Acheson was praised by the Communist Daily Worker "as one of the most

⁴⁹⁷ Nehru's representative at the UN was frank and defiant in his statement to the General Assembly that India would have her way "Charter or no Charter; Council or no Council!" In the Security Council, a resolution condemning India for her aggression was promptly vetoed by the Soviets; and in the General Assembly less than one third of the members (thirty-five, to be exact) were willing to go on record as opposing Nehru. Also, speech by former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, entered in the Congressional Record by Congressman James B. Utt (May 1, 1962). Also, "Goa, UN and Nehru," Chicago Tribune (December 19, 1961), sec. 1, p. 20.

forward looking men in the State Department."⁴⁹⁸ In November of 1945 he was one of the principal speakers at a Madison Square Garden rally sponsored by the National Conference of Soviet–American Friendship. The other speakers were Corliss Lamont and Paul Robeson.⁴⁹⁹ While undersecretary of state, Acheson promoted a loan of ninety million dollars to the Communist–controlled government of Poland. The loan was negotiated by Donald Hiss, Alger Hiss's brother. Donald Hiss was a member of Acheson's law firm.⁵⁰⁰

In June of 1947, a Senate appropriations subcommittee addressed a confidential memorandum to George Marshall, the new secretary of state. This memorandum read, in part, as follows:

“It becomes necessary, due to the gravity of the situation, to call your attention to a condition that developed and still flourishes in the State Department under the administration of Dean Acheson. It is evident that there is a deliberate, calculated program being carried out, not only to protect Communist personnel in high places, but to reduce security and intelligence protection to a nullity. On file in the department is a copy of a preliminary report of the FBI on Soviet espionage activities in the U.S. which involves a large number of State Department employees, some in high official positions. Voluminous files are on hand in the Department proving the connection of the State Department employees and officials with the Soviet espionage ring.”⁵⁰¹

Marshall reacted to this information by doing exactly what Acheson had done—nothing.

In 1950 Hiss was convicted and sent to prison for perjury involving statements relating to his Communist activities. Since the second Hiss trial evidence has continued to be amassed through other congressional investigations that is even more incriminating than that used for his conviction. As it was, the FBI had solid evidence of Hiss's Communist activities as far back as 1939 and had even issued numerous security reports to the justice Department and executive branch dealing with this fact.⁵⁰² In addition, a parade of former Communists testified that they personally had known and worked with Alger Hiss as a fellow member of the party.

It is worth noting that Alger Hiss was very influential with the leaders of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which a Senate committee found to be infiltrated at the top by Communists. Hiss was one of the trustees of the IPR and was very active in its affairs.⁵⁰³

⁴⁹⁸ Daily Worker (June 7, 1945). As quoted by Felix Wittmer, "Freedom's Case Against Dean Acheson," American Mercury (New York, April 1952).

⁴⁹⁹ Felix Wittmer, "Freedom's Case Against Dean Acheson," American Mercury (New York, April 1952).

⁵⁰⁰ Victor Lasky, "The Case Against Dean Acheson." Entered in the Congressional Record (December 6, 1950).

⁵⁰¹ Ibid.

⁵⁰² Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, SISS report (July 30, 1953), pp. 8–10.

⁵⁰³ Ibid.

Mr. J. Anthony Panuch, who had been assigned the task of supervising the security aspects of the transfer of large numbers of personnel from various war agencies to the State Department in the fall of 1945, testified that as a security officer he had access to conclusive information on Hiss's Communist activity; but when he tried to do something about it, it was he, not Hiss, who was dismissed.⁵⁰⁴

In 1944 Hiss became acting director of the Office of Special Political Affairs which had charge of all postwar planning, most of which directly involved the creation of the United Nations; and in March 1945, in spite of all the FBI reports and other adverse security information circulating among the top echelons of government, he was promoted to director of that office.

It is more than a little ironic that Alger Hiss was the man who traveled with FDR to Yalta as his State Department advisor. It was at the Yalta meeting that the decision was made to give the Soviets three votes in the General Assembly to one for the United States. Giving votes to the Russians for the Ukrainian SSR and Byelorussia SSR made as much sense as giving extra votes to the United States for Texas and California.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference was held in 1944 to determine the future form that the United Nations would take. It was an extremely important meeting since most of the really critical decisions were made there. This meeting was so hush-hush that the public and even the press were excluded from the proceedings. Alger Hiss was the executive secretary of this conference.

Hiss's role at the San Francisco conference, where the United Nations was finally taken off the drawing board and put on the assembly line, is better known to most Americans. He was the chief planner and executive of the entire affair. He organized the American delegation and was the acting secretary-general. Visitor passes bore his signature. According to the April 16, 1945, issue of Time magazine:

“The Secretary-General for the San Francisco Conference was named at Yalta but announced only last week-- lanky, Harvard trained Alger Hiss, one of the State Department's brighter young men. Alger Hiss was one of the Harvard Law School students whose records earned them the favor of Professor (now justice) Felix Frankfurter [CFR member] and a year as secretary to the late justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. He was drafted from a New York law firm by the New Deal in 1933, joined the State Department in 1936, accompanied President Roosevelt to Yalta. -At San Francisco, he and his Secretariat of 300 (mostly Americans) will have the drudging, thankless clerk's job of copying, translating and publishing, running the thousands of paper-clip and pencil chores of an international meeting. But Alger Hiss will be an important figure there. As secretary-general, managing the agenda, he will have a lot to say behind the scenes about who gets the breaks.”⁵⁰⁵

Hiss was not only the acting secretary-general at the San Francisco conference, but also served on the steering and executive committees which were charged with the

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁰⁵ Time (April 16, 1945), international section.

responsibility of actually writing the new Charter.⁵⁰⁶ In such a position, he undoubtedly wielded a tremendous amount of influence on the drafting of the UN Charter itself. He did not do it single-handedly, however, as some critics of the United Nations have claimed. For instance, Andrei Gromyko was asked during a press conference in 1958 whether he considered it a violation of the Charter for a country to send its forces into the territory of another. He replied: "Believe me, I sit here as one who helped to draft the UN Charter, and I had a distinct part in drafting this part of the Charter with my own hands."⁵⁰⁷

At the conclusion of the conference Alger Hiss personally carried the freshly written document back to Washington by plane for Senate ratification. The Charter traveled in a black water-tight box with a parachute. The master planners were taking no chances.

Knowing that Alger Hiss was a Soviet agent, the FBI had prepared an extensive surveillance of his activities during the San Francisco conference. Shortly after Hiss learned of this through his contacts in the Justice Department, however, the FBI received orders from the top to cancel its plans.⁵⁰⁸

An entire book could be written on the single subject of Alger Hiss and his influence over the United Nations during its formative phase. But, as important as he was, he was only one man. Had Hiss never been born, or had he spent his entire life in a monastery, the UN would still be what it is today, for Hiss was not alone.

J. Edgar Hoover testified before a Senate investigating committee that "from November 8, 1945, until June 24, 1946, seven communications went to the White House bearing on espionage activities wherein Harry D. White's name was specifically mentioned."⁵⁰⁹ In spite of all this, White stayed on in his government post, as did Alger Hiss. White was even sent to the San Francisco conference to represent the Treasury Department. He served as chairman of the important committee that established the United Nations multi-billion-dollar International Monetary Fund. Only a few months after being thoroughly exposed as a secret agent, White was appointed to the post of executive secretary of this International Monetary Fund which he helped create with large injections of United States tax money.

The whole ugly story of these men and their actions can be found in the Senate report on the investigations of the IPR [Identified by Quigley as a third network of the Secret Round Table Group with a purpose "to coordinate the world into one" world government], the transcript of the Senate hearings on Activities of United States

⁵⁰⁶ Insignia, conference issue (1801 Broadway, San Diego, Calif., 1945), vol. 6, no. 1, P.67.

⁵⁰⁷ "Russia Keeps Up Pressure on Withdrawal," London Daily Telegraph (August 23, 1958). As quoted by Mark Ewell, *Manacles for Mankind* (London, Britons Publishing Company, 1960), p. 50.

⁵⁰⁸ Statement by Senator Edwin Mechem, a former FBI agent assigned to cover Alger Hiss and other Russian spies, *Chicago Tribune* (May 26, 1963), sec. 1, p. 4.

⁵⁰⁹ SISS hearings (November 17, 1953).

Citizens Employed by the United Nations, and the report entitled Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments.⁵¹⁰

It all adds up to a clear pattern of deliberate Communist penetration into key positions within our own government and the use of these positions to generate a Communist-inspired United States foreign policy. The major feature of this policy has centered around getting the United States to gradually give up its independence to the authority and control of the United Nations, which was created by the Communists for just this purpose.

As security officer J. Anthony Panuch summarized it:

“It was World War II which gave the Soviet plan its impetus. During this period, a massive infiltration of sensitive agencies of the government took place. Pro-Communist and personnel of subversive and revolutionary tendencies were able to establish themselves in strategic slots. to shift the center of gravity in the process of U.S. foreign policy from a national to an international orientation via the supra-national UN organization. Furthermore, if working control of the U.S. foreign policy were focalized in the UN organization, the role of Congress in our foreign affairs could be bypassed.”⁵¹¹



A dramatic moment in history, Alger Hiss (standing right) comes face-to-face with Whittaker Chambers (standing left). Chambers, a former Communist and spy courier, is the man who identified Hiss as a member of the Party. Robert Stripling, Chief Investigator for the House Committee on un-American Activities, is pointing at Chambers. Because of this exposure, Hiss the communist is now far better known than Hiss the CFR member. Yet it is the latter connection that undoubtedly opened many doors of government to him and was responsible for his meteoric success.

⁵¹⁰ Two of these documents are now out of print, but can be located still in many large metropolitan public libraries.

⁵¹¹ Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, SISS hearings, pt. 8, pp. 904-905.

Postwar foreign policy planning and the San Francisco conference of 1945 seem so far in the past that it is difficult for many to find a correlation between then and now. Yet events in Katanga were shaped as much by these now forgotten hands as they were by the O'Brien's and the Hammarskjold's of more recent memory. Needless to say, however, 1945 was just the beginning.

When it came time to begin the actual hiring of the UN administrative staff, secret American Communists were among the first in line. Trygve Lie, the United Nations' first secretary-general, said that in the first-year members of the Secretariat had to be recruited very rapidly; about three thousand were hired between March and December of 1946 and hundreds more were hired in 1947. Lie was well aware of the possibility of there being secret Communists among the American job applicants, but this caused him little concern. As he put it:

"Nothing in the Charter or in the staff regulations bars a Communist from being a member of the UN Secretariat; nor could there be in an organization that embraces both Communist and non-Communist members."⁵¹²

This is, of course, one of the reasons why the United Nations can never work to promote freedom, justice or anything else the Communists wish to suppress. But that is another subject. For now, the important point is that the immediate demand for thousands of people to fill out the United Nations' original staff provided a golden opportunity for the agents of Communism to get in on the ground floor and to swarm into the key positions. The record shows that this is precisely what they did.

Communists control the UN and its staff association, and use it for all its worth

Since the new world-government organization needed men and women with skills and experience similar to those acquired in the service of national government agencies, it was only natural that most of the original applicants were people who had been working for the United States Government in one capacity or another. It was natural, too, that these people should have the approval or recommendation of their former employer. There are two kinds of recommendations, however: official and unofficial. An official recommendation would naturally be entered into the record and might contain, among other things, a security check. An unofficial recommendation would have no such drawbacks; a simple telephone call from an influential person in the State Department is all that would be required:

"It is not surprising that the State Department elected to follow what it called the "no recommendation rule." The reason offered for this policy was that it would avoid making the U.S. look as if it overly influenced the selection of UN personnel.⁵¹³ According to the testimony of Carlisle Humelsine, deputy undersecretary of state, the "no recommendation rule" was formulated in the department that was under the direction of Alger Hiss, and Hiss had much to do with it."⁵¹⁴

⁵¹² Lie, p. 388.

⁵¹³ Chesly Manly, *The UN Record* (Chicago, Henry Regnery Company, 1955), p. 110.

⁵¹⁴ *Activities of U.S. Citizens Employed by the UN*, SISS hearings (December 17, 1952), p. 332.

Apologists for the United Nations have often attempted to deny or minimize Hiss's part in influencing the selection of employees for the initial United Nations staff. State Department officials have insisted that most of these people were merely on loan from various branches of the U.S. Government. But the record is unmistakably clear and speaks for itself. As the 1954 report of the SISS revealed, Alger Hiss was "unofficially" influential in the employment of 494 persons by the United Nations on its initial staff.⁵¹⁵

The Socialist International (which proudly traces its origins to the First International headed by Karl Marx) today claims tens of millions of members in 54 countries. At its 1962 Congress, it declared:

"The ultimate objective of the parties of the Socialist International is nothing less than world government ... Membership of the United Nations must be made universal ..." Almost all of the UN's "independent" commissions for the last thirty years have been headed by members of the Socialist International.

During the Korean War, a New York grand jury accidentally stumbled across evidence of Communist penetration into the American staff of the United Nations. One piece of evidence led to another and so alarmed the grand jury that it proceeded to conduct a full-scale inquiry into the matter. The publicity attracted a great deal of attention and prompted the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to initiate a parallel investigation of its own. Shortly after these investigations began, some two hundred Americans employed by the UN resigned, apparently to avoid testifying.⁵¹⁶ Those that did testify, however, provided more than ample evidence for the grand jury to issue the following presentment:

"This jury must, as a duty to the people of the United States, advise the court that startling evidence has disclosed infiltration into the UN of an overwhelmingly large group of disloyal U.S. citizens, many of whom are closely associated with the international Communist movement. This group numbers scores of individuals, most of whom have long records of federal employment, and at the same time have been connected with persons and organizations subversive to this country. Their positions at the time we subpoenaed them were ones of trust and responsibility in the UN Secretariat and in its specialized agencies."⁵¹⁷

"[I]n some of the most flagrant and obvious cases of disloyalty, the State Department gave the disloyal officials a clean bill of health to the United Nations."... "The evidence indicated that they had shifted from one Federal agency to another in a definite pattern. These persons assisted one another up

⁵¹⁵ Activities of U.S. Citizens Employed by the UN, second report of the SISS (March 22, 1954), p.12.

⁵¹⁶ SISS hearings (September 24, 1953), pt. 3, p. 503. Also, "Is the United Nations Anti-U.S.?" U.S. News and World Report (December 12, 1952), pp. 32-34.

⁵¹⁷ Activities of U.S. Citizens Employed by the UN, hearings before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary (1952), pp. 407-408.

through Government agencies into the United Nations.”⁵¹⁸

It was even admitted that our own Justice Department tried to **hamper** and **halt** the investigation:

“The grand jury found that the employment of so many disloyal nationals in the specialized branches of the U.N. constitutes a menace to our Government.”...“The federal grand jury brushed aside attempted restraints by the Justice Department to return a presentment⁵¹⁹ sharply criticizing the State Department for clearing “disloyal Americans” for key jobs at the United Nations.” ... Despite a “certain faction” within the Justice Department had begun a program to get the grand jury to drop its U.N. probe.”⁵²⁰

The Senate investigations produced exactly the same conclusions. Senator Eastland, chairman of the committee, made the following statement at the conclusion of the hearings:

“I am appalled at the extensive evidence indicating that there is today in the UN among the American employees there, the greatest concentration of Communists that this Committee has ever encountered. Those American officials who have been called represent a substantial percentage of the people who are representing us in the UN. These people occupy high positions. They have very high salaries and almost all of these people have, in the past, been employees in the U.S. government in high and sensitive positions. I believe that the evidence shows that the security officers of our government knew, or at least had reason to know, that these people have been Communists for many years. In fact, some of these people have been the subject of charges before Congress before and during their employment with the UN. It is more than strange that such a condition existed in the government of the U.S., and it is certainly more than strange that these people should be transferred to the UN and charged to the American quota.”⁵²¹

Shortly after the results of these hearings were made known, Trygve Lie attempted to calm the waters of rising public concern by dismissing eleven of the Fifth Amendment pleaders. The “Red eleven,” as they were called in the newspapers, appealed the dismissal to the UN administrative tribunal which promptly declared that they must be either reinstated or be awarded substantial cash indemnities. As a result, seven of them were put back into their jobs with full back pay, and the others each received cash awards up to \$40,000. (American taxpayers paid the lion's share, needless to say.) The UN administrative tribunal which reinstated and indemnified these security

⁵¹⁸ U.S. Senate. 83d Cong., 2d sess., second report of the subcommittee to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act ... to the Committee on the Judiciary ... on activities of United States citizens employed by the United Nations (committee print). Mar. 22, 1954, p. 3.

⁵¹⁹ Presentment is a report to a court by a grand jury, made on its own initiative without a request or presentation of evidence by the local prosecutor, that a “public” crime (illegal act by public officials or affecting the public good) has been committed.

⁵²⁰ Ibid

⁵²¹ Ibid., pp. 181–182.

risks to America was composed completely of non-Americans. Seven nations were represented but at the time the U.S. was not even entitled to a voice in the decision.

Shortly afterward, Senator Pat McCarran introduced legislation requiring that all American citizens seeking employment at the United Nations receive a security clearance from the attorney general's office. This was certainly a reasonable policy and one which most Americans assumed had been in operation all along. Nevertheless, Trygve Lie was alarmed at the suggestion and declared: "To my dismay, the only precedent I could discover for such a law was the edict promulgated by fascist Italy in 1927..."⁵²²

Washington D.C. was equally alarmed. Just two days after the McCarran bill was introduced, President Truman signed an executive order stipulating that the United States would not undertake to instruct the Secretary-General as to American citizens he may not employ, nor would it penalize any citizens that he might employ contrary to the attorney general's judgment.⁵²³ In other words, Hiss's "no recommendation rule" was to remain unchanged.

The situation was summarized by the U.S. News and World Report in 1952 when it stated:

"U.S. authorities have no power to dig into the backgrounds of UN employees from other nations, although they have information indicating heavy Communist infiltration among these employees. Some UN employees who come from Great Britain, France, Mexico, Canada and other non-Communist countries are known or suspected Communists. . . . An informed estimate suggests that as many as one-half of the 1,350 administrative executives in the UN are either Communists or people who are willing to do what they want."⁵²⁴

Since 1954 there have been few attempts to investigate Communist penetration of the U.S. Government.

Apparently we are to assume that after all the communist infiltration into our government was exposed in the 1950s, Communists suddenly lost interest in trying to infiltrate the United States Government!

The Basic philosophy of the UN is both anti-American and pro-totalitarian

The true colors of the United Nations are apparent when looking at the UN's basic philosophy. For example, it is the UN's belief that governments grant human rights to their citizens. This philosophy is found in the International Covenants on Human Rights, passed in 1966 by the United Nations. It reads, in part:

"The States parties to the present Covenant recognize that, in the enjoyment of

⁵²² Ibid., p. 401.

⁵²³ Ibid., p. 402.

⁵²⁴ "Is the United Nations Anti-U.S.?" U.S. News and World Report (December 12, 1952), p. 32.; See also, "The Communist Pattern in the UN," speech by Joseph Z. Kornfeder before the Congress of Freedom, Veterans War Memorial Auditorium (San Francisco, April 1955).

those rights provided by the State, in conformity with the present Covenant, the State may subject such rights only to such limitations as are determined by law.. .."

This document, passed unanimously by all of the parties voting, including the United States, implies that man's rights are granted by the government. It further concluded that these rights could be limited by law which is the same way that the old Soviet constitution was written; in other words, that which the government grants can be controlled by the granting body, the government. That which the government gives can also be taken away. Man's rights under this thought are not very secure. Governments can change, and with the change, man's rights can disappear. Knowledge of this fact did not escape America's founders, who wrote in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights...."

Here, then, is the other theory of the source of man's rights: they are given to man by his Creator. Man's rights are inalienable (defined as incapable of being transferred) which means that they can not be taken away by anyone except the entity that gave the rights in the first place: in this case, the Creator. So here are the two competing and contradictory theories about the rights of man: one holds that they are given by the Creator, and therefore can only be removed by the entity that created them in the first place; the other holds that man's rights come from man himself and therefore can be limited or removed by man or by other men, as "determined by law." If any government can place restrictions on such fundamental rights as freedom of speech, the right to keep and bear arms, freedoms of the press, association, movement, and religion, then those freedoms can be quickly taken away by the government similar to what eventually occurred in the communist Soviet Union.

XIII
A CLOSER LOOK AT DEMOCRACIES

It is not just a coincidence that in school, we are taught that the form of government that we have in the United States is a democracy. Our Rockefeller controlled textbooks, politicians and media say the same thing — that we have a democracy. We often hear the claim that our nation is a democracy. How many times have we heard from politicians that a certain act, idea, or bill is a potential threat to our democracy? Problem is, nothing could be further from the truth. Our country is not a democracy, it is a republic. Our founders saw that democracy was another form of tyranny. As such, they intended, and laid out the ground rules, for our great nation to be a republic.

A republic and a democracy are similar except for a most fundamental difference: where each places sovereignty, or power. A democracy gives sovereignty to the citizens as a whole group, or majority, while a republic gives sovereignty to the individual and the people.

In a democracy, rights are determined by the majority, granted by the government, and given to the majority whether or not the subservient minority agrees. In a democracy, individuals are not recognized, but rather two groups, the majority and the minority, are recognized. There is no such thing as a minority group with rights nor an individual with rights, except those determined by the dictatorial majority. To solve a problem, only the majority is authorized to act (i.e. “Democracy is two wolves and a sheep deciding what’s for supper.” –unknown).

In a republic, the individual is recognized and the individual has rights. To solve a problem, an individual may act individually, or through his or her representative. A republic is self-government.

Man's rights under a democracy type of government is not very secure. Governments can change, or can be easily corrupted, and with the change, man's rights can disappear. (That which the government gives can also be taken away). Knowledge of this fact did not escape America's founders, which is why they brought a republic to this new nation.

In a republic, rights are granted by the creator to the individual. They cannot be limited or taken away by anyone except the entity that gave the rights in the first place: in this case, the creator. Our government is supposed to protect those rights.

America was originally created as a Constitutional Republic with a Constitution made to restrict what the government could do and empower the States and the people—not the other way around!

What did the founding fathers think of democracy? They thought it to be dangerous. After the Revolutionary War, the founding fathers needed to form a government. Because democracy amounts to mob rule, or a mobocracy, the founders felt that a democracy would lead to tyranny of the individual. At great cost, they had just recently freed themselves from the tyranny of King George. They weren't about to establish a government that could easily become another tyrannical dictatorship. From October 1787 to May 1788, a series of essays appeared in various New York newspapers. The purpose of these essays was to encourage New Yorkers to ratify the recently drafted U.S. Constitution. These essays, now known as The Federalist Papers, were penned by some of our founding fathers, and explained in great detail certain doctrines found in

The Constitution.

In Federalist #10 titled The Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection James Madison wrote:

“Democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.”

The will of the people as a whole can change drastically from one day to the next and allowing the majority to execute their ever swaying will is a very neurotic and unsustainable system. In many democracies, the majority will eventually learn to rely on the minority for entitlements enforced by the government. When individuals decide to become members of the unproductive majority, there leaves less in the productive minority, and the system will eventually collapse in on itself leaving a dictatorship. In a letter explaining his defense of the U.S. Constitution and our republic, John Adams wrote in 1814:

“Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy yet that did not commit suicide.”

Nowhere in the U.S. Constitution or The Declaration of Independence does the word “democracy” appear. In fact, Article 4, Section 4 of The Constitution states, “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government.” Our system of government was without question established as a republic. Moreover, let’s ask ourselves: does our pledge of allegiance to the flag say to “the democracy for which it stands,” or does it say to the “republic for which it stands”? Or do we sing “The Battle Hymn of the Democracy” or “The Battle Hymn of the Republic”?

After the four month long Constitutional Convention ended on September 18, 1787 (which determined our form of government), Benjamin Franklin emerged from Independence Hall. A Mrs. Powell asked him, “Well Doctor, what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?” Franklin replied, “A republic, if you can keep it.”

In fact, if our founding fathers, in 1776, had acknowledged the principle that a majority had the right to rule the minority, we should never have become a nation; for they were in a small minority, as compared with those who claimed the right to rule over them.

It’s no accident that the collectivist-minded foundations and those with a power-seeking agenda have been using their wealth to attack the basic structure and teachings of our constitution—if the majority of the populace is unschooled about our founding documents then the tyranny feared by the founders is much simpler and easier to attain—for all that is required is to get corrupt politicians to muster a majority vote. Just as they did at the turn of the century to hijack the nation’s monetary system and levy an unconstitutional national income tax on America. Karl Marx understood this better than anyone:

“Democracy is a form of government that cannot long survive, for as soon as the

people learn that they have a voice in the fiscal policies of the government, they will move to vote for themselves all the money in the treasury, and bankrupt the nation.”

XIV

A CLOSER LOOK AT AMERICA'S WARS

“Liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people [of] that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge, I mean of the characters and conduct of their rulers.”

—John Adams

In the Declaration of Independence, we find the primary argument for establishing government power: to secure the rights of the people. Without some type of protection mechanism in place, criminals will prey on the population without fear of consequences. They will do as they please to those who are too weak to resist them.

In the exact same document, we find the primary argument for limiting or revoking government power: to secure the rights of the people. Without some type of protection mechanism in place, criminals will gain control of government and use its power to prey on the population. They will do as they please to those who are too weak to resist them. (They will never use the power of government to prosecute and punish themselves.)

The first argument (government can protect us from crime) is still alive and well. In fact, it's drilled relentlessly into every citizen's head from a very early age. However, the second argument (government can actually subject us to crime) has practically disappeared from politically correct conversation. This, despite the fact that the threat posed by criminals in government far exceeds any threat posed by common criminals. If there is any doubt, consider the following:

“Common criminals do not have access to the media, the trust of the masses, or the air of legitimacy given to those who secure a position of authority. They cannot legally seize our money, destroy the purchasing power of our currency, or legislate away our rights, or reduce our children to debt slaves. They cannot obstruct an inquiry into their crimes from inside the system or write laws and selectively enforce them. They cannot take nations to war, profiting financially and politically from the carnage...”

Suffice to say, this is why those who created the U.S. government spoke constantly about limiting its power via the Constitution and Bill of Rights. As Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, too much confidence in our elected leaders' good intentions is the “parent of despotism everywhere.” It would be a “dangerous delusion,” he warned, for us to trust those who currently hold power simply because they are “men of our choice.”

“In questions of power...let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.”—Thomas Jefferson, Kentucky Resolutions

Members of the Round Table Network have spent the past one hundred years doing everything in their power to nurture the “dangerous delusion” that Jefferson warned us about. Before they can have their way with the world, our rulers must break the “chains of the Constitution” that bind them down. They don't want to exercise limited government power; they want to exercise the opposite.

“Of all the enemies to public liberty war is, perhaps, the most to be dreaded... War is the parent of armies; from these proceed debts and taxes...and armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few...No nation could preserve its freedom in the midst of

continual warfare.”—James Madison⁵²⁵

In chapter VII, we covered the 1950s-era investigations into large, tax-exempt foundations. Many were shocked when it was discovered that these powerful foundations were using their wealth to undermine our precious institutions, and our basic moral and religious and political and free-enterprise principles.

Again, this seems ridiculous—why would the wealthiest men in the world want to “orient American far eastern policies toward communist objectives?”⁵²⁶ This seemingly suicidal policy begins to make more sense when you learn how the Network actually operates. It’s important to remember that war, and the threat of war, as will be covered more at the end of this chapter, has enabled them (more than anything else) to inch ever closer to their goal of destroying national sovereignty.

As already covered, Norman Dodd was the lead researcher for one of the aforementioned investigations⁵²⁷ and, as such, he was chosen to appoint the committee’s staff. By the 1950s, propaganda touting the humanitarian “benevolence” of the tax-exempt foundations was widely accepted and many people, including one of Dodd’s researchers, Katherine Casey, felt that the foundations were beyond reproach. As Dodd put it, Casey was “unsympathetic to the purpose of the investigation. Her attitude...was: “What could possibly be wrong with foundations? They do so much good.”⁵²⁸ But Casey’s trust was soon shattered as she dug into what was, at the time, decades-old records of the Network-connected Carnegie Foundation. Dodd explains:

“I blocked out certain periods of time [for Casey] to concentrate on, and off she went to New York. She came back at the end of two weeks with the following on Dictaphone tapes:”

“We are now at the year 1908...In that year, the trustees...raised a specific question, which they discussed throughout the balance of the year in a very learned fashion. 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 raised the second question and discussed it, namely: **‘How do we involve the United States in a war?’**...Then, finally, they answered that question as follows: **‘We must control the State Department.’** 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.”⁵²⁹

⁵²⁵ http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/James_Madison

⁵²⁶ Final report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institute_of_Pacific_Relations

⁵²⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Reece_Committee

⁵²⁸ Source: Interview of congressional investigator Norman Dodd, 1980 <https://youtu.be/YUYCBfmIcHM>; (I would encourage the reader to watch the full videotaped interview of congressional investigator Norman Dodd, in 1980—so the reader can see for themselves the sincerity and credibility of this witness, Norman Dodd).

⁵²⁹ Source: Interview of congressional investigator Norman Dodd, 1980 <https://youtu.be/YUYCBfmIcHM>

Keep in mind, the plans that Casey is reporting on were originally written just a few years before the Round Table Network managed to gain control of the “diplomatic machinery” of the country (using Woodrow Wilson and his advisor Edward Mandell House). That control was later expanded via the Network-led group of “experts” known as The Inquiry. The Inquiry, in turn, evolved into what is now known as the Council on Foreign Relations. Within twenty years of its founding, the CFR’s enormous power within the State Department was undeniable as already shown. (Look no further than the CFR’s 1939 War and Peace Studies for an excellent example.) Casey’s report continues:

“Then time passes, and we are eventually in a war, which would be World War I. At that time they record on their minutes a shocking report in which **they dispatched to President Wilson a telegram, cautioning him to see that the war does not end too quickly.** 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. At that point they came to the conclusion that, to prevent a reversion, ‘we must control education in the United States.’...They realize that that’s a pretty big task...They then decide that the key to success...lay in the alteration of the teaching of American history.”⁵³⁰

According to Norman Dodd, Casey was so devastated by the information she uncovered during the Reece Committee investigation that she never recovered.

“As far as its impact on Katherine Casey was concerned...she never was able to return to her law practice. Ultimately, she lost her mind as a result of it. It was a terrible shock. It’s a very rough experience to encounter proof of these kinds.”⁵³¹

That final sentence is profound. It is a very “rough experience to encounter proof” that you’ve been intentionally misled. Katherine Casey uncovered something that was so inherently immoral, and so at odds with popular perception, that few people would ever believe the story was true. In continuing with our analysis of the Historical record, we move on to one of the most tragic events in American history.

Involving America in World War II

On December 7, 1941, the Japanese navy attacked the United States fleet at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii, sinking or heavily damaging 18 naval vessels (including eight battleships), destroying 188 planes, and leaving over 2,400 Americans dead. This, of course, was the event that propelled America into World War II.

It is important to remember that, in November, 1940, candidate Roosevelt told the American people: "I say to you fathers and mothers, and I will say it again and again and again, your boys will not be sent into foreign wars."

⁵³⁰ Source: see taped interview of congressional investigator Norman Dodd, 1980 <https://youtu.be/YUYCBfmIcHM>

⁵³¹ Ibid.

After the shocking news, a question plagued Americans: "How could this disaster have happened to our country? Why were we caught off guard?" President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed a commission to investigate what had happened. Heading it was Supreme Court justice Owen Roberts, an internationalist friendly with Roosevelt. Two of the other four members were in the CFR. The Roberts Commission absolved Washington of blame, declaring that Pearl Harbor had been caught off guard due to "dereliction of duty" by commanders Kimmel and Short.

The words "dereliction of duty" were emblazoned on headlines across the country. The two were inundated with hate mail and received death threats. It was claimed their neglect had caused the deaths of thousands of Americans. Some members of Congress said the pair should be shot. Kimmel and Short, however, protested the findings of the Roberts Commission, which they viewed as a kangaroo court. Roberts had run an unusual hearing –initially, evidence was heard without being recorded, and statements not made under oath. Kimmel and Short were denied the right to ask questions, cross-examine witnesses, or have fellow officers present to serve as legal counsel. They also found that the Commission's report omitted significant testimony.

Members of Congress demanded that they be court-martialed –which was exactly what the two officers wanted: to resolve the issue of Pearl Harbor in a bona fide courtroom, using established rules of evidence, instead of Owen Roberts's personal methods. Courts-martial, however, were feared by the Roosevelt administration, which had secrets concerning Pearl Harbor it wished to conceal. Therefore, it was announced, courts-martial would be held, but delayed "until such time as the public interest and safety would permit." Roosevelt knew that, if three years elapsed, the statute of limitations would expire, and Kimmel and Short could no longer be required to face court-martial.

However, the two officers waived the statute of limitations, and in June 1944 a Congressional resolution mandated the trials. That August, the Navy Court of Inquiry and Army Pearl Harbor Board convened. At these proceedings, the attorneys for Kimmel and Short presented undeniable proof that Washington had complete foreknowledge of the Pearl Harbor attack, but had withheld this information from the commanders in Hawaii. As the evidence was presented at the Navy Court of Inquiry, two of the admirals, including chairman Oran Murfin, flung their pencils on the floor in outrage. The court exonerated Admiral Kimmel of all charges and laid the blame squarely on Washington.

The Army Pearl Harbor Board also concluded that Washington had full foreknowledge of the attack. Its report closed with these words: "Up to the morning of December 7, 1941, everything that the Japanese were planning to do was known to the United States."⁵³²

The American people had reacted with wrath when Kimmel and Short were condemned by the Roberts Commission. How do you suppose they responded to this reversal? The answer: they didn't respond, because the Roosevelt administration ordered that the trial verdicts be made confidential. The public remained in the dark.

⁵³² "Top Secret Report, Army Pearl Harbor Board," Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack (United States Government Printing Office).

However, after World War II, a number of books strove to reveal the truth. These included Pearl Harbor (1947) by Chicago Tribune reporter George Morgenstern, The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor (1954) by Rear Admiral Robert Theobald, and Admiral Kimmel's Story (1955) by Admiral Kimmel.

The "Establishment" press gave these books scant attention, but they were out there for anyone seeking the truth. A real breakthrough came in 1982 with publication of Infamy: Pearl Harbor and Its Aftermath by John Toland, the Pulitzer Prize winner known as the dean of World War II historians. By the time of Toland's book, witnesses and information had emerged that had not been available to earlier investigators.

How did Washington know Pearl Harbor was coming? First, through decoded messages. In 1941, relations between Japan and the United States were deteriorating. The Japanese used a code called "Purple" to communicate to their embassies and major consulates throughout the world. Its complexity required that it be enciphered and deciphered by machine. The Japanese considered the code unbreakable, but in 1940 talented U.S. Army cryptanalysts cracked it and devised a facsimile of the Japanese machine. As the result, U.S. intelligence was reading Japanese diplomatic messages, often on a same-day basis.

Copies of the deciphered texts were promptly delivered in locked pouches to President Roosevelt, as well as to Secretary of State Cordell Hull (CFR member), Secretary of War Henry Stimson (CFR member), Army Chief of Staff General George Marshall, and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Harold Stark. These messages revealed:

- That the Japanese were planning to rupture relations with the United States and had ordered their Berlin embassy to inform the Germans (their allies) that "the breaking out of war may come quicker than anyone dreams."⁵³³
- That Tokyo had ordered its Consul General in Hawaii to divide Pearl Harbor into five areas and, on a frequent basis, report the exact locations of American warships there. Nothing is unusual about spies watching ship movements –but reporting precise whereabouts of ships in dock has only one implication.
- That, one week before the attack, the Japanese had ordered all of their North American diplomatic offices to destroy their secret documents (once war breaks out, the offices of a hostile power lose their diplomatic immunity and are seized).

All of this activity was recognized by the American government as a decided step toward war, but still nothing was done to alert Pearl Harbor. Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, (CFR member), after meeting with the Roosevelt administration on November 25, 1941, wrote in his diary:

"The discussion was about how we should maneuver to force the Japanese to fire the first shot, while not exposing ourselves to too great a danger; this will

⁵³³ Robert A. Theobald, The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor: The Washington Contribution (Old Greenwich, Conn.: The Devin-Adair Company, 1954), 5.

be a difficult task."⁵³⁴

Stimson was to repeat this concern that faced the Roosevelt administration when he testified before one of the Committees investigating Pearl Harbor. There he was quoted as saying:

"The question was how we should maneuver them [the Japanese] into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves."⁵³⁵

The McCollum memo provides further evidence that U.S. policy was meant to provoke a Japanese attack."

The McCollum memo "...recommended an eight-part course of action for the United States to take in regards to the Japanese Empire...suggesting the United States provoke Japan into committing an 'overt act of war'. The memo illustrates several people in the Office of Naval intelligence promoted the idea of goading Japan into war: 'It is not believed that in the present state of political opinion the United States government is capable of declaring war against Japan without more ado...If by [the elucidated eight-point plan] Japan could be led to commit an overt act of war, so much the better."⁵³⁶

During 1941, the Roosevelt administration also received several personal warnings regarding Pearl Harbor: On January 27th, our ambassador to Japan, Joseph Grew, reported to Washington:

"The Peruvian Minister has informed a member of my staff that he has heard from many sources, including a Japanese source, that in the event of trouble breaking out between the United States and Japan, the Japanese intended to make a surprise attack against Pearl Harbor with all their strength. . . ."⁵³⁷

Brigadier General Elliot Thorpe was the U.S. military observer in Java, then under Dutch control. In early December 1941, the Dutch army decoded a dispatch from Tokyo to its Bangkok embassy, forecasting an attack on Hawaii. The Dutch passed the information to Thorpe, who considered it so vital that he sent Washington a total of four warnings. Finally, the War Department ordered him to send no further warnings. You can see Brigadier General Thorpe interviewed in the BBC documentary *Sacrifice at Pearl Harbor*.

The Dutch Military attaché in Washington, Colonel F. G. L. Weijerman, personally warned U.S. Army Chief of Staff George Marshall about Pearl Harbor just days before the attack.⁵³⁸

⁵³⁴ Roosevelt and Churchill, 1939–1941: 1976, Joseph P. Lash p. 456

⁵³⁵ Ibid., p. 480

⁵³⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/McCollum_memo

⁵³⁷ Ibid., 43.

⁵³⁸ John Toland, *Infamy: Pearl Harbor and Its Aftermath* (New York: Berkeley Books, 1982), 332–33.

Dusko Popov was a Yugoslavian double agent whose true allegiance was to the Allies. Through information furnished by the Germans, Popov deduced the Japanese were planning to bomb Pearl Harbor. He notified the FBI; subsequently FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover stated that he warned Roosevelt, who told him not to pass the information further, but to leave it in his (the President's) hands. Popov is interviewed in *Sacrifice at Pearl Harbor*.

Senator Guy Gillette of Iowa received information from Kilsoo Haan of the Sino-Korean People's League that the Japanese intended to assault Hawaii "before Christmas." Gillette briefed the President, who said the matter would be looked into.⁵³⁹

U.S. Congressman Martin Dies of Texas came into possession of a map revealing the Japanese plan to attack Pearl Harbor. He later wrote:

"As soon as I received the document I telephoned Secretary of State Cordell Hull (CFR member) and told him what I had. Secretary Hull directed me not to let anyone know about the map and stated that he would call me as soon as he talked to President Roosevelt. In about an hour he telephoned to say that he had talked to Roosevelt and they agreed that it would be very serious if any information concerning this map reached the news services . . . I told him it was a grave responsibility to withhold such vital information from the public. The Secretary assured me that he and Roosevelt considered it essential to national defense."⁵⁴⁰

In his book *Day of Deceit: The Truth about FDR and Pearl Harbor*, Robert Stinnett proved, from documents obtained through the Freedom of Information Act, that Washington was not only deciphering Japanese diplomatic messages, but naval dispatches also. It had long been presumed that as the Japanese fleet approached Pearl Harbor, it maintained complete radio silence. This was not the case. The fleet observed discretion, but not complete silence.

In addition, U.S. Naval Intelligence intercepted and translated numerous dispatches, which President Roosevelt had access to. The most significant was sent by Admiral Yamamoto to the Japanese First Air Fleet on November 26, 1941:

"The task force, keeping its movement strictly secret and maintaining close guard against submarines and aircraft, shall advance into Hawaiian waters, and upon the very opening of hostilities shall attack the main force of the United States fleet and deal it a mortal blow. The first air raid is planned for the dawn of x-day. Exact date to be given by later order."⁵⁴¹

And so as hoped and allowed by Roosevelt, on December 7th, 1941 Japan attacked Pearl Harbor killing 2400 soldiers. Before Pearl Harbor 83% of the American public wanted nothing to do with the war. After Pearl Harbor - one million men volunteered

⁵³⁹ Ibid., 272, 350.

⁵⁴⁰ Martin Dies, "Assassination and Its Aftermath," *American Opinion* (April 1964): 33.

⁵⁴¹ Robert B. Stinnett, *Day of Deceit: The Truth About FDR and Pearl Harbor* (New York: Touchstone, 2001), 46.

for the war.

Admiral Husband Kimmel, the commander of the naval forces at Pearl Harbor, clearly places the blame for Pearl Harbor's unpreparedness on President Roosevelt. He has written:

"We were unready at Pearl Harbor because President Roosevelt's plans required that no word be sent to alert the fleet in Hawaii...Our leaders in Washington, who deliberately didn't inform our forces in Pearl Harbor, cannot be justified in any way. The Army and Navy Command in the Hawaiian Islands received not even a hint about intercepted and deciphered Japanese telegrams which were forwarded to concerned parties in Washington on the 6th and 7th of December, 1941"⁵⁴²

Admiral Robert Theobald, the Commander of all destroyers at Pearl Harbor, wrote a book entitled *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor*, in which he detailed his conclusions about the "surprise attack." He wrote:

1. President Roosevelt forced Japan to war and enticed them to initiate hostilities by holding the Pacific fleet in Hawaiian waters as an invitation to that attack;
2. The plans to use Pearl Harbor as the bait started in June, 1940;
3. War with Japan meant war with Germany; and
4. Roosevelt, Marshall and Stark knew about Pearl Harbor 21 hours before the attack.⁵⁴³

The Rt. Hon. Oliver Lyttleton, a member of Churchill's war cabinet, declared in an address to the American Chamber of Commerce in London on June 24, 1944:

"America provoked [the Japanese] to such an extent that the Japanese were forced to attack Pearl Harbor. It is a travesty of history to say that America was forced into the war."⁵⁴⁴

One last bit of testimony providing additional evidence of Washington's foreknowledge of the attack. The June 2, 2001 *Washington Times* quoted Helen E. Hamman, daughter of Don C. Smith, who directed the Red Cross's War Service before World War II:

"Shortly before the attack in 1941, President Roosevelt called him [my father] to the White House for a meeting concerning a top-secret matter. At this meeting, the president advised my father that his intelligence staff had informed him of a pending attack on Pearl Harbor, by the Japanese. He anticipated many casualties and much loss; he instructed my father to send workers and supplies to a holding area. When he protested to the president, President Roosevelt told him that the American people would never agree to enter the war in Europe unless they were attacked within their own borders. . . . He followed the orders of his

⁵⁴² Robert A. Theobald, *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor: The Washington Contribution* (Old Greenwich, Conn.: The Devin-Adair Company, 1954), 5.

⁵⁴³ *Final Secret of Pearl Harbor*, 1954, R. A. Theobald, p. 184-185, 197

⁵⁴⁴ Roosevelt, Churchill, and the World War II Opposition: George Eggleston, 1979, pp. xii-xiii.

president and spent many years contemplating this action, which he considered ethically and morally wrong. I do not know the Kimmel family, therefore would gain nothing by fabricating this situation, however, I do feel the time has come for this conspiracy to be exposed and Admiral Kimmel vindicated of all charges. In this manner perhaps both he and my father may rest in peace.”

Lastly, Quigley provides considerable insight into these facts to include how U.S. leaders had available all the Japanese coded messages, knew that war was about to begin, and that a Japanese fleet with at least four large carriers was loose (and lost) in the Pacific:

“The negotiations in Washington between Kichisaburo Nomura and Secretary Hull were among the strangest diplomatic discussions ever carried on. Although Nomura probably was not informed of the Japanese plans to make war...He found it impossible to reach such an agreement because Hull's demands were extreme...

The Americans had a clear view of the situation because they had broken the secret Japanese codes and generally had Nomura's instructions from Tokyo before he did. Thus, the Americans knew that Nomura had no powers to yield on any vital political issue, that he had been given a deadline in October, and that war would begin if he failed to obtain relaxation of the economic embargo before that deadline.

In the course of November American Naval Intelligence knew that Japanese armed forces were mobilizing and moving southward; by November 20th it became clear that a task force of the navy, including four of the largest Japanese aircraft carriers, had vanished. At the end of November intercepted Japanese messages showed clearly that the negotiations were no longer of significance. In early December these showed that the Japanese Embassy in Washington had been ordered to destroy all its codes and to prepare its staff for departure.”⁵⁴⁵

Many people, when they first learn the foregoing facts about Pearl Harbor, think: “Hey, I never knew there was any controversy about Pearl Harbor. I never read about it in school, or in the New York Times.” This document examines many suppressed stories of American history.

Involving America in World War I

Pearl Harbor embroiled America in World War II. What actually brought us into World War I? Though historians cite various factors, the Lusitania affair probably inflamed public opinion the most. In 1915, Britain was at war with Germany. The United States later joined the conflict on Britain's side, but at this point was still neutral.

The Lusitania, a British passenger ship enroute from America to England, was sunk by a German submarine. 128 Americans were among the passengers lost. Americans were told the Germans torpedoed the ship out of a wanton desire to kill innocent women and children. However, many facts were denied to the public.

⁵⁴⁵ Tragedy and Hope, page 919

Let's begin with the fact that although the Lusitania was considered a luxury passenger liner, its design specifications were drawn up by the British Admiralty. This enabled the British to easily convert her into a ship of war. In 1913, after adding armor and some other modifications, the British did exactly that. Unbeknownst to her passengers, the ship was then entered into the Admiralty fleet register as an armed auxiliary cruiser. Despite US "neutrality" and the risk to those aboard:

"The Lusitania became one of the most important carriers of war materials—including munitions—from the United States to England...On March 8th 1915... the captain of the Lusitania turned in his resignation...he was no longer willing "to carry the responsibility of mixing passengers with munitions."⁵⁴⁶

The Germans sank the Lusitania because she was transporting millions of rounds of ammunition, shrapnel shells, gun cotton, and other munitions. Quigley provided further insight into this little known fact about the passenger ship:

"American protests reached a peak when the Lusitania was sunk in this way nine miles off the English coast on May 7, 1915. The Lusitania was a British merchant vessel 'constructed with Government funds as an auxiliary cruiser,...expressly included in the navy list published by the British Admiralty,' with 'bases laid for mounting guns of six-inch caliber,' carrying a cargo of 2,400 cases of rifle cartridges and 1,250 cases of shrapnel, and with orders to attack German submarines whenever possible."⁵⁴⁷

Germany and Britain were at war, and the navies of both were attempting to cut each other's arms supplies. The Lusitania sank in just eighteen minutes after being struck by one torpedo. Survivors stated there had been two explosions –a smaller one followed by a huge one. The first was the torpedo hitting, the second very possibly the munitions detonating. This version of events –a single torpedo, followed by a massive explosion –was confirmed by the log book of the submarine, the U-20.

Even more significant is evidence the Lusitania was deliberately sent to her doom. Prior to the incident, Winston Churchill, then head of the British Admiralty, had ordered a study done to determine the political impact if the Germans sank a British passenger ship with Americans on board.

The British had cracked Germany's naval codes, and knew the approximate locations of her U-boats at that time, including the U-20. Commander Joseph Kenworthy, then in British Naval Intelligence, wrote:

"The Lusitania was sent at considerably reduced speed into an area where a U-boat was known to be waiting and with her escorts withdrawn."⁵⁴⁸

And just before the sinking, Edward Grey, the British foreign minister, asked Edward Mandell House (CFR founding member), top advisor to President Woodrow Wilson:

⁵⁴⁶ The Creature from Jekyll Island, pages 247, 248

⁵⁴⁷ Tragedy and Hope, page 250

⁵⁴⁸ Kenworthy, J.M. and George Young, Freedom of the Seas, New York, 1927, pg 131.

“What will America do if the Germans sink an ocean liner with American passengers on board?” As recorded in House’s diaries, he replied: “I believe that a flame of indignation would sweep the United States and that by itself would be sufficient to carry us into the war.”⁵⁴⁹

King George also brought up the subject and was even more specific about the possible target. He asked, “Suppose they should sink the Lusitania with American passengers on board...?”⁵⁵⁰

Approximately four hours later, a torpedo sent the Lusitania to the bottom of the ocean. Of its 1,959 passengers, 1,198 lost their lives. Nearly all of the US citizens aboard (128 of 139) were killed.⁵⁵¹ Predictably, House immediately seized the opportunity to stoke the “flame of indignation,” while cynically appealing to the moral implications of continued US neutrality. From England, Colonel House sent a telegram to President Wilson...It became the genesis of thousands of newspaper editorials across the land. He said piously:

“America has come to the parting of the ways, when she must determine whether she stands for civilized or uncivilized warfare. We can no longer remain neutral spectators. Our action in this crisis will determine...how far we may influence a settlement for the lasting good of humanity...our position amongst nations is being assessed by mankind.”

Regarding propaganda efforts overseas, Quigley adds:

“The propaganda agencies...made full use of the occasion. The Times of London [controlled by the Secret Round Table Group] announced that “four-fifths of her passengers were citizens of the United States”...the British manufactured and distributed a medal which they pretended had been awarded to the submarine crew by the German government; a French paper published a picture of the crowds in Berlin at the outbreak of war in 1914 as a picture of Germans “rejoicing” at the news of the sinking of the Lusitania.”⁵⁵²

1,198 people lost their lives in the sinking. This sinking has been described by Colin Simpson, the author of a book entitled *The Lusitania*, as “the foulest act of wilful murder ever committed on the seas.”⁵⁵³

At the U.S. hearing investigating the Lusitania incident, a critical piece of evidence was missing. President Woodrow Wilson ordered that the ship’s original manifest, listing her munitions, be hidden in the archives of the U.S. Treasury.

⁵⁴⁹ Colin Simpson, *The Lusitania* (Boston: Little Brown, 1972), 147.

⁵⁵⁰ *The Creature from Jekyll Island*

⁵⁵¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rms_Lusitania

⁵⁵² *Tragedy and Hope*, page 251

⁵⁵³ Colin Simpson, *The Lusitania* (Boston: Little Brown, 1972), 147.

In his book *The Lusitania*, British historian Colin Simpson recounted the foregoing facts; many of them aired in the documentary *In Search of the Lusitania*, seen on the History Channel and viewable today on YouTube in two parts.

Patrick Beesly is considered the leading authority on the history of British Naval Intelligence, in which he was long an officer. In his book *Room 40*, Beesly writes:

“I am reluctantly driven to the conclusion that there was a conspiracy deliberately to put the *Lusitania* at risk in the hopes that even an abortive attack on her would bring the United States into the war. Such a conspiracy could not have been put into effect without Winston Churchill’s express permission and approval.”⁵⁵⁴

Senior British military officer, military historian and strategist, Major General J. F. C. Fuller suspected that an international hidden power pushed U.S. in to the War:

“The government of the Western nations, whether monarchical or republican, had passed into the invisible hands of a plutocracy, international in power and grasp. It was, I venture to suggest, this semi-occult power which....pushed the mass of the American people into the cauldron of World War I.”

One lesser known fact about the war was that in 1915, the United States, who were not yet involved, loaned France and Great Britain \$500 million through American banks.

In 1912 the Pujo hearings of congress were held, addressing concentration of power on Wall Street. As Charles Tansill wrote in *America Goes to War*, “Even before the clash of arms, the French firm of Rothschild Freres cabled to Morgan Company in New York suggesting the flotation of a loan of \$100 million, a substantial part of which was to be left in the U.S. to pay for French purchases of American goods.”

In 1916, a single French loan totaled \$750 million. In all, the total amount of the loans to these allied countries amounted to \$3 billion, plus another \$6 billion for exports. This was just one of the reasons for America’s entry into the war. Had Germany won, those bonds held by American bankers would have been worthless. This explanation was also provided by historian Ferdinand Lundberg:

"The war, in brief, provided an unparalleled opportunity for the richest families to grab [exorbitant profits] at the expense of the public and, without exception, they made the most of this opportunity. The rich families, to be sure, wanted the war to be won, but they took care that the victory was expensive to the common taxpayers. They uttered no cries for government economy... so long as the public treasury was at their disposal."⁵⁵⁵

One of the families who reaped the exorbitant profits were "the Rockefellers, who were very eager for the United States to enter World War I, [and who] made far more than \$

⁵⁵⁴ Patrick Beesly, *Room 40: British Naval Intelligence 1914–1918* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanich, 1982), 122.

⁵⁵⁵ Ferdinand Lundberg, *America’s Sixty Families*, p. 201.

200,000,000 from that conflict."⁵⁵⁶

In fact, this theory was later confirmed by Sen. Gerald Nye (D-ND) who chaired a munitions investigation in 1936. Nye concluded that the House of Morgan had plunged the U.S. into WWI to protect loans and create a booming arms industry. Nye later produced a document titled *The Next War*, which cynically referred to “the old goddess of democracy trick”, through which Japan could be used to lure the U.S. into WWII.

As found by the Reece Congressional investigation of the Carnegie Foundation in 1954, the pressure to involve the American government started in 1909, long before the actual assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, the heir to the Habsburg throne, on June 28, 1914. This “war to end all wars” not only buried the United States in debt, it increased the Round Table Network’s financial leverage in direct proportion to that debt. But there were additional profits as well. Competing empires were destroyed, the isolationist tendencies of the United States were subverted, and the initial framework for a New World Order took shape. None of this happened by chance; each and every step was carefully planned to yield the desired result. And there you see how a handful of false and designing men can manipulate entire nations and alter the history of the world.⁵⁵⁷

Involving America in the Spanish–American War

In the mid–1890s, “yellow journal” newspapers, such as William Randolph Hearst’s *New York Journal*, were pushing for the United States to drive the Spanish out of Cuba, which had been a colony of Spain since 1511. Cuba had become the world’s wealthiest colony and largest sugar producer by the nineteenth century, and its sugar plantations were coveted by the Rockefellers’ National City Bank.

The American public was suddenly regaled with phony atrocity stories, such as the Spanish roasting Catholic priests and feeding Cubans to sharks. William Randolph Hearst paid bribes to have the private correspondence of Spanish ambassador Enrique Dupey de Lôme spied upon. In a private letter to a friend, the ambassador criticized U.S. President William McKinley. In violation of diplomatic immunity, the letter was stolen and reprinted in Hearst’s *Journal* under the headline “THE WORST INSULT TO THE UNITED STATES IN ITS HISTORY,” driving anti-Spanish feelings to fever pitch.

Just two days later –on February 15, 1898 –an enormous explosion tore apart the American battleship *Maine* in Cuba’s Havana Harbor. Most of the crew died –266 men. Although a Naval Court of Inquiry could not determine who was behind the incident, U.S. newspapers swiftly blamed the Spanish government.

The Spanish–American War ensued, with Americans rallied by the cry “Remember the Maine!” However, to this day, historians continue to ponder: What really sank the

⁵⁵⁶ David: Report on a Rockefeller, William Hoffman, December, 1971, p. 51.

⁵⁵⁷ As payments on mounting debt create greater and greater shortfalls, and as annual spending continues to increase unabated, larger and more frequent loans become necessary to bridge the gap. This accelerates the rate at which the national debt grows and, before long, even powerful nations will find themselves utterly dependent on a constant flow of newly borrowed funds to cover their expenses.” The Secret Network that controls the Federal Reserve is always happy to supply.

Maine? This much is certain: The Spanish had no motive to provoke America, and desperately tried to avoid war.

Spain still had mostly wooden warships, many in disrepair, which could not match the firepower of America's increasingly steel navy. The Spanish government's internal memoranda indicate they knew that a war against the mighty United States would be unwinnable. Spain acceded to every U.S. demand except complete withdrawal from Cuba, and offered to submit the matter of the Maine to arbitration.

Of the potential suspects for who sunk the Maine, Spain was least likely. According to historian Ferdinand Lundberg in his classic *America's Sixty Families*, President McKinley was beholden to John D. Rockefeller and Standard Oil. While governor of Ohio, McKinley went bankrupt, and was secretly bailed out by a syndicate headed by Rockefeller front man Mark Hanna, who had known John D. since they were high school classmates.

Hanna became McKinley's political manager. Many considered him the real White House boss; critics called the President "McHanna." On January 24, 1898, the inflammatory decision to send the Maine to Cuba was made at a White House meeting -of which no minutes were kept. Although the Spanish were advised that a warship would eventually visit, they were not expecting the Maine when it sailed into Havana January 25.

This was unknown to the ship's commander, Captain Charles Sigsbee, who wrote: "It became known to me afterward that the Maine had not been expected, even by the United States Consul General." With potential war looming, by what "oversight" did Washington fail to notify both Spanish and American officials in Havana of the battleship's arrival?

However, if anyone hoped shooting would erupt in the harbor, leading to war, they were disappointed. The Spanish, courteously if coolly, welcomed the Maine and permitted her to dock.

It is notable that the war was financed with a \$ 200 million loan from the Rockefellers' National City Bank. How was the loan to be repaid? Since no income tax then existed, a telephone tax was levied on the American people. That tax remained in place for 108 years. Mark Twain wrote:

"How our hearts burned with indignation against the atrocious Spaniards.... But when the smoke was over, the dead buried and the cost of the war came back to the people in an increase in the price of commodities and rent -that is, when we sobered up from our patriotic spree -it suddenly dawned on us that the cause of the Spanish-American War was the price of sugar."

And who acquired Spain's lucrative Cuban sugar industry -then known as "white gold"? Lundberg notes that "the Cuban sugar industry gravitated into [Rockefeller] National City's hands."

Quigley provides an additional peek behind the curtain of what the true cause of the Spanish American War was:

“In looking about for some issue which would distract public discontent from domestic economic issues, what better solution than a crisis in foreign affairs? ...The great opportunity...came with the Cuban revolt against Spain in 1895. While the ‘yellow press,’ led by William Randolph Hearst, roused public opinion, Henry Cabot Lodge [CFR member] and Theodore Roosevelt [CFR member] plotted how they could best get the United States into the fracas. They got the excuse they needed when the American battleship Maine was sunk by a mysterious explosion in Havana harbor in February 1898.”⁵⁵⁸

Involving America in the Vietnam War

The Gulf of Tonkin Incident is the name given to two separate incidents involving the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States in the waters of the Gulf of Tonkin. On August 2, 1964 two American destroyers engaged three North Vietnamese torpedo boats, resulting in the sinking of one of the torpedo boats. This was also the single most important reason for the escalation of the Vietnam War. After Kennedy was assassinated, the Gulf of Tonkin gave the country the sweeping support for aggressive military action against the North Vietnamese. The outcome of the incident was the passage by Congress of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, authorizing President Lyndon B. Johnson to intervene in the Vietnam War, to which he committed hundreds of thousands of troops. The justification given for the resolution was two alleged attacks on U.S. destroyers by Vietnamese torpedo boats in the Tonkin Gulf, on August 2 and 4, 1964.

President Johnson described the first attack as an “unprovoked assault” against a “routine patrol.” In actuality, the destroyer was supporting a South Vietnamese military operation against the North.

The second attack never occurred at all. Admiral James Stockdale, recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, was a pilot stationed in the Tonkin Gulf at the time. Later shot down, he spent seven years in a communist POW camp. After returning home, he summarized his experiences in his book *In Love and War*.

Stockdale was called to the scene of the alleged August 4 attack, but saw no Vietnamese boats during one and a half hours of overflight. Let’s pick up his narrative from his return to the aircraft carrier *Ticonderoga*:

“Wheeling into the ready room I had hurriedly left three hours before, I came face to face with about ten assorted ship’s company, air group, and staff intelligence officers –all with sheepish grins on their faces. The mood of the group was mirthful; obviously they had some big joke to tell me. “What in the hell has been going on out there?” they laughingly asked. “Damned if I know,” I said. “It’s really a flap. The guy on the Maddox [destroyer] Air Control radio was giving blow-by-blow accounts just like he did on Sunday. Turning left, turning right, torpedoes to the right of us, torpedoes to the left of us –boom, boom, boom! I got right down there and shot at whatever they were shooting at. I came around toward the destroyers once, right on the deck, chasing some imaginary PT boat they said was running up behind them, and fired every type of weapon I had –including a sidewinder!”. . . I was rather giddy by this time, and delivered

⁵⁵⁸ Tragedy and Hope, page 75

this “debriefing” with elaborate gestures as a kind of catch-on hilarity enveloped the room. “Did you see any boats?” “Not a one. No boats, no boat wakes, no ricochets off boats, no boat gunfire, no torpedo wakes –nothing but black sea and American firepower. But for goodness’ sake, I must be going crazy. How could all of that commotion have built up there without something being behind it?”⁵⁵⁹

Stockdale then describes being woken the next morning: After what seemed like a very short night,

“I felt myself being shaken. . . . “Who are you?” I asked. “I’m the junior officer of the deck, sir. The captain sent me down to wake you. We just got a message from Washington telling us to prepare to launch strikes against the beach, sir. . . .” “What’s the idea of the strikes?” “Reprisal, sir.” “Reprisal for what?” “For last night’s attack on the destroyers, sir.” I flipped on my bed lamp and the young officer left. I felt like I had been doused with ice water. How do I get in touch with the President? He’s going off half-cocked. . . . We were about to launch a war under false pretenses. . . . The fact that a war was being conceived out here in the humid muck of the Tonkin Gulf didn’t bother me so much; it seemed obvious that a tinderbox situation prevailed here and that there would be war in due course anyway. But for the long pull it seemed to me important that the grounds for entering war be legitimate. I felt it was a bad portent that we seemed to be under the control of a mindless Washington bureaucracy, vain enough to pick their own legitimacies regardless of the evidence.”⁵⁶⁰

Former Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara (CFR member) admitted years later that the Gulf of Tonkin Incident was a mistake. Indeed, in 2005, an internal National Security Agency historical study was declassified; it confirmed that USS Maddox had engaged the North Vietnamese on August 2, but that there may not have been any North Vietnamese vessels present during the engagement of August 4. The report stated “It is not simply that there is a different story as to what happened; it is that no attack happened that night...”

That yet another “mistake” cost over 50,000 GIs their lives? It was actually later revealed that the Tonkin Gulf Resolution was written before the alleged incident –i.e., the document was simply awaiting an excuse to activate it.

Few events have impacted America more than the Vietnam War. It spawned a vast protest movement, to which the subsequent “counterculture” generally traces its roots.

The typical explanation of the Vietnam disaster is that it was a quagmire: the Defense Department told Washington that beating the communists would be a piece of cake. But they underestimated the patriotic fervor of the Vietnamese, who loved communist leader Ho Chi Minh. So we sent 100,000 troops –that didn’t do any good; 200,000 didn’t either. Finally we sent 500,000 troops –no use! So the war dragged on for 14

⁵⁵⁹ Jim and Sybil Stockdale, *In Love & War: The Story of a Family’s Ordeal and Sacrifice during the Vietnam Years* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), 22–23.

⁵⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 24–25.

years, until finally we gave up, and South Vietnam fell to the communists. That's all there was to it –a big mess, a quagmire, that nothing could fix.

On a Google search you can find over one million websites pairing the words “Vietnam” and “quagmire.” But let's view Vietnam through the Establishment's hidden maneuverings and motives. Until 1954, Vietnam had been a French colony. As du Berrier noted:

“According to Mr. Charles Bohlen's [CFR member] minutes of the Cairo–Teheran papers, it was by secret agreement between President Roosevelt and Joseph Stalin on December 1, 1943, that France's premature elimination from Southeast Asia and the sowing of wars to come were effected. Franklin D. Roosevelt, we are told by Mr. Bohlen, “was 100% in agreement [at Teheran] with Marshal Stalin that France should not get back Indochina.”⁵⁶¹

After World War II, U.S. foreign policy dictated that France quit Vietnam. Few recall that the United States initially supported Ho Chi Minh, first by intervening to have the British release him from a Hong Kong jail. Then, in 1945, the OSS –forerunner of the CIA –trained Ho's army and provided him with guns and 20,000 cartridges to fight the French. In the meantime, the U.S. press extolled him. In 1946, Newsweek's Harold Isaacs compared him to George Washington. In 1954, with its troops hemmed in by Ho's forces at the critical battle of Dien Bien Phu, France begged the United States to intervene. A one-hour aircraft carrier strike would have averted disaster, but the U.S. government refused.

Following the French pullout, and division of Vietnam into North and South, U.S. foreign policy's next objective was removing emperor Bao Dai, the one man capable of uniting the country. Through a rigged plebiscite, Ngo Dinh Diem –hand-picked by the CFR –was installed as South Vietnam's president, and the emperor ousted. The South Vietnamese hated the corrupt and oppressive Diem, who drove many Vietnamese into the communists' arms.

In the meantime, CIA Colonel Edward Lansdale (CFR member) oversaw the disarming and destruction of three powerful anti-communist groups in Vietnam: the Cao Dai sect, Hoa Hao sect, and Le Van Vien's private army. Thus, even before U.S. troops went to Vietnam, our CFR-dictated foreign policy had ravaged the country, sponsored Ho Chi Minh, and destroyed his opponents at every level –French, imperial, and local.⁵⁶²

What about the catastrophic war itself, which lasted from 1961 until 1975? Let's give it context. In World War II, the United States fought on two fronts –Europe and the Pacific. The German and Japanese forces were extremely tough and well-equipped. Yet we crushed both those military empires, with our allies' help, in just three and a half years. On the other hand, we spent 14 years fighting little North Vietnam and failed. Something's wrong with the picture!

⁵⁶¹ Hilaire du Berrier, *Background to Betrayal: The Tragedy of Vietnam* (Belmont, Mass.: Western Islands, 1965), viii.

⁵⁶² Du Berrier's *Background to Betrayal: The Tragedy of Vietnam* extensively documents these facts.

In the March 1968 Science Mechanics, Lloyd Mallan interviewed nearly a dozen retired high-ranking U.S. military officers. Each, queried separately, said the Vietnam War could be won quickly –in weeks or months. They were nearly unanimous in their recommendations:

- (1) declare war on North Vietnam;
- (2) take the war directly against the North by invasion plus decisively bombing strategic targets;
- (3) blockade Haiphong Harbor, where North Vietnam received some 90 percent of its war supplies.

The communists were sending those supplies south via the Ho Chi Minh Trail. President Johnson periodically permitted bombing of the trail, but historically, bombing had not been very effective at halting supply lines. The communists, forewarned of approaching bombers detected by radar, would simply pull off the trail, wait until the bombs fell, then resume their trek. Officers interviewed by Mallan observed we should have blocked the trail with troops.

Not permitted to win the war

U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara was forbidding the Air Force to strike over 90 percent of the strategic targets it wanted to hit. (A CFR member, he left the Defense Department to become president of the UN World Bank.)

Then there were the Rules of Engagement, not declassified until 1985, when they consumed 26 pages of the Congressional Record's fine print. According to the Rules of Engagement, American soldiers weren't allowed to shoot at the enemy first, but had to wait until fired upon. If a pilot saw a MiG (fighter plane) on the ground, he couldn't attack –he had to wait until it was airborne and showing hostile intent. If a surface-to-air missile launch site was under construction, he couldn't bomb it –he had to wait until it was fully operational. Imagine if we had fought World War II that way. A pilot spots several Luftwaffe planes on a German airfield, but his squadron commander says, "Sorry, boys, leave them alone. We have to wait until they're in the air and shooting at us."

If we had approached World War II like we did Vietnam, the Axis would have defeated us. Clearly, we didn't lose in Vietnam because its people loved communism or Ho Chi Minh, but because our soldiers were chained. Washington politicians, not the military, authored those restrictions. Without them, the war would have ended in months, and would now be a little-remembered episode in U.S. history.

Who was responsible for this tragedy? The first U.S. combat troops went to Vietnam in late 1961. President Kennedy authorized sending about 10,000 on the advice of the State Department's and CFR member Walt Rostow, who had just returned from a fact-finding mission to Vietnam. Well, obviously this Rostow must have been a big anti-communist –otherwise he never would have made that recommendation! To the contrary: his father had been a Marxist revolutionary in Russia. Two of his aunts belonged to the U.S. Communist Party. His brother, CFR member Eugene V. Debs Rostow, was named after Socialist Party leader Eugene Debs. The Eisenhower State Department rejected Walt Rostow for employment three times as a security risk. Rostow's background resonated with communism, not anti-communism.

Let's quote Rostow's book *The United States in the World Arena*, published the year before his advice to Kennedy on Vietnam:

"It is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations—including the United States—the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this right is the root of national sovereignty, it is therefore an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined."⁵⁶³

The preceding was a classic World Government pronouncement, typical of the CFR—to which Rostow belonged. As we noted earlier, Congress authorized President Johnson to intervene in Vietnam through the 1964 Tonkin Gulf Resolution. It was written before the two alleged North Vietnamese attacks on the U.S. Navy; Admiral Stockdale testified that the second never even occurred. Who prematurely authored the Tonkin Gulf Resolution? CFR member William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Well, if Bundy wrote that resolution, he must have been an anti-communist. In the 1950s, Bundy headed the defense fund for the notorious Soviet spy and CFR member Alger Hiss, who's guilt has been proven conclusively by the release of the Verona files – FBI decodings of Soviet intercepts from the 1940s.

After Bundy left the State Department, CFR chairman David Rockefeller appointed him editor of *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the Council on Foreign Relations, America's leading opponent of national sovereignty.

In 1964, President Johnson successfully ran for reelection against Republican Barry Goldwater, whom the press branded a "war-monger." But after the election, Johnson himself suddenly began escalating the war, committing hundreds of thousands of troops. Why? Few people know that he made the decision at the urging of a secret clique called "the Wise Men," fourteen senior advisors, twelve of whom were CFR members. These meetings are described in the book *The Wise Men*, by Walter Isaacson and Evan Thomas, themselves CFR members.

The book does not condemn the Wise Men, but overflows with praise for them. Actually, Johnson had not wanted to escalate, but the Wise Men insisted. Their leader, who led the charge in demanding escalation, was former Secretary of State and CFR member Dean Acheson. Obviously, Acheson must have been a big reactionary anti-communist to give Johnson that advice. To the contrary, even before the United States recognized the USSR in 1933, the murderous dictator Joseph Stalin selected the young attorney Dean Acheson to represent Soviet interests in America.

While Truman's Secretary of State, Acheson surrounded himself with communists, known spies and security risks –such as John Stewart Service, John Carter Vincent and CFR member Lauchlin Currie. He promoted John Stewart Service even after the FBI caught him passing government secrets to communist agents. In the late 1940s, Poland's new communist regime hired Acheson's law firm to win U.S. recognition. His

⁵⁶³ Walt Rostow, *The United States in the World Arena* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 549.

law partner was Donald Hiss—brother of Soviet spy Alger Hiss and a secret member of the Communist Party (not to mention CFR member).

In short, the men who maneuvered us into Vietnam were not anti-communist, but soft on communism or even pro-communist. Although not “card-carrying” Party members, it defies credibility that they would seek to defeat communism through war. Nor were they flag-waving patriots –they were quite the opposite: CFR globalists who opposed nationalism in favor of all-powerful world government.

Incidentally, Bundy, who drafted the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, was Acheson’s son-in-law. This was a small, tight group. Furthermore, nearly all key American policy planners during the Vietnam War were CFR members. When we realize that the same clique that got us into the war authored the Rules of Engagement and other restrictions preventing victory, it is clear that Vietnam was not a “quagmire” or the result of “blunder,” but happened as planned.

The ‘war protest movement’ was secretly supported and financed from behind the scenes by those same interests which control the tax-exempt foundations and the Federal Reserve banking system

One of the goals—successfully implemented—was to provoke a huge American political slide to the left. College students, many of whom previously thought little about politics, were transformed into Marxists and revolutionaries. Wars have traditionally been exploited to sow revolution. Lenin, for example, used World War I to ignite the Russian Revolution. In *The Strawberry Statement: Notes of a College Revolutionary*, student radical James Kunen described the 1968 annual meeting of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which spearheaded the war protest movement:

“Also at the convention, men from Business International Round Tables –the meetings sponsored by Business International –tried to buy up a few radicals. These men are the world’s leading industrialists and they convene to decide how our lives are going to go. They are the left wing of the ruling class. They offered to finance our demonstrations in Chicago. We were also offered Esso (Rockefeller) money. They want us to make a lot of radical commotion so they can look more in the center as they move to the left.”⁵⁶⁴

Jerry Kirk, one-time member of SDS and the Communist Party, testified before the House and Senate Internal Security Panels:

“Young people have no conception of the conspiracy strategy of pressure from above and pressure from below. . . . They have no idea that they are playing into the hands of the Establishment they claim to hate. The radicals think they are fighting the forces of the super-rich, like Rockefeller and Ford, and they don’t realize that it is precisely such forces which are behind their own revolution, financing it, and using it for their own purposes.”⁵⁶⁵

When Stokeley Carmichael was head of the militant revolutionary group known as

⁵⁶⁴ James Kunen, *The Strawberry Statement: Notes of a College Revolutionary* (New York: Random House, 1969), 112.

⁵⁶⁵ William Norman Grigg, “Behind the Environmental Lobby,” *The New American* (April 4, 2005): 19.

SNCC, he was invited to speak at the University of Chicago. Jerry Kirk, then still a Black Panther, was among those who attended, and here is how he described Carmichael's appearance:

"Mr. Carmichael was obviously in the middle of something rather important which made him more nervous and more tense than in the past. ... He started speaking of things which he said he could not have said before because his research was not finished. . . .

He spoke of the false consciousness of many blacks who believed the Jews were the instruments of oppression of blacks, and ... he made note of the fact that, even though many Jewish people, for example in New York, owned quite a bit of land, one must understand that the overwhelming percentages of mortgages in Harlem was owned, not by Jewish people, but by Morgan Guarantee Trust (the Morgan Family) and Chase Manhattan Bank (the Rockefellers).

He repeated the line from the song he liked so well, "Something is happening here, but you don't know quite what it is, do you, Mr. Jones?"...

He kept hitting on the theme that a very large monopoly capitalist money group, bankers to be exact, was instrumental in formenting this idea that Jews are the ones actually behind the oppression of blacks. What he was getting at was that . . . the Jews were simply one strata of society who are themselves being oppressed by people who were much richer and much more powerful.

In the agencies of this power, he cited banks, the chief among which were Morgan Guarantee Trust and Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan. And the foundations connected with these monoliths."⁵⁶⁶

It was not long after he began to speak out against international bankers and tax-exempt foundations, Stokely Carmichael mysteriously was ousted from both SNCC and the Black Panthers. Apparently he had learned too much. As further documented by Quigley:

"More than fifty years ago the [International Bankers] 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."⁵⁶⁷

Thus the Secret Network played a double game, arranging the war on one hand, financing the resulting rebellion on the other. Part of the plan was to touch off a furor of anti-patriotism, epitomized by the burning of American flags on college

⁵⁶⁶ See "SNCC Breaks Ties With Stokely Carmichael," New York Times, Aug 23, 1968, p. 45.

⁵⁶⁷ Tragedy and Hope, page 396

campuses. Destroying patriotism, of course, is prerequisite to absorbing nations into an all-powerful world government.⁵⁶⁸

The real action is in the reaction

If those who seek world dominion can stimulate leftist mobs into violent confrontation with local law enforcement, and also provide exhaustive news coverage so that the entire nation can see and tremble, then the peaceful and freedom-loving majority can be programmed to accept a vast expansion of government powers and even a national police force offered supposedly to end the violence.

If those who seek world dominion can raise the spectre of an enemy armed to the teeth with superior atomic weapons on the verge of launching a nuclear holocaust, and then offer world government as a prevention, then millions of Americans can be programmed to accept the loss of national sovereignty as our last best hope for peace.

In revolutionary literature the tactic is known as "Pressure from above and below." It is the strategy that the founding member of the Council on Foreign Relations, Col. Edward Mandell House, laid down in his book Philip Dru, Administrator. **Deliberately create problems, and then offer only those solutions that result in the expansion of government.** Create conditions so frightful at home and abroad that the abandonment of personal liberties and national sovereignty will appear as a reasonable price for a return to domestic tranquility and world peace.

To put over police state measures at home, they need chaos, crime and anarchy in the streets. To sell, the idea of world government, they need the constant threat of nuclear war or Terrorism. Or, as they say in revolutionary circles, the real action is in the reaction, as illuminated by Henry Kissinger, CFR member and member of the Trilateral commission, during the 1991 Bilderberger Conference held in Evians, France:

“Today, America would be outraged if UN troops entered Los Angeles to restore order (referring to the riot caused by the Rodney King incident). Tomorrow they will be grateful! This is especially true if they were told that there were an outside threat from beyond, **whether real or promulgated**, that threatened our very existence. It is then that all peoples of the world will plead to deliver them from this evil. The one thing every man fears is the unknown. When presented

⁵⁶⁸ There's another interesting aspect to the Vietnam war based on this knowledge that the Establishment played a double game, arranging the war on one hand, financing the resulting rebellion on the other. It is possible that this was also the method by which the American people were also being conditioned to support a "no-win" strategy in war. For example, the American people, until at least the Korean War, believed that our government should first avoid wars, but once in one, they believed the government should win and then leave. But the government's strategy during the Vietnamese War was never to win but to find ways to prolong the war, and the funding of anti-war protestors were possibly for that purpose. This strategy is simple. The public was told by the controlled mainstream media that covered every meeting of three or more anti-war protestors, that to oppose the war was un-American. The protestors were to do everything to discredit the American flag, the nation, and the military. To do this they burned the flag, used obscenities, and carried the flag of the enemy, the Viet Cong. All of these activities were calculated to tell the American people that there were only two choices in the war: 1. Support your government in whatever action they might take in the war; or 2. Join the protestors in objecting to the war by burning the flag, using obscenities, and carrying the flag of the enemy. Another slogan made popular during the war was: "Your country: love it or leave it." There were only two options being offered: either support your government in its "no-win" strategy, or leave the country. The traditional goal of America's strategy in a war, victory, was not being offered as an option.

with this scenario, **individual rights will be willingly relinquished for the guarantee of their well-being granted to them by the World Government.**"⁵⁶⁹

This tactic is as old as the tyranny the American Founding generation fought to reject, as James Madison once said:

“Perhaps it is a universal truth that the loss of liberty at home is to be charged to provisions against danger, real or perceived, from abroad.” — James Madison, Letter to Thomas Jefferson

Scholar, writer and journalist, H. L. Mencken further explained:

“The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed—and thus clamorous to be led to safety—by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary.”

This was the same tactic used in Nazi Germany, as summed up by Hermann Goering, President of the Reichstag, Nazi Party, and Luftwaffe Commander in Chief:

“Naturally the common people don’t want war: Neither in Russia, nor in England, 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. 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 peacemakers for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country.”

This is the same philosophy espoused by the CFR as described by CFR Senior Fellow Michael Clough in 1994 describing the aforementioned secret CFR clique called “the Wise Men”:

“[T]he “Wise Men” [of the CFR] assiduously guarded it [American foreign policy] for the past 50 years... They ascended to power during World War II... This was as it should be. National security and the national interest, they argued must transcend the special interests and passions of the people who make up America... How was this small band of Atlantic-minded **internationalists** able to triumph ... Eastern internationalists were able to shape and staff the burgeoning foreign policy institutions... **As long as the Cold War endured and nuclear Armageddon seemed only a missile away, the public was willing to tolerate such an undemocratic foreign policy making system.**”⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁹ “It is not a matter of what is true that counts, but a matter of what is perceived to be true.” -- Henry Kissinger, CFR member, former Secretary of State and National Security Advisor to two U.S. Presidents,

⁵⁷⁰ As quoted in the opening article by CFR Senior Fellow Michael Clough in The CFR's Foreign Affairs publication January/February, 1994.

The philosophy behind this tactic is laid out in a 1960's government think tank Report From Iron Mountain, This Report was published in 1967 as the leaked findings of a private three-year study commissioned by the U.S. government. The study chiefly discussed the implications of the world moving from the system of war –which nuclear weapons were making impractical –to disarmament. The report cited many advantages to war, not the least of which was allegiance by citizens to their government: In general, the war system provides the basic motivation for primary social motivation. In doing so, it reflects on the societal level the incentives of individual human behavior. The most important of these, for social purposes, is the individual psychological rationale for allegiance to a society and its values. Allegiance requires a cause; a cause requires an enemy. This much is obvious; the critical point is that the enemy that defines the cause must seem genuinely formidable. The report noted that if wars disappeared, a new “enemy” would be required to induce allegiance as described in the excerpt below:

“The war system not only has been essential to the existence of nations as independent political entities, but has been equally indispensable to their stable political structure. Without it, no government has ever been able to obtain acquiescence in its "legitimacy," or right to rule its society. The possibility of war provides the sense of external necessity without which no government can long remain in power. The historical record reveals one instance after another where the failure of a regime to maintain the credibility of a war threat led to its dissolution, by the forces of private interest, of reactions to social injustice, or of other disintegrative elements. The organization of society for the possibility of war is its principal political stabilizer It has enabled societies to maintain necessary class distinctions, and it has insured the subordination of the citizens to the state by virtue of the residual war powers inherent in the concept of nationhood.”⁵⁷¹

It concludes that there can be no substitute for war unless it possesses three properties. It must (1) be economically wasteful, (2) represent a credible threat of great magnitude, and (3) provide a logical excuse for compulsory service to the government...Credibility, in fact, lies at the heart of the problem of developing a political substitute for war.⁵⁷²

It bears repeating what the Reece Committee found in their investigation, as quoted by Rene Wormser, Counsel for the Reece Congressional Committee of Congress:

"When Andrew Carnegie established The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, he gave the managers of this fund a difficult task. How were they to go about promoting peace? They seem to have had no very clear idea until Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler . . . got excited about the peril of the Allies in World War I and decided that **the best way to establish peace was to help get the United States into the War.** To this end he began to use the Endowment funds.”⁵⁷³

⁵⁷¹ Leonard C. Lewin, Report from Iron Mountain (1967, reprint; New York: The Free Press, 1996

⁵⁷² Ibid., p. 60–61.

⁵⁷³ Foundations: Their Power and Influence (Devin–Adair: New York, 1958, p. 341),

This idea adopted by Dr. Butler and the Carnegie Endowment (premised on the establishment of One-world government) of **“establishing peace” through the “creation of war”— with the ultimate goal of all humankind living under one common political authority—was clearly a rationale and a major factor in these wars**, especially World War I (used to create the League of Nations), World War II (United Nations), and the Korean War—as covered in the following section—(used to validate the UN as a peacekeeper).

The Role Of The United Nations In The Korean War

On June 25, 1950, Kim Il-sung, North Korea’s communist dictator, sent his troops to invade South Korea. American forces, fighting under UN authority, came to South Korea’s defense, in a bloody three-year war that ended in stalemate.

But how did Kim Il-sung and the communists come to power in North Korea? The answer: officials in the United States government put them there, in a roundabout way.

The foreign policy snafu in Korea

During World War II, the U.S. fought the Germans in Europe and the Japanese in Asia. The Soviet Union, then under Joseph Stalin’s brutal rule, was our “ally” during this war. The Soviets, however, only fought Germany; they maintained a nonaggression pact with Japan. But at the “Big Three” conferences at Teheran and Yalta, President Roosevelt asked Stalin if he would break his treaty with Japan and enter the Pacific war.

Stalin agreed—on condition that the United States supply him with all the weapons, vehicles and material his Far Eastern army would need for the expedition. Roosevelt agreed, and some 600 shiploads of supplies were sent across the Pacific to Russia to equip Stalin’s army to fight Japan.

This was an absurd foreign policy decision. Stalin was a well-known aggressor. The 1939 invasion of Poland, which officially began World War II, had actually been a joint venture by the Germans and Soviets. In 1940, Stalin had invaded Finland, Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, and annexed part of Romania. No one could seriously believe he would bring benevolence to Asia.

Stalin did not send his army into the Far East until five days before the war ended; Japan, already struck by the atomic bomb, was ready to surrender. Soviet forces moved into China, where, after very limited fighting, they accepted the surrender of huge Japanese weapons depots. They then turned these weapons, plus their own American lend-lease supplies, supplies, over to communist rebel Mao Tse-tung. Thus armed, the Chinese communists ultimately overthrew the Nationalist government. But what about Korea? At the time, it was a Japanese protectorate.

In April 1944, the CFR’s influential journal of foreign policy *Foreign Affairs* published an article entitled “Korea in the Postwar World.” It proposed dividing Korea into a trusteeship, its fate similar to that of East and West Germany and Berlin. We would control Korea’s southern half, while our “noble” Soviet allies would take custody of the North.

Naturally, Stalin agreed with this idea, and the Soviets received power over North Korea. Considering that the Soviets did nothing to win the Pacific war, North Korea was

an enormous trophy to give the dictator Stalin, well known to have murdered millions of his own people. Stalin swiftly established a communist government under Kim Il-sung in North Korea, and equipped him with the tanks, MiGs and other weapons needed for the 1950 invasion –which could have been completely avoided had we not made overtures to Stalin to bring him into the Far East.

This little “policy snafu” resulted in a war that killed more than 33,000 American soldiers, as well as over one million Koreans. In addition, North Koreans have suffered for over 60 years under one of history’s most oppressive dictatorships. So before we dismiss this as “accident,” let’s quote James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense under President Truman. Seeing that certain diplomats made decisions that invariably favored the Soviet Union and harmed the United States, he said:

“Consistency has never been a mark of stupidity. If the diplomats who have mishandled our relations with Russia were merely stupid, they would occasionally make a mistake in our favor.”

Until the United States became a member of the United Nations, of course, we had never fought a war that ended in anything except victory. And we could easily have achieved victory in Korea if it had not been for our unnatural subservience to foreign interests. Since the Korean War is often cited as one of the outstanding achievements of the UN, it is worth our while to take a brief look at a few of the less obvious aspects of this tragic affair in light of Secretary Forrestal’s admission.

In 1947 General Albert C. Wedemeyer was sent to the Far East to make an official military appraisal of conditions there. In his report to President Truman, General Wedemeyer stated:

“Whereas American and Soviet forces engaged in occupation duties in South and North Korea respectively are approximately equal, each comprising less than 50,000 troops, the Soviet equipped and trained North Korean People’s Army of approximately 125,000 is vastly superior to the U.S. organized constabulary of 16,000 Koreans equipped with Japanese small arms. The North Korean People’s Army constitutes a potential military threat to South Korea, since there is a strong possibility that the Soviets will withdraw their occupation forces, and thus induce our own withdrawal. This probably will take place just as soon as they can be sure that the North Korean puppet government and its armed forces which they have created are strong enough and sufficiently well indoctrinated to be relied upon to carry out Soviet objectives without the actual presence of Soviet troops.”⁵⁷⁴

This, of course, is exactly what happened, but General Wedemeyer’s report was, at Secretary of State George Marshall’s insistence, suppressed and denied to both Congress and the public. After we had withdrawn most of our troops in accordance with a United Nations resolution, our Army general headquarters in South Korea began sending repeated and urgent reports to Washington warning that there was an

⁵⁷⁴ Albert C. Wedemeyer, *Wedemeyer Reports* (New York, Henry Holt & Company, Inc., 1958), p. 475.

unmistakable military buildup just above the 38th Parallel. One such report even contained the date of the expected North Korean attack.⁵⁷⁵

In spite of these reports, however, and despite the fact that money had been appropriated by Congress for the purpose of building up South Korea's defenses, officialdom somehow managed to stall and delay for over three months so that no military equipment—not even ammunition—was delivered to reinforce South Korea.⁵⁷⁶ Yet, when the attack finally came Washington officials pretended to be surprised and taken off guard.

The actual course of the war is well known. Our tiny occupational force was overwhelmed, backed into the Pusan pocket, and hovered on the brink of being pushed into the sea. There is no doubt that the Communists fully expected to sweep us off the peninsula with hardly any opposition, and they would have done it, too, if it had not been for the independent Americanism of General MacArthur and the bravery of his troops. As MacArthur, himself, recalled:

"The only predictions from Washington at that time warned of impending military disaster. Then, too, our ammunition was critically short. . . . General [Walton] Walker, at one stage, was down to five rounds per gun. His heroically successful efforts under unparalleled shortages of all sorts constituted an amazing military exploit."⁵⁷⁷

Hopelessly outnumbered by the enemy, General MacArthur conceived one of the most brilliant maneuvers in military history: the Inchon landing. It was a daring surprise flank attack aimed at cutting off the North Korean supply lines. It worked beautifully and, as a result, the enemy forces disintegrated and were nearly destroyed. As General MacArthur stated:

"By the latter part of October, the capital of Pyongyang was captured. These events completely transformed the situation from pessimism to optimism. This was the golden moment to translate military victory to a politically advantageous peace. Success in war involves military as well as political considerations. For the sacrifice leading to a military victory would be pointless if not translated properly to the political advantage of peace. But what happened was just the contrary."⁵⁷⁸

There was early evidence that the North Korean forces were being trained and equipped by the Soviets and, after the Inchon landing, that the Chinese Communists

⁵⁷⁵ Military Situation in the Far East, hearings before the Senate committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations (1951), pt. 1, pp. 436, 545; and pt. 3, p. 1991. Also, "Accept Chiang's Troop Offer, Knowland Urges," Los Angeles Examiner (July 11, 1950), sec. 1, p. 4. At this time Senator Knowland was a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

⁵⁷⁶ Military Situation in the Far East, hearings before the Senate committees on Armed Forces and Foreign Relations, final report (August 17, 1951), pt. 5, p. 3581.

⁵⁷⁷ Speech by Anthony T. Bouscaren before the Congress of Freedom, Veterans War Memorial Auditorium (San Francisco, April 1955).

⁵⁷⁸ Ibid.

were providing actual combat troops by the thousands. Lt. General Samuel E. Anderson, commander of the Fifth Air Force, revealed that entire Soviet Air Force units fought in the Korean War for over two and a half years "to gain combat experience for the pilots." All in all, some 425 Migs were being flown by Russian pilots.⁵⁷⁹

The Soviets never even tried to conceal their part in the war. When United States Ambassador Lodge complained to the UN General Assembly's political committee that "Soviet planning instigated the original aggression, which was subsequently maintained by Soviet training and equipment," Vyshinsky, the Soviet delegate, calmly admitted the substance of the charge and replied, "Mr. Lodge is pushing at an open door."⁵⁸⁰

Not permitted to win the war

In spite of all this, the United States Government refused to allow General MacArthur to pursue the enemy across the Yalu River or even to bomb the bridges over which the Chinese Communists transported their troops and supplies. The official reason given was to prevent a war between the United States and Red China! The real reason, since we were already in a war with Red China, was simply that the United Nations did not want us to obtain a victory in Korea, and we had, by this time, agreed to go along with whatever the UN wanted.

The typical view of so many of our UN allies was expressed in *The Fabian Essays*, published in London in 1952, with a preface by Prime Minister Clement Attlee. On page 31 the author, R. H. Crossman, says:

"A victory for either side [in the cold war] would be defeat for socialism. We are members of the Atlantic Alliance (NATO); but this does not mean that we are enemies of every Communist revolution. We are opposed to Russian expansion, but also to an American victory."⁵⁸¹

In 1950, when Congress appropriated rather substantial sums of money to carry on the Korean War, and it looked as though we just might start thinking in terms of pressing for a victory, Prime Minister Attlee rushed to the United States to confer with President Truman. His mission was aptly described by the *U.S. News and World Report* which stated:

"The British Government continues to maintain direct diplomatic relations with the Chinese Communists . . . even though Chinese armies were killing British youths. . . . To Mr. Attlee, China's Mao Tse-tung still is an official friend. . . . He does big business with the British through Hong Kong. British businessmen are accepted in China. . . . The British want to get rid of Chiang and turn Formosa over to the Communists. They oppose any move inside China that might embarrass the Communist regime. . . . Mr. Attlee still hopes for a deal covering Asia, while keeping up the appearance of a fight in Korea."⁵⁸²

⁵⁷⁹ "Soviet Jet Units Defeated in Korea by U.S. Flyers Air Chief Discloses," *New York Times* (September 19, 1953), sec. 1, p. 1.

⁵⁸⁰ Chesly Manly, *The UN Record* (Chicago, Henry Regnery Company, 1955), pp. 82-83.

⁵⁸¹ As quoted by Alice Widener, *Congressional Digest* (Washington, D.C., August-September 1960), p. 217.

⁵⁸² *U.S. News and World Report* (December 15, 1950), pp. 11-12.

Mr. Attlee was needlessly alarmed, for on November 16, 1950, President Truman announced:

"Speaking for the U.S. Government and people, I can give assurances that we support and are acting within the limits of the UN policy in Korea and that we have never at any time entertained any intention to carry hostilities into China."⁵⁸³

When the Chinese crossed the Yalu, General MacArthur instantly ordered the bridges—six of them—destroyed by our Air Force. Within hours his orders were countermanded from Washington. These bridges still stand. In his bitterness, the general exclaimed,

"I realized for the first time that I had actually been denied the use of my full military power to safeguard the lives of my soldiers and the safety of my army. To me, it clearly foreshadowed a future tragic situation in Korea and left me with a sense of inexpressible shock."⁵⁸⁴

Not only did we forbid our army commanders to fight for victory in Korea, we denied them access to military assistance that was readily available. The free Nationalist Chinese on Formosa had offered to send between fifty and sixty thousand fighting men to push back the Chinese Reds. They were confident that with very little difficulty a crushing military defeat in North Korea could set off widespread rebellion in Red China itself. The Nationalist Chinese would have been a valuable help to our forces in any event, since they had a reason to fight and wanted desperately to get into it. They offered troops, but General George Marshall, CFR cohort, turned them down because it was not felt that Chiang's troops would be effective, and "for other reasons."

On June 27, 1950, President Truman announced: ". . . I am calling upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done."⁵⁸⁵

We not only denied our own troops in Korea much-needed reinforcements which would have spared us thousands of casualties, but we even sent the U.S. Seventh Fleet to patrol the Formosa Straits to protect the Chinese Reds from attack!

In spite of these unprecedented self-imposed handicaps, General MacArthur continued to spoil the Communist plans. At another crucial point in the fighting, the enemy once again began to fall apart. In the last half of May they had been driven back twenty miles with casualties estimated at one hundred thousand. In order to save them from complete defeat and to give them a breathing spell, UN Soviet delegate Jacob Malik proposed negotiations for a cease-fire at the 38th Parallel.

⁵⁸³ Speech by Anthony T. Bouscaren before the Congress of Freedom, Veterans War Memorial Auditorium (San Francisco, April 1955).

⁵⁸⁴ Charles A. Willoughby and John Chamberlain, *MacArthur, 1941–1951* (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1954), pp. 401–402.

⁵⁸⁵ *American Historical Documents*, p. 406.

With MacArthur insisting that there was no substitute for victory and that the war against Communism would be either won or lost in Korea, he was relieved of his command, on April 11, 1951, by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway (CFR member). And so, with our forces once again poised on the brink of victory, MacArthur was dismissed and our forward movement was halted. Even though South Korean President Syngman Rhee wanted to drive the Communists across the 38th Parallel and liberate all of North Korea, President Eisenhower (CFR member) wrote to him and said:

"It was indeed a crime that those who attacked from the North invoked violence to unite Korea under their rule. Not only as your official friend, but as your personal friend, I urge that your country not embark upon a similar course."⁵⁸⁶

Air Force Commander, Gen. George Stratemeyer said:

"We had sufficient air bombardment, fighters, reconnaissance so that I could have taken out all those supplies, those airdromes on the other side of the Yalu; I could have bombed the devils between there and Mukden, stopped the railroad operating and the people of China that were fighting could not have been supplied ... **But we weren't permitted to do it. As a result, a lot of American blood was spilled over there in Korea.**"

Gen. Stratemeyer testified before the Congress: "

"You get in war to win it. You do not get in war to stand still and lose it and **we were required to lose it. We were not permitted to win.**"

Gen. Matt Clark told them: "I was not allowed to bomb the numerous bridges across the Yalu River over which the enemy constantly poured his trucks, and his munitions, and his killers."

MacArthur would later write:

"I was ... worried by a series of directives from Washington which were greatly decreasing the potential of my air force. First **I was forbidden 'hot' pursuit of enemy planes that attacked our own.** Manchuria and Siberia were sanctuaries of inviolate protection for all enemy forces and for all enemy purposes, no matter what depredations or assaults might come from there. Then **I was denied the right to bomb the hydroelectric plants along the Yalu River.** This order was broadened to include every plant in North Korea which was **capable of furnishing electric power to Manchuria and Siberia ...** Most incomprehensible of all was the **refusal to let me bomb the important supply center at Racin,** which was not in Manchuria or Siberia, but many miles from the border ... (where) the Soviet Union forwarded supplies from Vladivostok for the North Korean Army. I felt that **step-by-step my weapons were being taken away from me...**"

"That there was some leak in intelligence was evident to everyone. (Brig. Gen. Walton) Walker continually complained to me that **operations were known to**

⁵⁸⁶ As quoted by Manly, pp. 75-76.

the enemy in advance through sources in Washington ... information must have been relayed to them assuring that the Yalu River bridges would continue to enjoy sanctuary and that their bases would be left intact. They knew they could swarm down across the Yalu River without having to worry about bombers hitting their Manchurian supply lines ... **I realized for the first time that I had actually been denied the use of my full military power to safeguard the lives of my soldiers and the safety of my army.**"

Gen. Douglas MacArthur also said: "I am concerned for the security of our great nation, not so much because of any threat from without, but because of the insidious forces working from within."

Chinese General Lin Piao, the commander of the Chinese troops who slaughtered so many Americans, would go on to admit:

"I never would have made the attack and risked my men and my military reputation if I had not been assured that Washington would restrain General MacArthur..."⁵⁸⁷

Over 33,000 American lives were lost in a war that they were not allowed to win. Instead, a truce was signed on July 27, 1953.

One final tragic glimpse at this new American no-win policy, which was put into practice in Korea, was provided in a Department of Defense press release dated May 15, 1954. It described in detail how high-ranking Russian military officers were actually on the scene in North Korea directing military operations. This, of course, was not news. But then the release stated:

"They wore civilian clothing and it was forbidden to address them by rank. They were introduced as "newspaper reporters," but they had supreme authority. . . . A North Korean Major identified two of these Russian "advisors" as General Vasilev and Colonel Dolgin. Vasilev, he said, was in charge of all movements across the 38th Parallel. Another prisoner . . . said he actually heard General Vasilev give the order to attack on June 25th."⁵⁸⁸

General Vasilev had been the chairman of the United Nations Military Staff Committee which, along with the office of the undersecretary-general for political and security council affairs, is responsible for United Nations military action under the Security Council.

As this Defense Department statement revealed, he showed up in North Korea as one of the top military planners **directing the war against the United Nations**—the very organization he had just a few months earlier served supposedly in the interest of international peace and brotherhood.

⁵⁸⁷ MacArthur, Reminiscences. New York Times Inc., New York, 1964.

⁵⁸⁸ The Truth about Soviet Involvement in the Korean War, Department of Defense press release #465-54 (May 15, 1954). Also, "U.S. Reveals Russ Ordered Attack on Korea," Los Angeles Examiner (May 16, 1954), sec. 1, pt. A, p. 2.

Once the war had gotten under way, when the Russians returned to their seats as members of the United Nations Military Staff Committee. General Vasilev was not among them, however. He had turned over his position to another Communist, General Ivan A. Skliaro. **In effect the Communists were directing both sides of the war!**

This shocking piece of information was mentioned on the floor of the United States House of Representatives by Congressman James B. Utt of California, and was thus brought to the attention of the American people.⁵⁸⁹ For the most part, however, the nation's press played down this news.

It was this pattern in Korea that prompted General Mark Clark to state that he feared Communists had wormed their way so deeply into our government that they were able to exercise an inordinate degree of power in shaping the course of America. "I could not help wondering and worrying whether we were faced with open enemies across the conference table and hidden ones who sat with us in our most secret councils."⁵⁹⁰

This is what advocates of the United Nations hold up as the UN's greatest single achievement.

⁵⁸⁹ Congressman James B. Utt, Congressional Record (January 15, 1962). On March 21, 1960; Secretary of State Dean Acheson (CFR member) further revealed: "There have been resolutions of the General Assembly which make clear the course that the General Assembly thinks wise; and the United States is endeavoring to follow the course which has tremendous international support and is not contemplating taking unilateral steps of its own. "It is clear that while the United States was theoretically responsible for the military direction of the "unified command" in Korea, in reality we were going along with whatever the United Nations decided. See Military Situation in the Far East, hearings before the Senate committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations (1951), pt. 3, pp. 1937, 1940; also, pt. 5, p. 3583.

⁵⁹⁰ Mark Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954), p. 11.

XV

THE NATURE OF TRUTH

“A conspiracy is nothing but a secret agreement of a number of men for the pursuance of policies which they dare not admit in public.”—Mark Twain

While the notion of conspiratorial influence on world events had gained credence with both extremities of the American political spectrum, and to a degree with the general public, the more academically-oriented person has tended to downplay such influence, largely because of the lack of scholarship in the presentation and analysis of the facts by those supporting the conspiracy theories. In addition, many such supporters have made themselves easy to ignore and, in fact, have themselves always assumed that they would be ignored. Professor Quigley's work does not suffer from these defects.

Nevertheless, many today instantly dismiss as ludicrous the mere suggestion of what they contemptuously refer to as a "conspiracy theory." The validity of a concept is not determined by whether or not it can be labeled a "conspiracy theory." Yet the popular notion of our time is that an idea can be discredited by simply designating it a conspiracy theory.

The history of mankind is replete with conspiracies. It was a conspiracy that directed Brutus against Julius Caesar in the Roman senate on the Ides of March. It was a conspiracy that plotted the betrayal of West Point by Benedict Arnold during the American Revolution. It was a conspiracy that led John Wilkes Booth to the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln on Good Friday in 1865. The past record of man is burdened with accounts of assassinations, secret combines, palace plots, and betrayals in war. The tenet of conspiracy has been a dominant force in all history. In fact, it's hard to come up with a major event in history that wasn't created to some large and significant extent by a conspiracy or more of them. Conspiracies are indeed very real in history. They are very real in our present day. If you doubt that just go to any courtroom and sit there and listen to the cases that come before the judge and before the jury, and a good percentage of them involve conspiracies of one kind or another. But in spite of this clear record an amazing number of people scoff at the possibility of conspiracy at work today. Are we to believe that human beings no longer engage in secret plots to achieve their nefarious ends? Obviously not all people in this world are honest, hard-working and forthcoming about their intentions. Certainly we can all agree on this.

The definition of the term conspiracy

Nevertheless, we have been programmed to have a knee-jerk reaction to anything that can be labeled a conspiracy. There is some emotional overload to it, so, let's first define this horrible word conspiracy. Most of the dictionaries define it rather straight forwardly. To be a conspiracy, there must be three elements present. First, there must be two or more people involved. The second element is that they are using deceit or force. And the third element is to accomplish an illegal or immoral act. That's a conspiracy. So the Secret Network that has been the focus of this document—they certainly involve two or more people, so that one is easy to check off. The second category—using deceit or force—is real easy to check off because these people are masters at deceit and certainly masters of coercion. It is part of the style and tactics that they have adopted. It's the third element where there is somewhat of a debate. Is their goal illegal or immoral?

The question of legality

Sometimes they engage in illegal activities because they really don't care much about that, but for the most part their major operations are done entirely legally because many of these same people write the laws. They contour the laws to force society to do

what they want us to do, and if we the people resist we're the ones that are acting in an illegal fashion. Almost everything that this group is accomplishing is done entirely in accordance with the law. A good example is the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve has never been officially audited by an independent agency—but even they were to audit it—they'd find that the Federal Reserve was doing exactly what it's supposed to be doing according to the law. Everything is legal. They're stealing your money and mine legally. So, with respect to the question of legality, we cannot say that this group is doing things essentially illegal either.

The question of immorality

But now we deal to this question of moral. Is their goal moral or ethical? Well, you and I may not think so, but these elitists have their own set of values, their own ethics, their own morals, and most of them firmly believe that their goal is the highest morality, far higher than we the people. They are trying to build what they fondly call the New World Order, and to them this is high morality, and it's the old Neanderthal throwbacks like us that insist on sovereignty and liberty and human dignity. We're the ones that have mental problems or moral problems in their minds. They are pursuing the highest moral standards in accordance with their own convictions. So if we rely on the traditional definition of a conspiracy, in their minds they are not involved in a conspiracy. However, in the minds of the rest of the people on this planet who have to live under the results of what they're trying to do, the word conspiracy is a very adequate and appropriate word.

We are told what they want us to know

It is a sobering fact that the hidden power structure has exerted tremendous influence over public opinion in this country through its virtual control of education and major segments of mass communications.

We've been programmed by the Establishment that any view outside of the "original mainstream view" is grounded in with fiction, fantasy and folklore. We've been programmed to believe that the "mainstream" view of things to be seen as the correct version, all the time, every time, and anything outside of the "official storyline" is lunacy and paranoia. As shown in this document, the history that is taught in public school, and presented in the media, rarely reflects the accuracy of actual events. We are taught what they want us to know. Therefore, we have grown up under the delusion of such misconception, that it has become inconceivable to believe anything other than what has been perceived as truth. The human mind is like a computer. No matter how efficient it may be, its reliability is only as great as the information fed into it. If it is possible to control the input of the human mind, then no matter how intelligent a person may be, it is entirely possible to program what he will think. And, yes, it "is even possible to program people to laugh at the mere mention of the word conspiracy."

We have been programmed as though history has slipped back 450 years. When Galileo attempted to demonstrate the theory that the earth was not the center of the universe, he was imprisoned and condemned as follows:

"We say, pronounce, sentence and declare that you, the said Galileo, by reason of the matters adduced in this trial, and by you confessed as above, have rendered yourself, in

the judgment of this holy office, vehemently suspected of heresy, namely of having believed and held the doctrine—which is false and contrary to the sacred and divine scriptures—that the sun is the center of the world and does not move from east to west, and that the earth moves and is not the center of the world...Consequently, you have incurred all the censures and penalties imposed and promulgated in the sacred canons and other constitutions, general and particular, against such delinquents.”

The Establishment controlled mainstream media wants us to believe their “official storyline view” that we have a truly independent, free and honest press in our country—despite stunning media silence when a respected scientist and author of a peer-reviewed and published study—who has worked for many years at the CDC and who participated in destruction of vital documents—comes forward and publically confesses to a crime that he and his colleagues committed gross fraud in an area as charged as vaccine research that could very well impact the lives of millions of children (as detailed in Appendix II).

The Establishment wants us to dismiss their affinity towards communism as “just another conspiracy theory” even though the 1950s-era investigations found that the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford Foundations were conspiring together to use their money to support un-American and subversive activities, and subsidizing collectivistic-minded educators, and had financed a socialist trend in American government.

The Establishment controlled mainstream media says everything can be explained as coincidences/ accidents, and that anything to the contrary should be dismissed as paranoid conspiracy theories. in spite of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee finding that that the Rockefeller funded Institute of Pacific Relations was largely responsible for China’s fall to Communism;⁵⁹¹ or that of Marc Tucker, of the Carnegie Corporation, and David Rockefeller, conspired to remold the entire American Education system in their own elitist world vision.⁵⁹²

The Establishment wants us to believe the “mainstream story of events” of conventional expensive painful cancer treatments of surgery; chemotherapy, and radiation are the only options available despite the 1953 Interstate Commerce Investigation that found that there was indeed a conspiracy by organized medicine and the FDA to monopolize the medical and drug industry and to eliminate alternative options and suppress natural cancer therapy including at least a dozen promising cancer treatments (as detailed in Appendix I).⁵⁹³

⁵⁹¹ 1952 Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee report (McCarran Committee).

⁵⁹² In 1998, Rep. Bob Schaffer placed in the Congressional Record an 18-page letter that has become known as Mr. Marc Tucker's "Dear Hillary" letter.

⁵⁹³ The "Fitzgerald Report"; Congressional Record Appendix August 3, 1953, A Report by Special Counsel for a United States Senate Investigating Committee ... Making a Fact Finding Study of a Conspiracy against the Health of the American people.

Design proves a designer

Let's address the distinction between paranoia and evil. Paranoia does exist. A person sometimes has delusions that others are trying to hurt him when they're not. But can we also agree there is real evil? To illustrate the two perspectives: Suppose you're an office worker, carrying a stack of reports down a corridor. Another employee, Mr. Rockefeller, comes in the opposite direction. He bumps into you and the reports fall. If you said, "Mr. Rockefeller, you deliberately did that!" it would be pretty paranoid.

But let's say you picked up the reports and Mr. Rockefeller bumped you again, knocking them to the floor. If you're a patient, forgiving person, perhaps you'd make no accusation, but you might at least feel annoyed and say something like, "Well, Mr. Rockefeller, I guess we've got the dropsies today, huh?"

However, suppose you picked up the reports, and Mr. Rockefeller bumped you a third time, sending them flying. At this point, you'd probably say, "All right, Mr. Rockefeller! What's going on?" You'd know he had acted deliberately. Your conclusion would not be paranoid. And it only took three times to establish pretty firmly that Mr. Rockefeller acted by design, not blunder.

The same criteria apply in politics. Thomas Jefferson said:

"Single acts of tyranny may be ascribed to the accidental opinion of a day; but a series of oppressions, begun at a distinguished period, and pursued unalterably through every change of ministers, too plainly prove a deliberate systematical plan of reducing us to slavery."⁵⁹⁴

James Forrestal, First U.S. Secretary of Defense, expressed the same viewpoint in saying:

"Consistency has never been a mark of stupidity. If the diplomats who have mishandled our relations with Russia were merely stupid, they would occasionally make a mistake in our favor."

Congressman Walter Judd, speaking in the context of China's fall to communism, made a similar observation:

"On the law of averages, a mere moron once in a while would make a decision that would be favorable to the United States. When policies are advocated by any group which consistently work out to the Communists' advantage, that couldn't be happenstance."⁵⁹⁵

Edith Kermit Roosevelt, nationally syndicated columnist and Granddaughter of President Theodore Roosevelt provided additional perspective on U.S. foreign policy:

⁵⁹⁴ Thomas Jefferson, "A Summary View of the Rights of British America," Philip B. Kurland and Ralph Lerner, ed., *The Founders Constitution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), online edition, www.press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch14s10.html

⁵⁹⁵ Anthony Kubek, *How the Far East Was Lost: American Policy and the Creation of Communist China, 1941-1949* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1963), 272.

“Through the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations (and beyond) its ideology (has been) constant: That the best way to fight Communism is by a **One World Socialist state governed by “experts” like themselves**. The result has been policies which favor the growth of the superstate, **gradual surrender of U.S. sovereignty** to the United Nations and a steady retreat in the face of communist aggression.”⁵⁹⁶

Forrestal and Judd and Roosevelt saw the same group of officials –the CFR clique in the State Department –were involved in decision after decision that supported the Soviet Union and harmed America: giving North Korea to the Russians; ceding parts of Northern China to Russia without China’s permission; granting the Soviets three votes in the UN while we got one; agreeing that all Russians displaced during World War II would be forcibly repatriated to the USSR; etc.

Like “bumping Mr. Rockefeller” at the office, these guys weren’t blundering, they were perpetrating. So when we see Frank Vanderlip confess to secretly planned the Federal Reserve, without the knowledge or consent of the people or Congress, and that these very same men were then appointed to run the Fed, it’s not “paranoia” to connect the dots and say this happened by design, not coincidence.⁵⁹⁷ When we look at the fundamental systems in America—Education, Medicine, Money, Media, Research, Politics, Policy—it is not some coincidence or accident that these have ALL been quietly controlled and manipulated by the same hidden hands for over a century. These are the same people and organizations revealed by Historian Dr. Quigley exposing in verifiable detail the way leading figures in the British and American Establishment have conspired together for decades to create a global empire, of greater power and scope than any in history. This document contains thousands of dots—all connected back to the same Round Table Establishment Network. It follows then if “bumping Mr. Rockefeller” at the office were to bump into you not just 3-times but thousands of times—as shown in this document—it should establish pretty firmly that Mr. Rockefeller acted by design, and was not merely some crazy paranoia or conspiracy theory.

District attorneys regularly make such correlations to prove criminal cases. Killers rarely commit murder right in front of witnesses, or while being videotaped –so prosecutors have to accumulate indirect evidence of guilt. For example, they might show that the accused owned the murder weapon, or that his fingerprints were on it, or that the victim’s blood was on his clothing, that he was observed leaving the crime scene, that he had a motive, etc. Are district attorneys paranoid to do this? No; it’s essential to solving crimes. A preponderance of evidence can prove criminal intent, and that is what this document establishes clear and convincingly of the secret Hijacking of America, of treason against the United States, and that crimes have been committed against humanity. There is a principle called “design proves a designer.” We know the Mount Rushmore Monument did not arise by chance because it’s too well designed. Likewise, policemen, prosecutors and judges understand that artfully planned crimes cannot be dismissed as the result of a series of accidents.

⁵⁹⁶ Edith Kermit Roosevelt, “Elite Clique Holds Power in U.S.,” Indianapolis News, December 23, 1961, 6.

⁵⁹⁷ 1935 Saturday Evening Post article, “From Farm Boy to Financier”

CONCLUSION

“Today the path to total dictatorship in the U.S. can be laid by strictly legal means, unseen and unheard by Congress, the President, or the people. We have a well-organized political-action group in this country, determined to destroy our Constitution and establish a one-party state....[It has a] foothold within our Government, and its own propaganda apparatus...The important point to remember about this group is not its ideology but its organization. It is a dynamic, aggressive, elite corps, forcing its way through every opening, to make a breach for a collectivist one-party state. It operates secretly, silently, continuously to transform our Government without suspecting that change is under way....This secret revolutionary corps understands well the power to influence the people...This ruthless power-seeking elite is a disease of our century....This group ... is answerable neither to the President, the Congress, nor the courts. It is practically irremovable.” —U.S. Senator William E. Jenner, February 23, 1954

We've covered an awful lot of ground in the pages of this document: from the origins of the Network's secret society to its monopoly over diverse fields of political, financial, economic, industrial, medical, educational, war, oil, food, cancer therapy (Appendix I) and media among others; from the subversive nature of their tax-exempt foundations to its ruthless monopolies, fraud of its primary funding mechanisms⁵⁹⁸ to its manipulation of government subversion, vaccine research (Appendix II), scientific research, and the true colors of the UN—as they seek to establish a global monopoly on the commodity they value more than any other — Power. This document has hopefully shone light into some of this secret history of our world. Let's quickly go back to the beginning and summarize one last time what Dr. Quigley cautiously exposed, which is one of the best kept secrets of all time:

At the end of the 19th Century, a secret society was formed by Cecil Rhodes. Cecil Rhodes was one of the wealthiest men in the world. He was the political head man in South Africa, who became Prime Minister, and while he was there he was able to acquire control over all of the diamond deposits and the gold deposits of South Africa — all of the mineral reserves, and in that period of time he amassed one of the greatest, if not, the greatest fortune in the world. What people don't realize is that when he died, none of that money went to his heirs. Where did it go?

It went through a series of seven wills to create a secret society. The purpose of the secret society was to create a structure that would literally control the world — from behind the scenes, in a fashion that the average man or woman would never see it or never suspect it even existed.

The Rhodes Scholarship which most people know about was just the tip of the iceberg that created in one of the wills of Cecil Rhodes. The purpose of the Rhodes Scholarship was to provide a funnel or a recruiting mechanism to find the most appropriate, the most likely individuals — young men and women who could be recruited into this secret society.

This secret organization is not just of historical interest. It exists today and, according to Quigley and other observers who are close to it, it is the most important single historical force in the world since World War I.

The goal of the secret organization originally was to expand the British Empire and the men who were behind it — not necessarily the royalty, but the real political figures behind it— to extend the British Empire to control the world. Rhodes and his associates believed that the British had acquired the highest culture, the highest level of morality according at least to his definitions of morality, and the highest standard of living, the most perfect language. He felt that the race was superior and that for the benefit of the rest of the world, for their good, it was their responsibility to rule the world for the benefit of the world, of course.

At the inner-circle of this secret organization, that was called the "Society of the Elect." It originally consisted of Cecil Rhodes and a small brain trust of his very wealthy and influential political cronies from British politics and British banking.

⁵⁹⁸ As covered in chapter III, the two primary funding mechanisms are the Federal Reserve System and federal income tax, both of which were "sold" to the public via deception in 1913.

The secondary rings around this Society of the Elect that Cecil Rhodes created were called “roundtables,” and these existed in the United States, Britain and all of the former British dependencies. Finally there was a tertiary group or ring around that which was created. Each of those roundtables in each of the countries, created another ring larger around it, and they called those in most of the British dependencies “The Royal Institute for International Affairs.” You’ll find that in England, you’ll find it in Canada, and Australia, and so forth. Very powerful, prominent institutions in politics in all of these countries. In the United States they call it the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR).

After Rhodes' death it didn't take long before the center of gravity of this Secret Society shifted away to the Rockefeller group. The goal changed. World domination didn't change. Control from behind the scenes by a very small elite group didn't change. But what did change is that the focal point for this was no longer the British or England, but it was to be a world empire centered around the United Nations called the New World Order—a totalitarian form of a one-world government where the powerful elite has complete monopoly control over the people of the entire planet.

What we the people can do

The Round Table Network believes that the key to controlling the world lies in the application of “secret political and economic influence” and secret control of “journalistic, educational, and propaganda agencies.”⁵⁹⁹ Based on their impressive list of global accomplishments, it certainly appears as if they're right. But what happens if their secret “influence” and tactics are exposed for all to see? Could they continue to get away with their crimes? Could they continue to manipulate us, bury us beneath inescapable debt, and con us into surrendering our sovereignty? The answer, by their own estimation, is no. When what they're doing and how they're doing it becomes widely known, the foundation on which their success is built crumbles beneath them.

Fortunately, this means that the most important work we can do is also the easiest. To the extent we expose the origin and purpose of their instruments, their tried-and-true tactics of manipulation, and their immoral belief that only might determines what's right, we destroy the illusion of legitimacy that they depend on. “So long as we are gaining and spreading awareness, they (by default) are losing power.” This is where we must begin. This is the first step toward destroying their system. So please pass this document on to as many people as possible. Whether we the people can make a difference, and take back our country, history will be the judge.

⁵⁹⁹ The Anglo-American Establishment

APPENDICES

- A The Takeover Of Modern Cancer Therapy**
- B An In-Depth Look At Vaccine Corruption**
- C A Closer Look At Common Core Education**

Appendix A

THE TAKEOVER OF MODERN CANCER THERAPY

20,000 people die of cancer every day. This translates to eight million deaths every year—half a million of which are Americans. That means one American dies of cancer every minute. To put that number in perspective, that's 1,440 Americans a day, or the equivalent of three fully loaded 747's crashing and killing everybody aboard every day. That's 10,000 a week – 500,000 a year – every year – ten times the number who died in Vietnam. At the beginning of the last century, 1 person out of 20 would get cancer. In the 1940's, it was 1 out of every 16 people. In the 1970's 1 person out of 10. Today 1 person out of 2 will get cancer. In the course of their life over one million Americans are diagnosed with a new cancer every year. All these people suddenly plunged into a dark tunnel that will dramatically change their life for many years to come: faced with an apparently endless chain of medical tests, examinations, second opinions, medications, new tests, surgical operations, and follow-up checks; they find themselves at the complete mercy of the disease.

While in that tunnel each patient feeds an immense medical apparatus that employs hundreds of thousands of people and generates millions and millions of dollars for the medical and pharmaceutical industries from research laboratories, to medical schools, from prevention clinics, to worldwide drug sales. Today the cancer medical apparatus is so large and expensive that it needs its patients in order to survive, just as much as the patients need the apparatus. Cancer is a big business, one of the biggest businesses. The typical cancer patient spends at least fifty thousand dollars to treat his or her disease with one million new American cancer patients every year. That translates to fifty billion dollars annually, spent just on cancer treatments in the United States. But to modern medicine, cancer still remains a mystery.

Airplanes a century ago were just simple wooden contraptions, able to lift only a few feet off the ground have today become sophisticated jets capable of reaching incredible heights, travelling at three times the speed of sound. Communications a century ago consisted of the creaking sound of the telegraph—over some rustling wires—today has become a global network of fiber optics where millions of people exchange information in all possible directions. What a century ago was still a relatively unknown planet, today has been lit by day and night and it has been explored to the extent that we can visit it in every longitude and latitude from the comfort of our own home via the internet. The examples are endless... the only thing that has not changed in the last 100 years is the apparent incapacity of medical science to understand and conquer, a disease like cancer. Why?

The official theory maintains that cancer is a problem that originates in the human cell:

It is a group of over 100 diseases characterized by abnormal uncontrolled cell growth; the uncontrolled growth in cancer cells causes the creation of abnormal unstructured masses of tissue known as neoplasms or tumors; and most cancer related deaths are due to metastasis, malignant cells that penetrate in to the circulatory system and establish colonies in other parts of the body. How and where the migrating cells stop is different for different cancer types. Once the tumor cells are no longer moving they can begin the process of forming a new tumor by leaving the blood vessel and beginning to reproduce in the new location.

This official theory, also called molecular theory is basically the same that was formulated more than sixty years ago.

In the last 50 years the search for the cause of cancer within the human cell has been pushed beyond the limits of anyone's imagination. Today the most advanced laboratories are working directly on the human genome in order to identify the genes that seem to be responsible, according to some scientists for the different kinds of cancer. This opens the door to a dream-like scenario for the pharmaceutical industry—a world where each patient would need its own personal cure tailored to its own personal needs. One million new patients every year. One million new cures for each and every one of them.

"What we want to do is to match the disease with the cure or palliative treatment, whatever it is by using the genomic tools that's really what the whole cancer world is now going to be about for a very long time" --Dr David Botstein, Stanford University

In the meantime, however, no one has been able to prove that the official theory is the correct one and that the origin of cancer is in fact of genetic nature. Major advances are being made in the detection, prevention and treatment of cancer but the mechanisms that trigger malignant cell growth are still not completely understood. In the meantime statistics seem only to get worse.

Since the 1950's the outlook for most cancer patients has remained the same: a 1 in 3 chance of living for 5 years after diagnosis using conventional therapies of surgery, radiation and chemotherapy drugs. The fact is that today two out of three American cancer patients will be dead before five years despite such dismal results.

This 5-year survival rate benchmark that the medical establishment uses is an example of statistical manipulation to inflate the perceived success rates of mainstream oncology. For example, M.D. Anderson in Houston, Texas claims of a combined overall success rate of 42% remission of their cancer patients is based on this arbitrary 5-year survival rate. This means that immediately upon diagnosis, they have a 5-year yardstick to get you to a statistical cure. It doesn't matter if you die of cancer one day after the 5-year mark, you are still considered among the cases cured. Since technological advancements in diagnostic tests have improved to obtain earlier detection, mammography, CAT Scans and MRI's are catching cancer mutations in early Stage I, which gives them a head start on their chemo and radiation treatments. For instance, consider the woman whose breast cancer is diagnosed an average of 3 years earlier because of mammography; today she might live for 7 years. In 1985, using the older diagnostic tools, this same woman would have appeared to live only 4 years. Nothing has changed in terms of effectiveness of conventional therapy. So because most cancer patients can last the 5 years of slow poisoning with chemo and radiation, the true statistics of cure rates lie within the period of 6-10 years. Cancer victims are dying in the 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th years. These are horrible - 6% survival, not 42%. That means 94 out of 100 patients eventually die of chemo and radiation within a 10-year period. The success exists only on paper.

Despite the extremely poor track record of conventional cancer treatment, modern medicine continues to impose on patients the three same primitive therapies that were

developed over 100 years ago: surgery; chemotherapy, and radiation...and two of the three, are actually carcinogenic (i.e. cause cancer). It's ironic that conventional treatment solutions of chemotherapy and radiation cause the very disease they are meant to treat. Moreover, because they both shut down the immune system, it's common, particularly with chemotherapy, for the treatment to kill the patient before the cancer does. All 3 focus only on the tumor. But the tumor is the symptom not the cause, so it is likely to recur. Surgery is the oldest technique and the most successful of the three but surgery is useful only when the cancer is localized—which applies to only a minority of cases. Chemotherapy is designed to kill cancer cells throughout the body, it is highly toxic, however, it also kills healthy cells. In other words, they kill the body to kill the cancer. If the cancer doesn't kill you the treatment will. The use of radiation remains controversial even in medical circles as there is a great fear of radiation's dangerous side effects. Today chemotherapy is often given in combination with surgery and radiation.

In fact, in 1953, the Fitzgerald Report, commissioned by a United States Senate committee, to investigate allegations of conspiracy and monopolistic practices on the part of orthodox medicine published their findings which stated in part:

"I have approached this problem with an open mind. Recognizing the importance of men skilled in the science of medicine, who are best informed, if not qualified, on the question of cancer, its causes and treatment, I directed my attention to the propaganda by the American Medical Association and the American Cancer Society to the effect: namely, "that radium, x-ray therapy and surgery are the only recognized treatments for cancer."

"Is there any dispute among recognized medical scientists in America and elsewhere in the world on the use of radium and x-ray therapy in the treatment of cancer. The answer is definitely Yes; there is a division of opinion on the use of radium and x-ray. Both agencies are destructive, not constructive. In the alleged destruction of the abnormal, outlaw or cancer cells both x-ray therapy and radium destroy normal tissue and normal cells. Recognized medical authorities in America and elsewhere state positively that x-ray therapy can cause cancer in and of itself. Documented cases are available."

"Dr. Reimann's report on cancer cases in Pennsylvania over a long period of time showed that **those who received no treatment lived a longer period than those that received surgery, radium or x-ray**...The survey also showed that following the use of radium and x-ray much more harm than good was done to the average cancer patient." -Also reported in Congressional Committee on Senate Bill 1875, July 1946 Report of Dr. Miley of a survey made by Dr. Stanley Reimann (in charge of Tumor Research and Pathology, Gotham Hospital).

"If radium, x-ray or surgery or either of them is the complete answer, then the greatest hoax of the age is being perpetrated upon the people by the continued appeal for funds for further research. If neither x-ray, radium or- surgery is the complete answer to this dreaded disease, and I submit that it is not, then what is the plain duty of society? Should we stand still? Should we sit idly by and count the number of physicians, surgeons and cancerologists who are not only divided but who, because of fear or favor, are forced to line up with the so-

called accepted view of the American Medical Association, or should this Committee make a full scale investigation of the organized effort to hinder, suppress and restrict the free flow of drugs which allegedly have proven successful in cases where clinical records, case history, pathological reports and x-ray photographic proof, together with the alleged cured patients, are available.”

In 1985, Professor John Cairns from Harvard University published a study in Scientific American concerning the benefits of chemotherapy drugs. He found that chemotherapy drugs benefit at most 5 percent, 1 out of 20 of the cancer patients they are given to. He further stated:

“Aside from certain rare cancers, it is not possible to detect any sudden changes in the death rates for any of the major cancers that could be credited to chemotherapy. Whether any of the common cancers can be cured by chemotherapy has yet to be established.” He also stated, “A six-or twelve-month course of chemotherapy not only is a very unpleasant experience but also has its own intrinsic mortality...treatments now avert...perhaps 2 or 3 percent...of the deaths from cancer that occur each year in the U.S.”

Nineteen years later, in 2004, Australian researchers came to the same conclusion as Dr. Cairns. They found that the overall contribution of cytotoxic chemotherapy to 5-year survival in adults was estimated to be 2.3% in Australia and 2.1% in the USA. In other words, **very little benefit** is being obtained from the billions of dollars that are spent on chemotherapy drugs.

If conventional therapy has such limited results why isn't the medical profession willing to investigate alternative approaches? The answer to this question may be found in some historic events that took place almost a century ago when official medicine finally managed to gain the upper hand on the so-called empirical doctors who cured patients with herbs and natural remedies.

In the 1800's society sanctioned both approaches to healing. Patients had a choice of using either doctors called allopaths, or natural healers called empirics or homeopaths. The two groups waged a bitter philosophical debate.

The allopathic doctors called their approach heroic medicine. They believed the physician must aggressively drive disease from the body. They based their practice on what they considered scientific theory. The allopaths used three main techniques: they bled the body to drain out the bad humors; they gave huge doses of toxic minerals like mercury and lead to displace the original disease; they also used surgery but it was a brutal procedure before anesthesia and infection control. Few patients were willing to have surgery. Most patients feared allopathic methods altogether. Satirists of the day remarked that with allopathic treatment the patient died of the cure.

Competing with the doctors were the empiric healers. Contrary to the doctors they believed in stimulating the body's own defenses to heal itself instead of poisonous minerals. They used vegetable products and non-toxic substances in small quantities. They especially favored herbs, learned from Native American and old European traditions. The empirics said they base their remedies not on theory, but on

observation and experience. Satirists of the day added that with empiric treatment the patient died of the disease not the cure, and the balance of medical power remained equal until the turn of the century.

As a review of chapter IX, new medical treatments emerged that were potentially very profitable. The American Medical Association (AMA) joined with strong financial forces, to transform medicine into an industry. The fortunes of Carnegie, Morgan and Rockefeller financed surgery, radiation and synthetic drugs. They were to become the economic foundations of the new medical economy. The takeover of the medical industry was accomplished by a takeover of the medical schools. Rockefeller and Carnegie, in particular, came to the picture and offered tremendous amounts of money to the schools that would agree to cooperate with them. With each significant gift or endowment, there would be a clause or stipulation in the endowment document requiring one or more of the contributor's office holders to sit on the board of trustees of each of these institutions. Almost overnight all the major universities received large grants from these sources and also accepted one two or three of these people on their board of directors, and the school's literally were taken over by the financial interests that put up the money. As a result, the schools did receive an infusion of money. They were able to build new buildings. They were able to add expensive equipment to their laboratories. They were able to hire top-notch teachers but at the same time as doing that they skewed the whole thing in the direction of pharmaceutical drugs. That was the efficiency in philanthropy—that doctors from that point forward in history would be taught pharmaceutical drugs. All of the great teaching institutions in America were captured by the pharmaceutical interests in this fashion, and it's amazing how little money it really took to do it. Surgery became viable with anesthesia and infection control and doctors advocated expensive radical operations.

These in turn produced the need for a large lucrative hospital system. Radium fever swept medicine. The price of Radium rose 1000 percent almost overnight. Another costly technological industry, entered the hospital system. A drug industry grew out of the booming patent medicine business. The doctors changed educational standards and licensing regulations to exclude the empirics. Soon only AMA approved doctors could legally practice medicine. In a brief twenty-years the AMA came to dominate medical practice. Organized medicine launched a media campaign to associate the empirics with quacks. The code word for competition was quackery.

So now the average doctor goes through school; and gets a great education; they have to be really smart to get through it; they learn all about drugs; they don't know too much about basic nutrition. But they sure know their drugs, and if you go to your typical doctor today, it doesn't matter what it is, the chances are, and you will walk out of there with a prescription. Why? Because that's what he has been trained to do.

The companies that make up the pharmaceutical industry are among the largest corporations in the world. Together these businesses have come to be known as Big Pharma. In 2004 their combined global sales were over half a trillion dollars with Pfizer and Johnson Johnson leading the pack. In the U.S. the core of Big Pharma's immense profits is from sales of prescription medication, and since these drugs can only be prescribed by medical professionals, most of the industry's promotional and marketing activities are directed at doctors, pharmacists and other healthcare providers.

According to Dr. Larry Statch, research associate and consultant with Public Citizen's Health Research Group:

"This starts out on the first day of medical school, and in many medical schools, even the incoming students who are two years away from seeing a patient will start to get gifts, from the pharmaceutical industry. And as the students get farther along in their medical education the interactions and gifts escalate... to free lunches, to dinners."

According to Gene Carbona, former pharmaceutical drug salesman:

"Champagne, brunches, happy hours, New York Jets tickets no matter where you spend the money you make money and my boss always told me, 'don't worry about it there will always be more funding, spend what you can in fact if I give you a hundred thousand dollars to spend Gene I want you to spend 200,000'."

Before 1980, most clinical research was funded by the National Institutes of Health. During the 1990's most of that research got pulled out of universities and was brought to for profit research organizations. The problem is that gave virtual complete control over the research to the drug companies. They could design the studies, they had control of the data so that meant many of the authors, of the most important articles, published in our best journals aren't even allowed to see their own data. They don't get free access to their own data and they don't have control of publication.

To sum it all up: the pharmaceutical industry first gained control of the teaching system; then it gave the AMA the power to exclude all other doctors from practicing; then it took over the entire drug testing process, while heavily influencing the medical publications that review those drugs; and finally Big Pharma extended its control over the federal entity that is supposed to verify those drugs safety and efficacy. At the opposite end are the sick citizens and in the middle other doctors who must cure them based on information they can only get from the pharmaceutical industry which can no longer be verified.

Chemotherapy drugs are in fact among the most expensive of all: a one-month supply of Erlotinib, a chemotherapy drug produced by Roche cost \$2,300. The same supply of Sorafenib, Bayer's chemotherapy drug costs \$5,500. The monthly supply of Sunitinib, a chemotherapy drug produced by Pfizer cost almost \$7,000. The drug industry is the most successful global industry in the world. What they don't want you to do is to get better because if you get better; their market is gone.

Anything that comes from nature cannot be patented. They're not interested in that so we translate that into the real world of FDA approval. Surely these drug companies aren't going to spend twenty million dollars or more testing any substance from nature because it can't be patented. And of course the FDA says it's illegal to use unless it's been tested for efficacy and safety. Now you see the Catch-22 you're in. there's nothing from nature, regardless of how effective it might be, that will ever be proven safe or effective according to the FDA. It'll never be because nobody's going to spend the money to go through the test so therefore everything from nature will always be condemned by the FDA as unproven.

In the 1950's, Congressman Charles Tobey enlisted Benedict Fitzgerald, an investigator for the Interstate Commerce Commission, to investigate allegations of conspiracy and monopolistic practices on the part of orthodox medicine. This came about as the result of the son of Senator Tobey who developed cancer and was given less than two years to live by orthodox medicine. However, Tobey Jr., discovered options in the alternative field, received alternative treatment and fully recovered from his cancerous condition. That is when he learned of alleged conspiratorial practices on the part of orthodox medicine. He passed the word to his father, Senator Charles Tobey, who initiated an investigation. The final report clearly indicated there was indeed a conspiracy to monopolize the medical and drug industry and to eliminate alternative options. The "Fitzgerald Report" was submitted into the Congressional Record Appendix August 3, 1953:

"My investigation to date should convince this committee that a conspiracy does exist to stop the free flow and use of drugs in interstate commerce which allegedly has solid therapeutic value. Public and private funds have been thrown around like confetti at a country fair to close up and destroy clinics, hospitals, and scientific research laboratories which do not conform to the viewpoint of medical associations."⁶⁰⁰

What follows are amazing accounts of the systematic persecution of people who have attempted to help people to heal cancer which further illustrates these congressional findings:

An Unproven Cancer Cure: the Remarkable Story of Rene Caisse

In a small town in Northern Ontario, Canada...the year 1922, Rene Caisse (1888–1978) first learned of a cancer remedy that had been suggested by the medicine man from the local Ojibwe tribe. Unbeknownst to most people, this Canadian nurse has heroically managed to cure thousands of people from cancer with this simple concoction of herbs. For more than 50-years people from all over the world went to Ontario, Canada for cancer treatment with this simple herbal formula that gave miraculous results. The story of ESSIAC should be part and parcel of the natural healing lore of North America. Instead it is virtually unknown today despite the fact that it performed so well against thousands of cases of terminal cancer that it came within only three votes of being legalized by the Canadian parliament. Still, chances are you have never heard of it. What follows is this fascinating story of Rene M. Caisse of Bracebridge, Canada and describes her extraordinary perseverance to obtain official recognition of her herbal cancer remedy she called ESSIAC (Her surname spelled backwards). For the entire story, as well as vast cited sources, see the very well documented book Clinic of Hope: The Story of Rene Caisse and Essiac, Donna M. Ivey, 2004.

Nurse Rene Caisse decided upon first learning of the herbal treatment that "if I should ever develop cancer, I would use this herb tea." She was a practical and sensible woman, who was very busy with her nursing career, so she didn't get excited right away about the fantastic story of the herbal remedy, and even after another doctor's statement about the anti-cancer qualities of one of the herbs, seemed to confirm that she might have something worthwhile, she didn't experiment or bother herself about the formula.

⁶⁰⁰ Benedict F. Fitzgerald, Jr., Special Counsel, US Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 1953

Then her mother's sister was diagnosed with cancer of the stomach and liver. The woman was given, at most, six months to live by her physician, R. O. Fisher, M.D. Rene knew the doctor well, so she told him the story of the herbal tea and asked permission to give it a try under his observation. Since there was apparently nothing else medical technology could do, Dr. Fisher consented on the spot. "I obtained the necessary herbs, with some difficulty," Rene wrote, "and made the tea." Rene gave her one drink daily of the freshly brewed decoction for two months until she rallied and went to her home in Peterborough to recuperate. Rene put it succinctly in her book: "My aunt lived for 21 years after being given up by the medical profession. There was no recurrence of cancer."

Rene was greatly encouraged by her aunt's steady improvement, and Dr. Fisher, impressed with the effects of the remedy, asked her to treat more of his hopeless cases. Some patients responded with great improvement, and as other Toronto physicians heard of the positive effects of the herbal treatments, they too brought their terminal patients to Rene. After that successful experience Rene quit the hospital and began curing people with the mixture of herbs that would become known as an Essiac which is her last name spelled backwards. These events inadvertently set the course of her working life, spanning almost the next five decades, thrusting her into a medical-legal-political controversy that stretched across the province and into the United States.

One day towards the end of 1924, a patient with cancer of the tongue and throat was brought to Rene and Dr. Fisher, from Lyons, New York. At Dr. Fisher's suggestion, Rene injected the liquid remedy (containing eight herbs) directly into the man's tongue as Dr. Fisher and his young assistant Dr. Ross A. Blye stood by to observe the results.

"Well, I was nearly scared to death," Rene recalled. "The patient developed a severe chill and his tongue swelled so badly the doctor had to press it down with a spatula to allow him to breathe." This incident lasted about twenty minutes before the swelling went down and the shaking subsided. The cancer stopped growing, and while the patient never received another injection, he was able to live comfortably for almost four years. After this alarming but challenging event, Rene set up a section of the basement of her mother's house as a laboratory. There she and Dr. Fisher began research on mice inoculated with human carcinoma. They studied the effect of administering the formula by injection rather than giving it orally as a tea. Rene found, "By giving the intramuscular injection in the forearm, to destroy the mass of malignant cells, and giving the medicine orally to purify the blood, I got quicker results." Each day Rene would brew a decoction of each of the eight dried herbs for injection into selected mice. Fisher and his colleagues, including Dr. Blye and Dr. E.T. Hoidge, who worked with them.

Dr. Blye, whose practice was on Dundas Street East, "sent away to one of the most famous laboratories of the United States and obtained some carcinoma and sarcoma mice." Of eight mice received, four died before Rene could treat them, but "she kept the remaining four alive long after the time they could be kept by ordinary means." Experiments continued as Rene brewed varying decoctions over several months, eliminating first one herb and then another, until the researchers identified the herb that appeared to most effectively reduce the size of the tumors. By removing its protein content, they found that the substance could now be injected intra muscularly

into the hind leg of a mouse, or the forearm of a human volunteer, without causing any reaction. This refinement appeared to carry off the toxins created by the malignancy, purify the blood, and increase the patients' energy and sense of well-being. "I got quicker results," Rene said, "than when the medicine was all given orally." Rene recorded with some pride that the mice implanted with human carcinoma responded well to nine days of herbal injections, until cancer was no longer invading living tissue. The tumors decreased in size and the mice lived longer. Dr. Fisher probably helped Rene to develop and refine her treatment more than any other physician. He dared Rene to try the injection and assisted her in singling out the herb that reduced tumors.

Some of the doctors exposed to the remarkable cancer remissions Rene had brought about felt that she should be given an opportunity to research her remedy more thoroughly. In October 1926, eight determined physicians sent a petition to the Canadian government department responsible for health in Ottawa. They had observed for themselves the effective results while working with Rene and asserted that:

"We, the undersigned, believe the treatment for cancer by Nurse R. M. Caisse can do no harm, and that it relieves pain, will reduce the enlargement, and prolong life in hopeless cases. To the best of our knowledge, she has not been given a case to treat until everything in medical and surgical science has been tried without effect, and even then she was able to show remarkably beneficial results on those cases at the late stage. We would be interested to see her given an opportunity to prove her work in a large way. To the best of our knowledge she has treated all cases free of any charge and has been carrying on this work over the period of the past two years." The document was signed by R.O. Fisher, R.A. Blye, J.A. McInnis, E.T. Hoidge, Chas. H. Hair, S. Moore, W.T. Williams, and J.X. Robert.⁶⁰¹

In the 1930s the town council allotted Rene a free clinic on condition that her patients were diagnosed by a licensed doctor and treated free of charge. People soon appeared from all corners of the province and other parts of Canada as well. It was said that "Dominion Street took on an atmosphere reminiscent of the famous Shrine of Lourdes, as hopeful pilgrims sought a new lease on life." Hopeful cancer patients arrived walking, by ambulance, by private cars — some were even carried. Sometimes sirens would announce the arrival of an ambulance as it pulled into the crowded street. The clinic was alive with hope and Rene's remedy was very much sought after.

Some days as many as fifty to one hundred patients would come to the clinic. Patients were treated once a week if possible, and twice a week in some cases, with at least forty-eight hours between treatments. A good number of patients were treated for three months. Some breast cancers, if not too far advanced, would disappear in about six treatments. In the treatment room, Rene would inject the Essiac into the patient's arm, leg, or hip muscles and follow it with a glass of medicine as a blood purifier. Where there were open sores she would apply a local treatment with gauze, and for hemorrhages she would use a solution for irrigation to stop the bleeding. In cases where the mouth and throat were involved, she administered a gargle she had made

⁶⁰¹ Two of the signatories, Dr. Fisher and Dr. Blye, were her Toronto colleagues. Others were local doctors, including Dr. Charles Hair, whom she had probably worked with at the Cobalt Red Cross hospital; he was now a surgeon at the Toronto General Hospital. Then there were her Timmins supporters, Drs. McInnis and Moore.

and a mouthwash to cleanse. She recommended patients use hers rather than any of the patented mouth-washes because of its healing properties.

The results of the Essiac treatments were often astounding. Even patients whose bodies were irreparably damaged from cancer received some form of relief — less pain, reduced pressure by the shrinking of tumors, as well as great comfort and some hope. The cancer clinic was functioning with the financial subsidization and moral support of the town, as well as the personal offerings of Rene's patients. She never charged for a treatment, but sometimes she received fresh vegetables, fruit, flowers, jams, or jellies.

Dr. Emma M. Carson of Los Angeles, California, heard about Miss Caisse's Bracebridge cancer clinic from Professor Henry James Reynolds of the University of Chicago. "Dr. Reynolds is a big man in the American medical world, heading a Federal research committee, and he has taken an interest in Miss Caisse," Dr. Carson said. Several of her professional friends talked about the Caisse Cancer Clinic in Bracebridge, Ontario, and praised Miss Rene M. Caisse's Essiac treatment for cancer that they claimed had become, practically speaking, "world famous" during the past fourteen years. "After listening to their fascinating statements, in whom I had implicit confidence, my curiosity became thoroughly stabilized," she claimed, and so Dr. Carson exchanged letters with Rene, arranging to visit her Bracebridge clinic in August of 1937.

The Muskoka Herald stated:

"Dr. Carson is well known throughout California, and has had signal honors conferred upon her by the President Theodore Roosevelt administration and the President Wilson administration. She has travelled extensively, and been around the world three times. She has been 'trying to retire' for some years so that she might give her attention more fully to research work."

Dr. Carson told reporters, "I expected to talk with Miss Caisse and go home within 24 hours, but I am going to stay a week or two. Everything in the clinic is absolutely open, excepting for the formula Miss Caisse uses, and I have advised her to keep that her secret for the present."

Dr. Carson later wrote,

"I realized that I had never before seen or been in such a remarkably cheerful and sympathetic clinic," and made up her mind to obtain absolute proof of the efficacy of Essiac. In her distinctive style she recorded that she was amazed at the endurance of patients and those "oppressively afflicted persons, so patiently endeavoring to pleasantly entertain those who were unable to converse owing to the forbidding location and extent of complications.... The prominently manifest absence of moans, groans or grunts were especially emphasized by the fact that not a complaint, criticism or fault of any nature and not the slightest trace of impatience or confusion was evidence anywhere."

Dr Carson followed the nurse everywhere inside the clinic, writing down Rene's methods of procedure, her answers to questions asked, and personal observations about everything and everyone during the twenty-four days of investigation.

Following her investigation, Dr. Emma Carson's report of her 1937 stated:

"I am thoroughly convinced Nurse Caisse has cured cancer. I am satisfied of this from the actual results I have seen following a close study of the histories investigated. I am amazed beyond expression. Canada should be proud of her great achievement to medical science and the world should be given the opportunity to acknowledge her discovery as one of the most important in the modern history of medical discovery.... Action by the Government in recognizing the great work Miss Caisse is doing is the first essential and if in view of what I have seen with my own eyes, the Ontario Medical Council remains indifferent it will be a crime against civilization."

Just as Dr. Carson was winding up her investigation of the Essiac treatment, a second American physician, Dr. Richard A. Leonardo, came into the clinic while on a weekend holiday with state Attorney General Muscarello at Muskoka's classic Windermere House on Lake Rosseau. The chief coroner of Rochester, New York, was a well-known cancer specialist, reportedly having written several books on the subject, frequently travelling to Europe to study advanced surgical procedures.

On Thursday, August 26, Dr. Leonardo interviewed and examined some patients. Rene regarded his scoffs at her remedy as fair challenge and told him that the only way to prove or disprove the work was to remain in the clinic, see the patients, and watch her work. Which he did.

At the end of his visit, Dr. Leonardo met with Rene. "Young lady," he told her, "I must congratulate you. You have made a wonderful discovery." He'd have to go home and discard his surgical instruments, he said. "He offered to establish and equip a hospital in Rochester, N.Y., if I care to go there and with him," Rene said, but she wanted to prove the merit of Essiac in Canada, she would write years later. Dr. Leonardo left Bracebridge claiming to be firmly convinced of the value of her work, and indicated his intention to return to Bracebridge at a later date. One would wonder how the medical profession received his exciting information.

He spoke before a New York medical association on Monday night, August 30, and included in his address references to Miss Caisse's work. Dr. Leonardo said he "was satisfied that she [Miss Caisse] possessed a remedial agent which was far superior to any method of cancer treatment he had ever seen," and suggested that it might change the whole theory on cancer, eventually doing away with surgery, X ray, and radium treatments.

Later that year Rene received an extraordinary offer in the fall of 1937 from a group of U.S. businessmen through their Buffalo attorney, Ralph Saft, offering Rene one million dollars for the secret formula but she flatly refused, as they would not guarantee that her cure, would be made available for free to anyone who ever needed it.

Within a few months of her rejecting the offer, a controversial cancer bill was quickly passed by the Canadian Parliament. Its long title identified it as "An act for the Investigation of Remedies for Cancer"; its official short title was "The Cancer Remedy Act, 1938." It was also referred to as the "Kirby Bill." The Act enabled the formation of a governing commission regulating alternative cancer treatments. The law appeared to

be aimed directly at Rene. Providing for fines of up to \$2,500 and jail sentences of up to six months for refusal to comply, it dashed all remaining hopes of Rene and others aspiring to a future in non-conventional cancer treatments. So many terminally ill patients became well again that public pressure forced the Parliament to react in 1939. The greatest majority of Rene's evidence was rejected. The commission said the doctors, had only made a mistaken diagnosis—that's why the patients thought they were cured. The medical monopoly pulled out all stops, yet ESSIAC came within only three votes of becoming a legal therapy for cancer. The medical establishment won the war of politics and propaganda – but helped lose the war on cancer.

The Muskoka Herald obtained a copy of the testimonial Dr. Ben Guyatt presented to the commission, and Bracebridge readers were given the entire presentation. The curator of the University of Toronto's anatomy department wrote the following in support of the Caisse treatment:

“During many years it has been my privilege to follow and dispel the ravages of disease. Some of these seem almost to vanish as the morning mist under the magic spell of the physician; others defy in a most adamant manner the almost exhaustless efforts of the dauntless medico. During the past three years it has been my privilege to observe in the Caisse clinic at Bracebridge, Ontario, the work of Nurse Caisse whose enthusiasm, endurance and optimism has been an inspiration to me. Miss Caisse has worked chiefly unaided, but has received much encouragement from those who have observed results, and been greatly inspired by those patients who have responded to treatment. The first most noticeable response observed in this Caisse Clinic is the cheerfulness and optimism of treated patients. This fascinated me; the treatment received appeared to be attacking the disability from the angle which had greatly interested me. In most cases distorted countenances became normal and pain reduced as treatment proceeded. The relief from pain is a notable feature as pain in these cases is very difficult to control. On checking authentic cancer cases it was found that hemorrhage was readily brought under control in many difficult cases, open lesions of lip and breast responded to treatment, cancers of the cervix, rectum and bladder have been caused to disappear, and patients with cancer of the stomach diagnosed by reputable physicians and surgeons have returned to normal activity. The number of patients treated in this clinic are many hundreds and the number responding wholly or in part I do not know, but I DO KNOW that I have witnessed in this clinic a treatment which brings about restoration through destroying the tumor tissue, and supplying that something which improves the mental outlook on life, and facilitates reestablishment of physiological function.”

In a later interview, Rene explained what happened next:

“I kept my clinic open as long as I could until they stopped the doctors from giving a diagnosis, and then I had to stop. And it's a sad thing when somebody comes and they have somebody who is ill with cancer, and the medical profession can do nothing for them, and they beg of me to treat them. It's a very very sad thing to turn them away. I had a nervous breakdown over that, so I really had to stop...and I don't see how they can... how they can refrain from recognizing it because if you have the proof...you have the diagnosis from the

doctor, you have the pathological findings...you have the living patient to show that they are still alive after the medical profession has given up. And yet... they refuse to admit that it is a cure.”

After she recovered from the breakdown Rene started again from scratch brewing the herbal mixture and curing patients in her own basement. Soon the authorities began harassing her again, having her arrested more than once for the most preposterous reasons. But the fame of Essiac had already crossed the border as one day, in 1958, Rene received an invitation to scientifically test her herbal remedy from Dr Charles Bruschi of the famed Bruschi Clinic in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Physician to John F. Kennedy before he was elected to the White House.

Soon Rene began regular trips to Cambridge, and administered a series of treatments on a small number of terminally ill cancer patients as well as laboratory mice implanted with anaplastic carcinoma. Dr. Halsey Loder was observer, and some eighteen physicians were put on the project.

Dr. Philip Merker, head of the Mouse Host Studies section of the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research in Rye, New York, agreed to co-operate with the Bruschi project and in June arranged to supply eighteen mice injected with human carcinoma to the Bruschi Medical Center. The compromise was that no publicity be attached to the tests and that the mice be returned to Sloan-Kettering for further testing and analysis.

After three months of patient testing, Dr. McClure and Dr. Bruschi concluded:

“On mice it [Essiac] had been showed to cause a decided recession of the mass and a definite change in cell formation.... On mice it [Essiac] has merit in the treatment of cancer.” The report continued, “Clinically, on patients suffering from pathologically proven cancer, it reduces pain and causes a recession in the growth; patients have gained weight and shown an improvement in their general health.”

Essiac was then referred to Sloan Kettering Cancer Research Center to be evaluated but the research never happened. Testing ceased and the laboratories would no longer supply mice or process animal autopsies. Rene felt certain pressure had been exerted on these labs to cause them to cease co-operating with her. (Incidentally, much of New York's Memorial Sloan-Kettering's financing and Board of Directors are provided by the Rockefeller Foundation and Interlocking Directorates).

Apparently the American Medical Association had forbidden its members to administer “unknown remedies” to patients. Rene continued to make and supply Essiac for local patients. Meanwhile at least one medical doctor approved of Essiac, with or without the formula. Dr. Leo V. Roy of Whitney, Ontario, village on the southeast fringe of Algonquin Park, was impressed with Essiac's results and wrote an essay on the subject in 1961. As a young doctor in 1953, he became interested in Rene's remedy and referred patients to her for treatment. Recalling his meeting with her, he wrote:

“I was looking for some answers that everybody said did not exist. Her whole stature, then as now, had that quiet assurance of one “who knows”. We only had the one day together. But for years after, this meeting, and the ideas that came

out of it, were the stimulation and the assurance that a new era of cancer therapy is here — waiting to be made available for the suffering masses. Each time I referred a patient to Miss Caisse, the results forced the same knowledge deeper into my convictions. The effects of the herbal preparations are rapid and efficient. More and more each year, the simplicity of the therapy shocked the basis of orthodox medical convictions learned in university training.”

Complaints about Dr. Roy’s work with a purported cancer cure were subsequently placed before the College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1963, and allegations of professional misconduct were discussed along with demands that he cease his involvement with Essiac. Dr. Morton Shulman noted in his autobiographical book that he complained to the College of Physicians and Surgeons about Dr. Roy, and on August 21, 1964, his license to practice was taken away.

At an age when most people consider that any unfinished business would remain that way, in 1973 Rene decided to write Dr. C. Chester Stock at Sloan–Kettering Institute for Cancer Research in Rye, New York, hoping to reopen the Essiac trials for FDA approval. Rene agreed to finally divulge the ingredients of her secret formula, and Dr. Stock, now the vice president and director of the Walker Laboratory, assured her that should they be successful, she would receive due recognition for her contribution. But once the herbs arrived at Sloan–Kettering, the process somehow got bogged down by inexplicable delays.

Eventually some tests were done but the Essiac had not been prepared as she had directed. The laboratory’s “Immunotherapy Studies” report noted, “Leaves and stems were ground in a mortar, suspended in 60ml sterile water and extracted for 5 days in a refrigerator. Suspension was filtered through a double layer of cheesecloth, diluted to 120ml with water and distributed in vials which were kept in refrigerator.” Rene was furious. In an August 4 1975 correspondence to Sloan–Kettering, she steamed:

“I am very shocked at the way your people are using the materials I sent. They might as well inject sterile water. I am sure, I gave you instructions on how to prepare it? They are just using leaves and stems leaving out the roots, they are a part of Essiac, and to strain it through cheese cloth destroys it. You are the only person in the world that I have trusted completely Dr. Stock, and I had such high hopes that even if I should pass on, it would be made available to suffering humanity (at least as a very beneficial treatment for cancer). I know Dr. Stock that you do not do this testing or preparing yourself, but feel sure you can guide them?”

Refrigerating the remedy was against her specific instructions, and that the mice had been injected with animal sarcoma instead of human carcinoma, which she had been under the impression would be used, made her very angry. Surprisingly, in spite of that, Dr. Stock had admitted that two out of six mice showed regressions in sarcoma 180 in the experiments.

Rene sent more dried herbs to Sloan–Kettering, and her correspondence with Dr. Stock became repetitious and revealed a tired old lady who may have been considered a pest by the New York research scientist. But it was so important to her. The process was bogged down by further delays and the Sloan–Kettering trials eventually never came to

a conclusion. Results of their tests were never released.

Exhausted and frustrated by the endless fight Rene simply returned home and went on treating patients on a personal basis until the day she died in 1978. One year before that many of her cured patients convened on her 90th birthday to thank her for what she had done for them. Ex-patients and supporters arrived in Bracebridge Ontario from all over the world. They came to help Rene celebrate her 90th birthday as they have experienced the benefits of Essiac and they felt they owe their life to Rene. At this celebration, Rene said of Essiac "I have given my life for it, I couldn't give any more than that God's been good to let me live this long, to see it used and used by people."

Regarding her over 50 years of harassment, Rene lamented, "I never dreamed of the opposition and the persecution that would be my lot in trying to help suffering humanity with no thought of personal gain." After Rene's death, further attempts to legalize the Essiac cure were made by different groups of patients who went as far as suing the medical authorities for denying them a possible cure for cancer. Nevertheless Essiac was never approved as a cancer treatment.

Dr. Chester Stock, Co-director Sloan Kettering later admitted in a video interview:

"The results that I have reported to Rene Caisse were studies in Sarcoma 180 in the mice, in which we were looking not only for a possible primary inhibition of the tumor which did not occur but also for regressions. And there was a very small percentage in a small group of regressions, but we never had the opportunity to confirm this and to see whether we could obtain better results."

In an extensively researched article in Homemaker's Magazine in 1977, writer Sheila Snow Fraser and Carrol Allen, stated:

"There's a tragic and shameful irony in the Essiac tale. In the beginning, a simple herbal recipe was freely shared by an Indian who understood that the blessings of the Creator belong to all. In the hands of more sophisticated (and allegedly more "civilized") healers, it was made the focus of an ugly struggle for ownership and power. Perhaps our cure for cancer lies back in the past, with our discarded humility and innocence. Perhaps the Indians will someday revive an old man's wisdom, and share it once again. Perhaps this story will be the catalyst; if so our efforts will not have been in vain."

After Caisse's death, Dr. Bruschi was diagnosed himself with colon cancer. He treated himself with the tea alone. And it worked, as he stated "[f]or I have in fact cured my own cancer, the original site of which was the lower bowels, through Essiac alone."— Charles Bruschi, M.D.

Dr. Glum, in his biography 'Calling of an Angel,' had this quote from Dr. Bruschi,

"The results we obtained with thousands of patients of various races, sexes and ages, with all types of cancer, definitely prove Essiac to be a cure for cancer. All studies done in four laboratories in the United States and one more in Canada fortify this claim."

The American Cancer society won't recognize Essiac as a cancer cure. But it does say "some of the specific herbs contained in the mixture have shown some anti-cancer effects in laboratory experiments."

An Unproven Cancer Cure: The Amazing Story of Hoxsey

Very similar to Rene's story, is the one of Harry Hoxsey a Texas businessman whose father had passed on to him an herbal formula that would reveal highly effective against cancer. Unlike Rene, however, Hoxsey was actually a very wealthy oilman, and was a natural born fighter who feared no-one. This set the premise for one of the most prolonged and virulent fights between an American citizen and the medical authorities in the history of the United States.

The ex-coal miner with an eighth-grade education, became a legend in his own time. Hoxsey explains in his book *You Don't Need to Die* that around 1840, his great grandfather observed his favorite horse recover from cancer by eating certain flowers and weeds, which he formulated into a liquid concoction. Each new Hoxsey generation continued as veterinarians and improved the formulas. Soon human cancer victims began demanding the Hoxsey formulas. According to Hoxsey, when his father was dying he had Harry promise to use both the topical salves or powders and internal liquid herbal formulas to help as many people as possible, to make the treatment available to people whether or not they could pay, and not exploit the remedies for personal wealth.

After being arrested for practicing medicine without a license from his Taylorville, Illinois clinic, Hoxsey went to Chicago around 1924 to prove his remedies' efficacy to Morris Fishbein, the AMA head and editor of the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)*.

Hoxsey's tonic and salve was tested with a terminal cancer patient of Dr. Malcom Harris, Chicago policeman, Sgt. Thomas Manix. He was cured by Hoxsey's herbal treatments in three months and wound up living another 10 years. Dr. Harris and Fishbein were impressed enough to extend a purchase offer to Hoxsey for the rights to his family's formulas. The alleged agreement assigned the property rights to a consortium of individuals including Dr. Morris Fishbein, the AMA chief and editor of the *JAMA*. Hoxsey himself would be required to cease any further practice, to be awarded a small percentage of profits after ten years if the treatment panned out. Invoking his Quaker father's deathbed charge that poor people be treated for free and that the treatment carry the family name, Hoxsey said the official threatened to hound him out of business unless he acquiesced.

As a result of Hoxsey's rejection of their terms, Hoxsey immediately incurred the wrath of organized medicine. He was arrested more times than any other man in medical history. Under Morris Fishbein's leadership, the AMA did everything it could to condemn and marginalize Hoxsey's operation despite many patients healing completely or at least improving considerably who had been abandoned by mainstream medicine.

If the treatment was worthless how did he gain so much support? To claim a cure for cancer is to invite evaluation. While the medical profession turned its back on Hoxsey, numerous individuals did make personal investigations. These experiences repeatedly

turned skeptics in to believers. Among them was Esquire magazine writer James Wakefield Burke who in 1939 began covering the Hoxsey story.

“Well my boss Arnold Gingrich, one day said ‘why don't you go down to Texas and lets expose this fellow, he's getting too big. And the American Medical Association would like to put him out of business. You go down and get acquainted with it. We will do a couple of pieces on him, and put an end to this’ so it was an assignment. I came to Texas, I expected to stay about a day, get my information and leave. I became fascinated. I stayed for six weeks. Every day Harry would pick me up and bring me to the clinic. We would come in in the morning and he would put his arm around these old men and women and say ‘dad...have them doctors been cutting you up?’ ‘I'm not gonna let them sons-of-bitches kill you’ ‘you gonna live’ and he would treat them. I would watch him treat them and they would get better, they would begin to get well. So I wrote an outline for a piece, which I called ‘the quack who cured cancer’ and I sent it to back to the editors, but it never came out.” --James Wakefield Burke, author and journalist

In 1936, Hoxsey established the nation's largest independent cancer clinic in Dallas, Texas. There, Assistant District Attorney Al Templeton was more than a skeptic. He arrested Hoxsey more than 100 times in two years. Then his own brother Mike got terminal cancer and secretly went to Hoxsey. Realizing Hoxsey's methods cured his brother of what had been declared an incurable cancer, Al Templeton became Hoxsey's lawyer. Soon after, Templeton was elected as a district judge in Dallas. Hoxsey finally had friends in high places-locally.

Hoxsey's assistant, nurse Mildred Nelson, who later established the Mexico Bio-Medical clinic on Hoxsey's request, originally came to Dallas to take her mother away from “that quack.” Her mother was cured and Mildred stayed to help Hoxsey.

But a new cancer treatment needs more than personal investigations to gain acceptance it needs a formal scientific review. Hoxsey knew that and boldly and publically challenged the medical establishment:

"And when I say to you, all I want is to have them come here" "the American Medical Association, the Pure Food and Drug" "the federal government... anybody" "come here to make an investigation" "and if I don't prove to them beyond any question of a doubt" "that our treatment is superior to Radium, X-ray and surgery" "then I will lock the doors of this institution forever."

Meanwhile Hoxsey struck oil in Texas and used his riches to promote his burgeoning clinic and finance his court battles. As Hoxsey expanded his clinics from Dallas into 16 different states, his notoriety became too obvious for Fishbein's AMA to endure without taking action.

Fishbein's biggest bomb on Hoxsey in 1949 led to his own undoing. He had an offensive hit piece published eagerly by Hearst publications' Sunday Magazine, available to 20 million readers. The title was “Blood Money.” It accused Hoxsey profiting from gullible cancer victims while not delivering cures and worsening health conditions.

Instead of relying on word of mouth, media support from a powerful independent Iowa radio station, and his local friends in high places, Hoxsey attacked Fishbein and Hearst Publications with a well-publicized lawsuit. The Hearst trial started on March 16, 1949. Hoxsey's lawyers were allowed to have only 57 cured patients on the witness stand. The names of the doctors who treated them with surgery and radiation therapy were presented along with the documentation that the doctors had determined all 57 of them as hopeless and terminal with no hope of improvement with organized medicine's cancer treatments.

Each one of the 57 cured patients told how they had come to the Hoxsey clinic with detailed explanations of their treatment and cures. All of them were beyond 5 years of their cure and some of them had been discharged as long as 12 years and none of them showed any signs of malignancy. To support their testimony, the biopsy reports, hospital records, and entire case histories (including radiation studies done before and after) of each of the 57 cured patients was presented.

Three prominent pathologists, all members of the American Medical Association, reluctantly testified that the tissue analyzed from each of these witnesses was definitely malignant. Many of the doctors who treated these patients individually and collectively testified that they felt the Hoxsey cancer treatment was worthless and had no effect whatsoever on cancer. Of course, on cross examination, they were forced to admit that they had never tested the treatment on patients and had no personal experience. They were basing their opinion on hearsay and not fact.

Dr. Fishbein was at the trial at the behest of the Hearst Corporation, and when he took the witness stand to condemn and discredit Hoxsey as a charlatan, he opened himself up for the first time to cross examination. Fishbein was forced to admit that he had never administered the Hoxsey treatment and he had never personally talked to anyone who had been treated by the Hoxsey treatment. He was also forced to admit that he had never treated a single patient in his life for any disease and certainly not cancer, while insisting he was an authority on the disease. He admitted, under oath, that he never practiced medicine one single day of his life and had even failed his anatomy course in medical school. He did graduate, but he never completed his internship. At the end of the trial, Hoxsey's lawyers served Fishbein with a subpoena as a primary defendant in separate libel suit. The AMA discharged Fishbein shortly after the Hearst trial.

The court determined Hoxsey was indeed libeled by the Hearst article. At the culmination of the trial, all of the 34 issues that were argued were decided in Hoxsey's favor. The jury ruled that Fishbein's statement that "Hoxsey had more than 20 years in which to prove such virtues as might have existed in his method; such proof has never been forthcoming" was false. They also ruled that "diagnosis has never been made by scientific methods" was false. The jury found that Fishbein had "acted with malice in doing the things inquired about." It found that every phrase referring to Hoxsey in the American weekly article was false and intended to injure the reputation of the plaintiff; impeach his honesty, integrity, and virtue; and expose him to public hatred, contempt, ridicule, and financial injury.

Fishbein made one very momentous concession during the trial which has never received appropriate attention. Fishbein stated "we'll admit to the fact that

the Hoxsey treatment cures external cancer, we're not arguing about external cancers, it is internal cancers we're interested in". It was a tremendous admission by the one-time head of the AMA, that Hoxsey's treatment cures external cancers such as melanoma, basal cell carcinoma, and squamous cell carcinoma. Why hasn't the knowledge of that admission ever been disseminated to the many sufferers from those kinds of cancer? We all know the answer to that question. It has never been allowed to reach those who need it. Judge Thornton's written opinion from the case is as follows:

"This is my second jury of 12 that has found in my court that the Hoxsey treatment cures cancer. I have sat here and listened to over fifty (50) witnesses from all walks of life who say that they have been cured. They have showed their scars; they have given the names of the doctors who operated on them or treated them with x-ray or radium. I have heard the testimony of prominent and eminent pathologists, some of whom I know personally, saying that these patients were suffering from cancer before they went to Hoxsey. I am of the firm opinion and belief that Hoxsey has cured these people of cancer. And the fact that this jury has answered all questions proves that Hoxsey has been done a great injustice and that the articles and utterances by defendant Morris Fishbein were false, slanderous, and libelous."

With all of the evidence presented in trials in which Hoxsey was forced to defend his treatment, all of the patients gave evidential reports of its profound effectiveness. The success rate approached 80% and was essentially always effective in those that did not have their immune system destroyed by chemotherapy or radiation. In 1950, his standard fee for lifetime service and treatment was \$400 which was raised from around \$150 in the 1940's. There was no charge for the poor, which included at least 25% of his patients.

When Fishbein and the AMA tried to overturn that decision, the Supreme Court upheld it. By the 1950's the Hoxsey Clinic of Dallas, Texas was the largest privately-owned cancer center in the world. Hoxsey clinics reached through seventeen states. Endorsing the treatment were senators, judges and even doctors.

In 1954, a group of 10 physicians from all over the nation met at the Dallas, Texas Hoxsey Cancer Clinic to make an impartial, independent investigation of his treatment. They concluded, after reviewing more than 100 cases of cancer cures and interviewing more than 100 former and active patients, as follows:

"We find as a fact that our investigation has demonstrated to our satisfaction that the Hoxsey cancer clinic in Dallas, Texas is successfully treating pathologically proven cancers of all kinds both internal and external without the use of surgery or radiation. We have established that by all yardstick sub-measurements we have seen sufficient cases to warrant that the Hoxsey treatment is superior to conventional methods of treatment and we are willing to assist this clinic in any way possible in bringing this treatment to the American public. We are willing to use it in our offices, in our practices, for our patients, when at our discretion it is deemed necessary. The above statement represents a unanimous finding of this committee and in

testimony thereof we hereby attach our signatures". S. Edgar Bond, M.D. of Richmond Indiana, Willard G. Palmer, M.D. Seattle Washington, Hans Kalm, M.D. of Akins South Carolina, A.C. Timbs, M.D. of Knoxville Tennessee, Frederick H. Thurston, M.D., D.O. of Boise Idaho, E. E. Loeffler M.D. of Spokane Washington, H. B. Mueller, M.D., of Cleveland Ohio, R.C. Bowie, M.D. of Ft. Morgan Colorado, Benjamin F. Bowers, M.D. of Ebensburg, Pennsylvania, Roy O. Yeates, M.D. of Hardin Montana.

Hoxsey requested the Federal Government make an investigation and report to prove his treatments' merits. No such investigation was made. In fact the 1953 Interstate Commerce Investigation concluded that organized medicine to include an agency of the Federal Government had "conspired" to suppress the Hoxsey therapy and at least a dozen other promising cancer treatments. The Fitzgerald Report stated in part:

"The attention of the Committee is invited to the request made by Senator Elmer Thomas following an investigation made by the Senator of the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic under date of February 25th, 1947, and addressed to the Surgeon General, Public Health Department, Washington, D.C., wherein he sought to enlist the support of the Federal Government to make an investigation and report. No such investigation was made. In fact, every effort was made to avoid and evade the investigation by the Surgeon General's office. The record will reveal that this clinic did furnish 62 complete case histories, including pathology, names of hospitals, physicians, etc., in 1945. Again in June, 1950, 77 case histories, which included the names of the patients, pathological reports in many instances, and in the absence thereof, the names of the Pathologists, hospitals and physicians who had treated these patients before being treated at the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic. The Council of National Cancer Institute, without investigation, in October 1950, refused to order an investigation. The record in the Federal Court discloses that this agency of the Federal Government took sides and sought in every way to hinder, suppress and restrict this institution in their treatment of cancer."⁶⁰²

As further stated in the United States Senate Investigating Committee's report:

"A running fight has been going on between officials, especially Dr. Morris Fishbein of the American Medical Association through the Journal of that organization, and the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic. Dr. Fishbein contended that the medicines employed by the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic had no therapeutic value; that it was run by a quack and a charlatan. (This clinic is manned by a staff of over 30 employees, including nurses and physicians). Reprints and circulation of several million copies of articles so prepared resulted in litigation. The Government thereafter intervened and sought an injunction to prevent the transmission in interstate commerce of certain medicines. It is interesting to note that in the Trial Court, before Judge Atwell, who had an opportunity to hear the witnesses in two different trials, it was held that the so-called Hoxsey method of treating cancer was in some respects superior to that of x-ray, radium and surgery and did have therapeutic value. The Circuit Court of Appeals

⁶⁰² The "Fitzgerald Report" as submitted into the Congressional Record Appendix August 3, 1953, A Report by Special Counsel for a United States Senate Investigating Committee ... Making a Fact Finding Study of a Conspiracy against the Health of the American people.

of the 5th Circuit decided otherwise. This decision was handed down during the trial of a libel suit in the District Court of Dallas, Texas, by Hoxsey against Morris Fishbein, who admitted that he had never practiced medicine one day in his life and had never had a private patient, which resulted in a verdict for Hoxsey and against Morris Fishbein. **The defense even admitted that Hoxsey could cure external cancer** but contended that his medicines for internal cancer had no therapeutic value. The jury, after listening to leading Pathologists, Radiologists, Physicians, Surgeons and scores of witnesses, a great number of whom had never been treated by any Physician or Surgeon except the treatment received at the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic, concluded that Dr. Fishbein was wrong; that his published statements were false, and that the Hoxsey method of treating cancer did have therapeutic value.

In this litigation the Government of the United States, as well as Dr. Fishbein, brought to the Court the leading medical scientists, including Pathologists and others skilled in the treatment of cancer. They came from all parts of the country. It is significant to note that a great number of these doctors admitted that x-ray therapy could cause cancer. This view is supported by medical publications, including the magazine entitled "CANCER" published by the American Cancer Society. May issue of 1948.

I am herewith including the names and addresses of some of the witnesses who testified in the State and Federal Court. It has been determined by pathology, in a great many instances by laboratories wholly disconnected from the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic, that they were suffering from different types of cancer, both internal and external, and following treatment they testified they were cured."

Unfortunately, despite these findings of fact by congress, and despite Hoxsey's obsessive effort to prove the harmless efficacy of his salve and tonic as well as his clinical setting's success, and despite the head of the American Medical Association admitting that Hoxsey COULD IN FACT CURE EXTERNAL CANCER —it all wound up leading to a tragic end. Hoxsey was too much of an effective pest for the medical establishment, which was soon strengthened with the FDA's newly designated legal police powers. On the heels of a California law criminalizing all cancer treatments except surgery, radiation, and chemotherapy, the federal government finally outlawed Hoxsey entirely in the United States in 1960 on questionable technicalities. In 1960, the FDA was called into the fray, padlocking all of Hoxsey's clinics in 16 states, even going to patients' homes and taking their bottles of Hoxsey tonics and disrupting their healing processes.

Harry Hoxsey eventually gave up his 25 yearlong fight against the medical establishment. That's when Hoxsey had his longtime nurse, Mildred Nelson, go to Tijuana to set up his clinic under a different name, where it remains today as the Bio-Medical Center in a small building on a hill overlooking the city and the Bay of San Diego. In 1963, When Mildred Nelson passed away, the Hoxsey legacy was taken up by her sister Liz Jones. This clinic is still seeing patients as of today with reports of similar successes. It has doctors who diagnose with modern equipment. But they prescribe only natural remedies in addition to Hoxsey's tonics and salves, which include homeopathy, laetrile, Montana Yew extract, and dietary recommendations.

Herbal Treatment Ingredients

It is notable that Mr. Hoxsey made no secret of the ingredients he used medicinally on either internal or external Cancer cases. The following shows the ingredients used in Hoxsey Tonic. Interestingly Mr. Hoxsey's tonic was similar to Nurse Rene Caisse's cancer cure in some respects.⁶⁰³

Hoxsey

Berberis Root 10 Mg
Poke Root 10 Mg
Cascara Amarga 5 Mg
Prickly Ash Bark 5 Mg
Berberis Root 10 Mg
Red Clover 20 Mg
Burdock Root 10 Mg
Stillingia Root 10 Mg
Liquorice 20 Mg
Potassium Iodine 150 Mg

Essiac

6 1/2 cups of burdock root (cut),
1 pound of sheep sorrel herb powdered
1/4 pound of slippery elm bark powdered,
1 ounce of Turkish rhubarb root powdered

An Unproven Cancer Cure: the Remarkable Story of Vitamin B-17

The main purpose of this chapter on cancer is to show that this great human tragedy of cancer can quite possibly be stopped now entirely on the basis of existing scientific knowledge. This section on Vitamin B-17 will explore the theory that cancer, like scurvy or pellagra, is a deficiency disease aggravated by the lack of an essential food compound in modern man's diet, and that its ultimate control is to be found simply in restoring this substance to our daily intake.

Similar to ESSIAC and Hoxsey, what you are about to read does not carry the approval of organized medicine. In fact, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and other agencies of government have used every means at their disposal to prevent this story from being told to include dishonesty and manipulation in the field of drug research, as you will see. They have arrested citizens for holding public meetings to tell others of their convictions on this subject. They have confiscated films and books. They even have prosecuted doctors who apply these theories in an effort to save the lives of their own patients. For the entire story, as well as vast cited sources, see the very well documented book *World Without Cancer; The Story of Vitamin B17*, by G. Edward Griffin.

To start off this section, let's review the concept of science from a historical perspective. The history of science is the history of struggle against entrenched error. Many of the world's greatest discoveries initially were rejected by the scientific community. And those who pioneered those discoveries often were ridiculed and

⁶⁰³ In spite of the suppression of information of Essiac, it's success has spread its usage worldwide. But there are reported problems related to the quality and nature of the herbs sometimes being used in the formula. Some herbal distributing companies have substituted yellow and curly dock for sheep's sorrel, which is one of the critical ingredients in Essiac. Sheep's sorrel is the ingredient that was found to be responsible for the destruction of cancer cells in the body. Also the herbs are sometimes harvested improperly and of a non-medical grade. Imported herbs which are often used, are quarantined by the US Drug Administration and sterilized using ionizing radiation and ethylene oxide gas to poison them. In addition to this, there are several other supposed Essiac formulas in circulation which are not true to Rene Caisse's formulation.

condemned as quacks or charlatans. Columbus was bitterly attacked for believing the Earth was round. Bruno was burned at the stake for claiming that Earth was not the center of the Universe. Galileo was imprisoned for teaching that the Earth moved around the Sun. Even the Wright Brothers were ridiculed for claiming that a machine could fly.

In the field of medicine, in the year 130 A.D., the physician Galen announced certain anatomic theories that later proved to be correct, but at the time he was bitterly opposed and actually forced to flee from Rome to escape the frenzy of the mob. In the Sixteenth Century, the physician Andreas Vesalius was denounced as an impostor and heretic because of his discoveries in the field of human anatomy. His theories were accepted after his death but, at the time, his career was ruined, and he was forced to flee from Italy. William Harvey was disgraced as a physician for believing that blood was pumped by the heart and moved around the body through arteries. William Roentgen, the discoverer of X-rays, at first was called a quack and then condemned out of fear that his “ray” would invade the privacy of the bedroom. And Ignaz Semmelweis was fired from his Vienna hospital post for requiring his maternity staff to wash their hands. Centuries ago it was not unusual for entire naval expeditions to be wiped out by scurvy. Between 1600 and 1800 the casualty list of the British Navy alone was over one million sailors. Medical experts of the time were baffled as they searched in vain for some kind of strange bacterium, virus, or toxin that supposedly lurked in the dark holds of ships. And yet, for hundreds of years, the cure was already known and written in the record.

In the winter of 1535, when the French explorer Jacques Cartier found his ships frozen in the ice off the St. Lawrence River, scurvy began to take its deadly toll. Out of a crew of one hundred and ten, twenty-five already had died, and most of the others were so ill they weren’t expected to recover. And then a friendly Indian showed them the simple remedy. Tree bark and needles from the white pine—both rich in ascorbic acid, or vitamin C—were stirred into a drink which produced immediate improvement and swift recovery.

Upon returning to Europe, Cartier reported this incident to the medical authorities. But they were amused by such “witchdoctor cures of ignorant savages” and did nothing to follow it up. Yes, the cure for scurvy was known. But, because of scientific arrogance, it took over two hundred years and cost hundreds of thousands of lives before the medical experts began to accept and apply this knowledge.

Finally, in 1747, John Lind, a young surgeon’s mate in the British Navy discovered that oranges and lemons produced relief from scurvy and recommended that the Royal Navy include citrus fruits in the stores of all its ships. And yet, it still took forty-eight more years before his recommendation was put into effect. When it was, of course, the British were able to surpass all other sea-faring nations, and the “Limeys” (so-called because they carried limes aboard ship) soon became the rulers of the Seven Seas. It is no exaggeration to say that the greatness of the British Empire in large measure was the direct result of overcoming scientific prejudice against vitamin therapy.

The twentieth century has proven to be no exception to this pattern. Only two generations ago large portions of the American Southeast were decimated by the dread disease of pellagra. The well-known physician Sir William Osier, in his *Principles and*

Practice of Medicine, explained that in one institution for the insane in Leonard, North Carolina, one-third of the inmates died of this disease during the winter months. This proved, he said, that pellagra was contagious and caused probably by an as yet undiscovered virus. As far back as 1914, however, Dr. Joseph Goldberger had proven that this condition was related to diet, and later showed that it could be prevented simply by eating liver or yeast. But it wasn't until the 1940's—almost thirty years later—that the “modern” medical world fully accepted pellagra as a vitamin B deficiency.

The story behind pernicious anemia is almost exactly the same. The reason that these diseases were so reluctantly accepted as vitamin deficiencies is because men tend to look for positive cause-and-effect relationships in which something causes something else. They find it more difficult to comprehend the negative relationship in which nothing or the lack of something can cause an effect. But perhaps of even more importance is the reality of intellectual pride. A man who has spent his life acquiring scientific knowledge far beyond the grasp of his fellow human beings is not usually inclined to listen with patience to someone who lacks that knowledge—especially if that person suggests that the solution to the scientist's most puzzling medical problem is to be found in a simple back-woods or near-primitive concoction of herbs and foods. The scientist is trained to search for complex answers and tends to look with smug amusement upon solutions that are not dependent upon his hard-earned skills.

To bring this a little closer to home, the average M.D. today has spent over ten years of intensive training to learn about health and disease. This educational process continues for as long as he practices his art. The greatest challenge to the medical profession today is cancer. If the solution to the cancer puzzle were to be found in the simple foods we eat (or don't eat), then what other diseases might also be traced to this cause? The implications are explosive. As one doctor put it so aptly, “Most of my medical training has been wasted. I've learned the wrong things!” And no one wants to discover that he has learned—or taught—the wrong things. Hence, there is an unconscious, but natural, tendency among many scientists and physicians to reject the vitamin-deficiency concept of disease until it is proven, and proven, and proven again.

The Theory of Cancer Being a “Deficiency Disease”

By 1952, Dr. Ernst T. Krebs, Jr., a biochemist in San Francisco, had advanced the theory that cancer, like scurvy and pellagra, is not caused by some kind of mysterious bacterium, virus, or toxin, but is merely a deficiency disease aggravated by the lack of an essential food compound in modern-man's diet. He identified this compound as part of the nitriloside family which occurs abundantly in nature in over twelve-hundred edible plants and found virtually in every part of the world. It is particularly prevalent in the seeds of those fruits in the Prunus Rosacea family (bitter almond, apricot, blackthorn, cherry, nectarine, peach, and plum), but also contained in grasses, maize, sorghum, millet, cassava, linseed, apple seeds, buckwheat, alfalfa, peas, macadamia nuts, lentils, and many other foods that that are generally not consumed in large quantities by modern civilization.

It is difficult to establish a clear-cut classification for a nitriloside. Since it does not occur entirely by itself but rather is found in foods, it probably should not be classified as a food. Like sugar, it is a food component or a food factor. Nor can it be classified as a drug inasmuch as it is a natural, non-toxic, water-soluble substance entirely

normal to and compatible with human metabolism. The proper name for a food factor that contains these properties is vitamin. Since this vitamin normally is found with the B-complex, and since it was the seventeenth such substance to be isolated within this complex, Dr. Krebs identified it as vitamin B17.⁶⁰⁴ He said:

“Can the water-soluble non-toxic nitrilosides properly be described as food? Probably not in the strict sense of the word. They are certainly not drugs per se. Since the nitrilosides are neither food nor drug, they may be considered as accessory food factors. Another term for water-soluble, non-toxic accessory food factors is vitamin.”⁶⁰⁵

A chronic disease is one which usually does not pass away of its own accord. A metabolic disease is one which occurs within the body and is not transmittable to another person. Cancer, therefore, being all of these, is a chronic, metabolic disease. There are many of these diseases that plague modern man, such as muscular dystrophy, heart disease, multiple sclerosis, and sickle-cell anemia. Scientists have spent billions of dollars searching for a prevention of these cripplers and killers, but they are no closer to the answers today than they were when they started. Perhaps the reason is that they are still looking for that something which causes these diseases instead of the lack of something.

Dr. Krebs has pointed out that, in the entire history of medical science, there has not been one chronic, metabolic disease that was ever cured or prevented by drugs, surgery, or mechanical manipulation of the body. In every case—whether it is scurvy, pellagra, rickets, beri-beri, night blindness, pernicious anemia, or any of the others—the ultimate solution was found only in factors relating to adequate nutrition. And he thinks that this is an important clue as to where to concentrate our scientific curiosity in the search for a better understanding of today’s diseases, particularly cancer.

Many Animals Instinctively Eat Nitrilocides

But there are other clues as well. As everyone who owns a dog or cat has observed, these domesticated pets often seek out certain grasses to eat even though they are adequately filled by other foods. This is particularly likely to happen if the animals are not well. It is interesting to note that the grasses selected by instinct are Johnson grass, Tunis grass, Sudan grass, and others that are especially rich in nitrilosides or vitamin B17.

Monkeys and other primates at the zoo when given a fresh peach or apricot will carefully pull away the sweet fleshy part, crack open the hard pit, and devour the seed that remains. Instinct compels them to do this even though they have never seen that kind of fruit before. These seeds are one of the most concentrated sources of nitrilosides to be found anywhere in nature. Wild bears are great consumers of nitrilosides in their natural diet. Not only do they seek berries that are rich in this

⁶⁰⁴ The chemical compound in question is vitamin B17, which is found in those natural foods containing nitriloxide. It is known also as amygdalin and, as such, has been used and studied extensively for well over a hundred years. But, in its concentrated and purified form developed by Dr. Krebs specifically for cancer therapy, it is known as Laetrile. For the sake of clarity in this volume, however, we shall favor the more simple name: vitamin B17.

⁶⁰⁵ Krebs, *The Laetriles/Nitrilosides in the Prevention and Control of Cancer* (Montreal: The McNaughton Foundation, n.d.), p. 16.

substance, but when they kill small grazing animals for their own food, instinctively they pass over the muscle portions and consume first the viscera and rumen which are filled with nitriloside grasses.⁶⁰⁶

In captivity, animals seldom are allowed to eat all the foods of their instinctive choice. In the San Diego Zoo, for example, the routine diet for bears, although nutritious in many other respects, is almost totally devoid of nitrilosides. In one grotto alone, over a 1962 six-year period, five bears died of cancer. It was generally speculated by the experts that a virus had been the cause.

It is significant that one seldom finds cancer in the carcasses of wild animals killed in the hunt. These creatures contract the disease only when they are domesticated by man and forced to eat the foods he provides or the scraps from his table. It is amazing how cancer researchers can come face-to-face with this evidence and still fail to realize its significance. Dr. Dennis P. Burkitt, the man who first identified the form of cancer known as Burkitt Lymphoma, delivered a lecture at the College of Medicine at the University of Iowa. After two decades of experience and research in Uganda and similar parts of the world, Dr. Burkitt observed that non-infectious (chronic metabolic) diseases such as cancer of the colon, diverticular disease, ulcerative colitis, polyps, and appendicitis, all seem to be related in some way. "They all go together," he said, "and I'm going to go so far as to suggest that they all have a common cause." He went on to say that all of these diseases are unknown in primitive societies and "always have their maximum incidence in the more economically developed nations."

Then Dr. Burkitt turned his attention to cancer specifically and observed: This is a disease caused by the way we live. This form of cancer is almost unknown in the animal kingdom. The only animals who get cancer or polyps of the large bowel are those that live closest to our way of life— our domestic dogs eating our leftovers.⁶⁰⁷

These are all excellent observations. But apparently neither Dr. Burkitt nor anyone in his esteemed audience could find any meaning in these facts. The lecture closed with the conclusion that colon cancer probably is related to bacteria in the large bowel and that we should all eat more bran and other cereal fibers to increase the roughage content of our intestines and the size of our stools!

At least Dr. Burkitt was looking at the foods we eat, which was a huge step forward. He may have been heading in the wrong direction, but at least he was on the right track. If more cancer researchers would think in terms of foods and vitamins rather than bacteria and viruses, it wouldn't take them long to see why the cancer rate in America is steadily climbing. Measured in terms of taste, volume, and variety, Americans eat very well, indeed. But expensive or tasty food is not necessarily good food. Many people assume that it makes little difference what they put into their stomachs as long as they are full. Magically, everything that goes in somehow will be converted into perfect health. They scoff at the thought of proper diet. Yet, many of these same people are fastidious about what they feed their pedigreed dogs and cats or their registered cattle and horses.

⁶⁰⁶ See Peter Krott, Ph.D., *Bears in the Family* (New York E.P. Dutton & Co., 1964).

⁶⁰⁷ "The Evidence Leavens: We Invite Colon Cancer," *Medical World News*, Aug. 11, 1972, pp. 33-34.

Dr. George M. Briggs, professor of nutrition at the University of California, and member of the Research Advisory Committee of the National Livestock and Meat Board, has said:

“The typical American diet is a national disaster...if I fed it to pigs or cows, without adding vitamins and other supplements, I could wipe out the livestock industry.”⁶⁰⁸

A brief look at the American diet tells the story. Grocery shelves are now lined with high carbohydrate foods that have been processed refined, synthesized, artificially flavored, and loaded with chemical preservatives.⁶⁰⁹ Some manufacturers, aiming their advertisements at the diet-conscious consumer, even boast of how little real food there is in their product. Everyone knows that modern processing removes many of the original vitamins from our foods, but we are told not to worry about it, because they have been put back before sending to market. And so we see the word “enriched” printed cheerfully across our bread, milk, and other foods. But make no mistake about it, these are not the same as the original. As the June 1971 Journal of the American Geriatric Society reported:

“Vitamins removed from food and returned as “enrichment” are not a safe substitute, as witnessed by the study in which Roger J. Williams, Ph.D., reported that rats fed enriched bread died or were severely stunted due to malnutrition. Rats fed a more whole bread flourished, for the most part, by comparison. Much illness, we are learning, may be due to vitamin-mineral deficiencies. Even senility has been proven to be caused by a deficiency of Vitamins B and C.”

Indeed, here is a worthy experiment that can and should be carried out in every grade-school science class. Rodents fed only “enriched” bread very soon become anti-social. Some even become cannibalistic, apparently responding to an instinctive drive to obtain the vital food elements they are lacking. Most will die within a month or two.

“Enriched” bread is just one small part of the larger picture. Millet once was the world’s staple grain. It is high in nitriloside content. But now it has been replaced by wheat which has practically none at all—even whole wheat. Sorghum cane has been replaced by sugar cane with the same result. Even our cattle are fed increasingly on quick-growing, low-nitriloside grasses so there is less vitamin B17 residue in the meat we eat. In some places, livestock now are being fed a diet containing fifteen percent paper to fatten them quicker for market.⁶¹⁰

In retrospect, there were many customs of our grandparents that, although lacking in scientific rationale at the time, were based upon centuries of accumulated experience through trial and error, and have since been proven to be infinitely wise. “An apple a

⁶⁰⁸ “University of California Nutrition Professor, A Health Advisor to the U.S. Government...Charges the Typical American Diet is a National Disaster,” National Enquirer, Dec. 5, 1971, p. 2.

⁶⁰⁹ There are now over 3,000 additives used in U.S. food products for flavoring, coloring, preservation, and similar purposes. Most are safe in the quantities used, but many of these chemicals pose a serious health hazard with prolonged use. See Toxics A to Z, by Harte, Holdren, Schneider, and Shirley (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

⁶¹⁰ “Paper Fattens Cattle,” (UPI) Oakland Tribune, Nov. 22, 1971

day keeps the doctor away” could well have been more than an idle slogan, especially in an era when it was customary for everyone to eat the seeds of those apples as well. It is a fact that the whole fruit—including the seeds—of an apple contains an amazingly high concentration of vitamins, minerals, fats, and proteins that are essential for health. Apple seeds are especially rich in nitrilosides or vitamin B17. The distasteful “spring tonic” or sorghum molasses and sulphur also was a rich source of nitriloside. And grandma’s apricot and peach preserves almost always contained the kernels of these canned fruits for winter eating. She probably didn’t know what they contained or why they were good for you. But she knew that they were good for you simply because her mother had told her so.

And so we see that the foods that once provided the American people with ample amounts of natural vitamin B17 gradually have been pushed aside or replaced altogether by foods almost devoid of this factor. Significantly, it is during this same period that the cancer rate has moved steadily upward to the point where, today, one out of every two persons in the United States is destined to contract this disease.

It cannot be argued that the cancer rate is up merely because other causes of death are down and, thus, people are living longer. First of all, they are not living that much longer—only a few years, on the average, over the past four generations. In 1972, a year in which the average age of the American population was headed downward, a year in which the population growth rate had shrunk practically to zero, the death rate from cancer rose to the highest level it had yet reached: three times the 1950 rate.⁶¹¹ Secondly, in those countries where people live longer than in the United States, the cancer rate for them is lower than for us.

There is no escape from the significance of these facts. While the medical world, the federal government, and the American Cancer Society are spending billions of dollars and millions of man-hours searching for an exotic cancer virus against which they plan to spend an equal amount to create an effective man-made immunization, the answer may lie right under their noses.

The best way to prove or disprove the vitamin theory of cancer would be to take a large group of people numbering in the thousands and, over a period of many years, expose them to a consistent diet of rich nitriloside foods, and then check the results. This, surely, would be the ultimate test. Fortunately, it already has been done.

In the remote recesses of the Himalaya Mountains, between West Pakistan, India, and China, there is a tiny kingdom called Hunza. These people are known world over for their amazing longevity and good health. It is not uncommon for Hunzakuts to live beyond a hundred years, and some even to a hundred and twenty or more. Visiting medical teams from the outside world have reported that they found no cancer in Hunza.

Although presently accepted science is unable to explain why these people should have been free of cancer, it is interesting to note that the traditional Hunza diet contains over two-hundred times more nitriloside than the average American diet. In fact, in that land where there was no such thing as money, a man’s wealth was

⁶¹¹ “Cancer Cure Still Eludes Scientists,” (NEA) News Chronicle (Calif.) Aug. 29, 1973, p. A-9.

measured by the number of apricot trees he owned. And the most prized of all foods was considered to be the apricot seed.

One of the first medical teams to gain access to the remote kingdom of Hunza was headed by the world-renowned British surgeon and physician Dr. Robert McCarrison. Writing in the January 7, 1922, issue of the journal of The American Medical Association, Dr. McCarrison reported:

“The Hunza has no known incidence of cancer. They have . . . an abundant crop of apricots. These they dry in the sun and use very largely in their food. Visitors to Hunza, when offered a fresh apricot or peach to eat, usually drop the hard pit to the ground when they are through. This brings looks of dismay and disbelief to the faces of their guides. To them, the seed inside is the delicacy of the fruit.”

Dr. Allen E. Banik, an optometrist from Kearney, Nebraska, was one such visitor. In his book, *Hunza Land*, he describes what happened:

“My first experience with Hunza apricots, fresh from the tree, came when my guide picked several, washed them in a mountain stream, and handed them to me. I ate the luscious fruit and casually tossed the seeds to the ground. After an incredulous glance at me, one of the older men stooped and picked up the seeds. He cracked them between two stones, and handed them to me. The guide said with a smile: “Eat them. It is the best part of the fruit.”

“My curiosity aroused, I asked, “What do you do with the seeds you do not eat?” The guide informed me that many are stored, but most of them are ground very fine and then squeezed under pressure to produce a very rich oil. “This oil,” my guide claimed, “looks much like olive oil. Sometimes we swallow a spoonful of it when we need it. On special days, we deep-fry our chappatis [bread] in it. On festival nights, our women use the oil to shine their hair. It makes a good rubbing compound for body bruises.”⁶¹²

In 1973, Prince Mohammed Ameen Khan, son of the Mir of Hunza, told Charles Hillinger of the *Los Angeles Times* that the average life expectancy of his people is about eighty-five years. He added: “Many members of the Council of Elders who help my father govern the state have been over one hundred.”⁶¹³

With a scientific distrust for both hearsay and the printed word, Dr. Ernst T. Krebs, Jr., met with Prince Khan for dinner where he queried him on the accuracy of the *LA. Times* report. The prince happily confirmed it and then described how it was not uncommon to eat thirty to fifty apricot seeds as an after-lunch snack. (Seeds in Hunza contain only about 6% of the amygdalin in typical California apricots. Eating that many U.S.-grown seeds would not be wise because of the possibility of a toxic effect). These often account for as much as 75,000 International Units of vitamin A per day in addition to as much as 50 mg of vitamin B17. Despite all of this, or possibly because of it, the life expectancy in Hunza, the Prince affirmed, is about eighty-five years. This is in puzzling contrast to the United States where, at that time, life expectancy was about seventy-

⁶¹² Allen E. Banik and Renee Taylor, *Hunza Land* (Long Beach, Calif.: Whitehorn, 1960), pp. 123-24.

⁶¹³ *Los Angeles Times*, May 7, 1973, Part I-A.

one years. Even now, more than four decades later, life expectancy at birth in the U.S. is only about seventy-eight.

That number may sound pretty good, but remember that it includes millions of old people who are alive but not really living. The length of their lives may have been extended by surgery or medication, but the quality of their lives has been devastated in the process. They are the ones who stare blankly into space with impaired mental capacity, or who are dependent on life-support mechanisms, or who are confined to bed requiring round-the-clock care. There are no such cases buried in the statistics from Hunza. Most of those people are healthy, vigorous, and vital right up to within a few days of the end. The quality of life is more important than the quantity. The Hunzakuts have both.

It will be noted that the Hunzakut intake of vitamin A may run seven-and-a-half times the maximum amount the FDA allows to be used in a tablet or capsule, while that agency has tried to outlaw entirely the eating of apricot seeds.

The women of Hunza are renowned for their strikingly smooth skin even into advanced age. Generally, their faces appear fifteen to twenty years younger than their counterparts in other areas of the world. They claim that their secret is merely the apricot oil which they apply to their skins almost daily.

In 1974 Senator Charles Percy, a member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, visited Hunza. When he returned to the United States he wrote:

“We began curiously to observe the life style of the Hunzakuts. Could their eating habits be a source of longevity?. . .Some Hunzakuts believe their long lives are due in part to the apricot. Eaten fresh in the summer, dried in the sun for the long winter, the apricot is a staple in Hunza, much as rice is in other parts of the world. Apricot seeds are ground fine and squeezed for their rich oil, used for both frying and lighting.”⁶¹⁴

And so, the Hunzakuts use the apricot, its seed, and the oil from its seed for practically everything. They share with most western scientists an ignorance of the chemistry and physiology of the nitriloside content of this fruit, but they have learned empirically that their life is enhanced by its generous use.

Five or six excellent volumes similar to Dr. Banik’s have been written by those who have risked their lives over the treacherous Himalaya Mountain passes to gain entrance to Hunza. Also, there have been scores of magazine and newspaper articles published over the years. They all present the identical picture of the average Hunza diet. In addition to the ever-present apricot, the Hunzakuts eat mainly grain and fresh vegetables. These include buckwheat, millet, alfalfa, peas, broad beans, turnips, lettuce, sprouting pulse or gram, and berries of various sorts. All of these, with the exception of lettuce and turnips, contain nitriloside or vitamin B17.

⁶¹⁴ “You Live To Be 100 in Hunza,” Parade, Feb. 17, 1974, p. 11.

It is sad to note that, in recent years, a narrow road was finally carved through the mountains, and food supplies from the “modern world” have at last arrived in Hunza. So have the first few cases of cancer.

In 1927 Dr. McCarrison was appointed Director of Nutrition Research in India. Part of his work consisted of experiments on albino rats to see what effect the Hunza diet had on them compared to the diets of other countries. Over a thousand rats were involved in the experiment and carefully observed from birth to twenty-seven months, which corresponds to about fifty years of age in man. At this point the Hunza-fed rats were killed and autopsied. Here is what McCarrison reported:

“During the past two and a quarter years there has been no case of illness in the “universe” of albino rats, no death from natural causes in the adult stock, and, but for a few accidental deaths, no infantile mortality. Both clinically and at post-mortem, examination of this stock has been shown to be remarkably free from disease. It may be that some of them have cryptic disease of one kind or another, but if so, I have failed to find either clinical or microscopic evidence of it.”⁶¹⁵

By comparison, over two thousand rats fed on typical Indian and Pakistani diets soon developed eye ailments, ulcers, boils, bad teeth, crooked spines, loss of hair, anemia, skin disorders, heart, kidney and glandular weaknesses, and a wide variety of gastrointestinal disorders. In follow-up experiments, McCarrison gave a group of rats the diet of the lower classes of England. It consisted of white bread, margarine, sweetened tea, boiled vegetables, canned meat, and inexpensive jams and jellies—a diet not too far removed from that of many Americans. Not only did the rats develop all kinds of chronic metabolic diseases, but they also became nervous wrecks. McCarrison wrote:

“They were nervous and apt to bite their attendants; they lived unhappily together, and by the sixteenth day of the experiment they began to kill and eat the weaker ones amongst them.”⁶¹⁶

It is not surprising, therefore, to learn that westernized man is victimized by the chronic metabolic disease of cancer while his counterpart in Hunza is not. And lest anyone suspect that this difference is due to hereditary factors, it is important to know that when the Hunzakuts leave their secluded land and adopt the menus of other countries, they soon succumb to the same diseases and infirmities—including cancer—as the rest of mankind.

The Eskimos are another people that have been observed by medical teams for many decades and found to be totally free of cancer. In Vilhjalmur Stefanson’s book, *Cancer: Disease of Civilization? An Anthropological and Historical Study*,⁶¹⁷ it is revealed that the traditional Eskimo diet is amazingly rich in nitrilosides that come from the residue of the meat of caribou and other grazing animals, and also from the salmon berry

⁶¹⁵ Quoted by Renee Taylor, *Hunza Health Secrets* (New York: Award Books, 1964), pp. 96–7.

⁶¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁶¹⁷ New York: Hill and Wang, 1960.

which grows abundantly in the Arctic areas. Another Eskimo delicacy is a green salad made out of the stomach contents of caribou and reindeer which are full of fresh tundra grasses. Among these grasses, Arrow grass (*Triglochin Maritima*) is very common. Studies made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture have shown that Arrow grass is probably richer in nitriloside content than another grass.

What happens when the Eskimo abandons his traditional way of life and begins to rely on westernized foods? He becomes even more cancer-prone than the average American. Dr. Otto Schaefer, M.D., who has studied the diets and health patterns of the Eskimos, reports that these people have undergone a drastic change in their eating habits, caused indirectly by the construction of military and civilian airports across the Canadian Arctic in the mid-50's. These attracted the Eskimos to new jobs, new homes, new schools—and new menus. Just a little over one generation previously, their diet consisted almost entirely of game and fish, along with seasonal berries, roots, leafy greens and seaweed. Carbohydrates were almost completely lacking. Suddenly all of that changed. Dr. Schaefer reports:

“When the Eskimo gives up his nomadic life and moves into the settlement, he and his family undergo remarkable changes. His children grow faster and taller, and reach puberty sooner. Their teeth rot, his wife comes down with gallbladder disease and, likely as not, a member of his family will suffer one of the degenerative diseases for which the white man is well known.”⁶¹⁸

There are many other peoples in the world that could be cited with the same characteristics. The Abkhazians deep in the Caucasus Mountains on the Northeast side of the Black Sea are a people with almost exactly the same record of health and longevity as the Hunzakuts. The parallels between the two are striking. First, Abkhazia is a hard, land which does not yield up a harvest easily. The inhabitants are accustomed to daily hard work throughout their lives. Consequently, their bodies and minds are strong right up until death, which comes swiftly with little or no preliminary illness. Like the Hunzakuts, the Abkhazians expect to live well beyond eighty years of age. Many are over a hundred. One of the oldest persons in the world was Mrs. Shirali Mislimov of Abkhazia who, in 1972, was estimated to be 165 years old.⁶¹⁹ The other common factor, of course, is the food, which, typically, is low in carbohydrates, high in vegetable proteins, and rich in minerals and vitamins, especially vitamin B17.

The Indians of North America, while they remained true to their native customs and foods, also were remarkably free from cancer. At one time, the American Medical Association urged the federal government to conduct a study in an effort to discover why there was so little cancer among the Hopi and Navajo Indians. The February 5, 1949, issue of the *Journal of the AMA* declared:

“The Indian's diet seems to be low in quality and quantity and wanting in variety, and the doctors wondered if this had anything to do with the fact that

⁶¹⁸ Nutrition Today, Nov./Dec, 1971, as quoted in “Modern Refined Foods Finally Reach The Eskimos,” Kaysers Health Research, May, 1972, pp. 11, 46, 48.

⁶¹⁹ “The Secret of Long Life” by Sula Benet, (NY. Times News Service), L.A. Herald Examiner, Jan. 2, 1972, p. A-12. Also “Soviet Study Finds Recipe for Long Life,” National Enquirer, Aug. 27, 1972, p. 13.

only 36 cases of malignant cancer were found out of 30,000 admissions to the Ganado Arizona Mission Hospital.”

In the same population of white persons, the doctors said there would have been about 1,800. Thirty-six cases compared to eighteen hundred represents only two percent of the expected number. Obviously, something is responsible.

Dr. Krebs, who has done exhaustive research on this subject, has written:

“I have analyzed from historical and anthropological records the nitrilosidic content of the diets of these various North American tribes. The evidence should put to rest forever the notion of toxicity in nitrilosidic foods. Some of these tribes would ingest over 8,000 milligrams of vitamin B17 (nitriloside) a day. My data on the Modoc Indians are particularly complete.”⁶²⁰

A quick glance at the cancer-free native populations in tropical areas, such as South America and Africa, reveals a great abundance and variety of nitriloside-rich foods. In fact, over one-third of all plants native to these areas contain vitamin B17. One of the most common is cassava, sometimes described as “the bread of the tropic.” But this is not the same as the sweet cassava preferred in the cities of western civilization. The native fruit is more bitter, but it is rich in nitriloside. The sweet cassava has much less of this vital substance, and even that is so processed as to eliminate practically all nitrile ions.⁶²¹

As far back as 1913, Dr. Albert Schweitzer, the world-famous medical missionary to Africa, had put his finger on the basic cause of cancer. He had not isolated the specific substance, but he was convinced from his observations that a difference in food was the key. In his preface to Alexander Berglas’ *Cancer: Cause and Cure* (Paris: Pasteur Institute, 1957), he wrote:

“On my arrival in Gabon in 1913, I was astonished to encounter no cases of cancer. I saw none among the natives two hundred miles from the coast I cannot, of course, say positively that there was no cancer at all, but, like other frontier doctors, I can only say that, if any cases existed, they must have been quite rare. This absence of cancer seemed to be due to the difference in nutrition of the natives compared to the Europeans.”

The missionary and medical journals have recorded many such cancer-free populations all over the world. Some are in tropic regions, some in the Arctic. Some are hunters who eat great quantities of meat; some are vegetarians who eat almost no meat at all. From all continents and all races, the one thing they have in common is that the degree to which they are free from cancer is in direct proportion to the amount of nitriloside or vitamin B17 found in their natural diet.

In answer to this, the skeptic may argue that these primitive groups are not exposed to the same cancer-producing elements that modern man is, and perhaps that is the reason they are immune. Let them breathe the same smog-filled air, smoke the same

⁶²⁰ Letter from Dr. E.T. Krebs, Jr. to Dr. Dean Burk of the National Cancer institute, dated March 14, 1972.

⁶²¹ The Laetriles/Nitrilosides, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

cigarettes, swallow the same chemicals added to their food or water, use the same soaps or deodorants, and then see how they fare.

This is a valid argument. But, fortunately, even that question now has been resolved by experience. In the highly populated and often air-polluted State of California there are over 100,000 people comprising a population that shows a cancer incidence of less than fifty per cent of that for the remaining population. This unique group has the same sex, age, socioeconomic, educational, occupational, ethnic and cultural profile as the remainder of the State's population that suffers twice as high an incidence of cancer. This is the Seventh Day Adventist population of the State.

There is only one material difference that sets this population apart from that of the rest of the State. This population is predominantly vegetarian. By increasing greatly the quantity of vegetables in their diet to compensate for the absence of meat they increase proportionately their dietary intake of vitamin B17 (nitriloside).⁶²² Probably the reason that this population is not totally free from cancer—as are the Hunzakuts, the aboriginal Eskimos, and other such populations—is that #1) many members of this sect have joined it after almost a lifetime on a general or standard dietary pattern; #2) the fruits and vegetables ingested are not consciously chosen for vitamin B17 content nor are fruit seeds generally eaten by them; and #3) not all Seventh Day Adventists adhere to the vegetarian diet. Another group that, because of religious doctrine, eats very little meat and, thus, a greater quantity of grains, vegetables, and fruits which contain B17, is the Mormon population. In Utah, which is seventy-three percent Mormon, the cancer rate is twenty-five percent below the national average. In Utah County, which includes the city of Provo and is ninety percent Mormon, the cancer rate is below the national average by twenty-eight percent for women and thirty-five percent for men.⁶²³

In the summer of 1940, the Netherlands became occupied by the military forces of Nazi Germany. Under a dictatorial regime the entire nation of about nine-million people was compelled to change its eating habits drastically. Dr. C. Moerman, a physician in Vlaardingen, the Netherlands, described what happened during that period:

“White bread was replaced by whole-meal bread and rye bread. The supply of sugar was drastically cut down and soon entirely stopped. Honey was used, if available. The oil supply from abroad was stopped and, as a result, no margarine was produced any more, causing the people to try and get butter. Add to this that the consumer received as much fruit and as many vegetables as possible, hoarding and buying from the farmers what they could. In short: people satisfied their hunger with large quantities of natural elements rich in vitamins.”

Now think of what happened later: in 1945 this forced nutrition suddenly came to an end. What was the result? People started eating again white bread, margarine,

⁶²² There are other substances found in vegetables that also have shown an anti-cancer effect —such as beta-carotene and a group of chemicals known as saponins which are found in a wide variety of vegetables and legumes. Nitrilosides, however, appear to be the most potent. See “Vegemania, Scientists Tout the Health Benefits of Saponins,” by Richard Lipkin, *Science News*, December 9, 1995, pp. 392-3.

⁶²³ “Cancer Rate for Mormons Among Lowest,” *Los Angeles Times*, Aug. 22, 1974, Part II, p. 1.

skimmed milk, much sugar, much meat, and only few vegetables and little fruit ...In short: people ate too much unnatural and too little natural food, and therefore got too few vitamins.⁶²⁴

Dr. Moerman showed that the cancer rate in the Netherlands dropped straight down from a peak in 1942 to its lowest point in 1945. But after 1945, with the return of processed foods, the cancer rate began to climb again and has shown a steady rise ever since.

Of course the experience in the Netherlands or among the seventh Day Adventists or Mormons is not conclusive for it still leaves open the question of the specific food factor or factors that were responsible. So let us narrow the field.

Since the 1960s, there has been a steadily-growing group of people who have accepted the vitamin theory of cancer and who have altered their diets accordingly. They represent all walks of life, all ages, both sexes, and reside in almost every advanced nation in the world. There are many thousands in the United States alone.⁶²⁵ For many persons, the logic of all these facts put together is great enough that it would be easy to close the case right here. But, let us reinforce our convictions with the science of the theory also, that we may understand why it works the way our logic tells us that it must.

An explanation of the trophoblast thesis of cancer

During his lifetime, Dr. Krebs authored many scientific papers including “The Unitarian or Trophoblastic Thesis of Cancer” and “The Nitrilosides in Plants and Animals.” He was the recipient of numerous honors and doctorates both at home and abroad. He was the science director of the John Beard Memorial Foundation prior to his death in 1996. He was also the discoverer of vitamin B15 (pangamic acid), which has proven to be an important adjunctive therapy in the treatment of many illnesses related to impaired circulation. Early in his student work, Dr. Krebs became familiar with the trophoblast thesis of cancer advanced by Professor John Beard.

In 1902, John Beard, a professor of embryology at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland, authored a paper published in the British medical journal *Lancet* in which he stated there were no differences between cancer cells and certain pre-embryonic cells that were normal to the early stages of pregnancy. In technical terms, these normal cells are called trophoblasts. Extensive research had led Professor Beard to the conclusion that cancer and trophoblast are, in fact, one and the same. His theory, therefore, is known as the trophoblast thesis of cancer.⁶²⁶

The trophoblast in pregnancy does exhibit all the classical characteristics of cancer. It spreads and multiplies rapidly as it invades into the uterus wall preparing a place where the embryo can attach itself for maternal protection and nourishment. The

⁶²⁴ “The Solution of the Cancer Problem” (m.s., 1962) p. 31.

⁶²⁵ Dr. Dean Burk, in a letter to Congressman Lou Frey, Jr., on May 30, 1972, stated that he had been contacted by at least 750 persons, “including many M.D. physicians,” most of whom were “using it merely with prevention of development of cancer in view.” See *Cancer Control Journal*, May/June, 1973, p. 1.

⁶²⁶ Sometimes referred to as the Unitarian thesis of cancer on the basis that all cancers are, fundamentally, the same.

trophoblast is formed as a result of a chain reaction starting with another cell identified as the diploid totipotent.⁶²⁷ For our purposes, let us call this simply the “total-life” cell because it contains within it all the separate characteristics of the complete organism and has the total capacity to evolve into any organ or tissue or, for that matter, into the complete embryo itself. About eighty percent of these total-life cells are located in the ovaries or testes serving as a genetic reservoir for future offspring. The rest of them are distributed elsewhere in the body for a purpose not yet fully understood but which may involve the regenerative or healing process of damaged or aging tissue. The hormone estrogen is well known for its ability to effect changes in living tissue. Although it is generally thought of as a female hormone, it is found in both sexes and performs many vital functions. Wherever the body is damaged, either by physical trauma, chemical action, or illness, estrogen and other steroid hormones always appear in great concentration, possibly serving as stimulators or catalysts for cellular growth and body repair. It is now known that the total-life cell is triggered into producing trophoblast when it comes into contact with these steroid hormones acting as “organizer stimuli.” When this happens to those total-life cells that have evolved from the fertilized egg, the result is a placenta and umbilical cord, a means of nourishing the embryo. But when it occurs non-sexually as a part of the general healing process, the result is cancer. To be more accurate, we should say that it is cancer if the healing process is not terminated upon completion of its task. Hardin B. Jones, Ph.D., in his highly revealing “A Report on Cancer,”⁶²⁸ touched upon this phenomenon as follows:

“A second important consideration about cancer is that all forms of overt cancer are associated with a random chance of survival which does not lessen with the duration of cancer. This strongly implies that there is some natural physiological restraint against progress of the disease and that the cause of the commonly observed rapid development of cancer in the terminal stages is the failure of the natural restraining influence.”

We shall see shortly why this natural restraining influence on the healing process should fail but, for now, at the risk of greatly over-simplifying the process, we may say that cancer is the result of over-healing. That is why it has been said that smoking, or excessive exposure to the sun, or any number of harmful chemicals seem to cause cancer. Anything that causes damage to the body can lead to cancer if the body’s healing processes are not functioning properly—as we shall see. Dr. Stewart M. Jones of Palo Alto, California, described the process this way:

“Whenever a trophoblast cell appears in the body outside of pregnancy, the natural forces that control it in a normal pregnancy may be absent and, in this case, it begins uncontrolled proliferation, invasion, extension, and metastasis. When this happens, it is initiated by an organizer

⁶²⁷ There is no need to go into all the details surrounding the formation of these cells, for they only tend to burden us with facts that are not essential to an understanding of the basic theory. Anyone interested in this background can readily obtain it at the public library from any standard reference book on embryology. Of particular value are John Beard’s *The Enzyme Treatment of Cancer and its scientific Basis* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1911) and Charles Gurchot’s *The Biology of Cancer* (San Francisco: Friedman, 1948).

⁶²⁸ Paper delivered before the American Cancer Society’s Eleventh Annual Science Writer’s Conference, New Orleans, March 7, 1969.

substance, usually estrogen, the presence of which further promotes the trophoblast activity. This is the beginning of cancer.”⁶²⁹

If it is true that the trophoblast cell is brought into being by a chain reaction which involves estrogen or other steroid hormones, then it would follow logically that an unnaturally high exposure to these substances would be a factor that favored the onset of cancer. And, indeed, this has been proven to be true. The use of diethylstilbestrol as a fattening agent for cattle was halted in 1972 because it was proven that this synthetic estrogen compound, which was present in trace amounts in the beef at our grocery stores, had caused stomach cancer in experimental rats. It also has been found that women taking contraceptive pills—especially those containing estrogen—not only undergo irreversible breast changes, but become almost three times more cancer-prone than women who do not. This fact was stressed by Dr. Otto Sartorius, Director of the Cancer Control Clinic at Santa Barbara General Hospital in California, who then added:

“Estrogen is the fodder on which carcinoma [cancer] grows. To produce cancer in lower animals, you first introduce an estrogen base.”⁶³⁰

In order to counteract the estrogenic action on the trophoblast, the body floods the areas of the trophoblast in a sea of beta-glucuronidase (BG) which inactivates all estrogen on contact. At the same time the cells of the tissues being invaded by the trophoblasts defensively multiply in an effort at local containment. Usually the efforts of the body to control the nidus of trophoblast are successful, the trophoblast dies, and a benign polyp or other benign tumor remains as a monument to the victory of the body over cancer.⁶³¹

Under microscopic examination, many of these tumors are found to resemble a mixture or hybrid of both trophoblast and surrounding cells; a fact which has led some researchers to the premature conclusion that there are many different types of cancer. But the degree to which tumors appear to be different is the same degree to which they are benign; which means that it is the degree to which there are non-cancerous cells within it. The greater the malignancy, the more these tumors begin to resemble each other, and the more clearly they begin to take on the classic characteristics of pregnancy trophoblast. And the most malignant of all cancers—the chorionepitheliomas are almost indistinguishable from trophoblast cells. For, as Dr. Beard pointed out almost a century ago, they are one and the same.

An interesting sidelight to these facts is that trophoblast cells produce a distinct hormone that readily can be detected in the urine. This is known as the chorionic gonadotrophic hormone (CGH).⁶³² If cancer is trophoblast, then one would expect that cancer cells also would secrete this hormone. And, indeed, they do. It is also true that

⁶²⁹ "Nutrition Rudiments in Cancer," S.M. Jones, M.S., B.A., Ph.D., M.D., (Palo Alto, California., 1972) p. 6.

⁶³⁰ As quoted in "Birth Control Pills Endanger Your Breasts," by Ida Honorof, Prevention, July 1972, p. 89. Also see "Pill Linked to Cancer Risk," L.A. Times, Nov. 21, 1972, p.A-21.

⁶³¹ Ibid., p. 7.

⁶³² In human biology, it is sometimes referred to as the HCG (human chorionic gonadotrophic) hormone.

no other cell is known to produce CGH.⁶³³ This means that, if CGH is detected in the urine, it indicates that there is present either normal pregnancy trophoblast or abnormal malignant cancer. If the patient is a woman, she either is pregnant or has cancer. If he is a man, cancer can be the only cause. The significance of this fact is far-reaching. A CGH urine test for pregnancy can detect the presence of cancer long before it manifests itself as illness or a lump, and it throws serious doubt upon the rationale behind surgical biopsies. Many physicians are convinced that any cutting into a malignant tumor, even for a biopsy, increases the likelihood that the tumor will spread. In any event, there is questionable need for such procedures in view of the fact that CGH urine tests are available.

Let us turn now to the question of defense mechanisms. Before we can hope to conquer cancer, first we must understand how nature conquers cancer—how nature protects the body and controls the growth of trophoblast cells. One would suppose that this would be the primary question that determines the direction of cancer research today. Unfortunately, it is not. Most research projects are preoccupied with exotic and toxic drugs or machines that deliver death rays to selected parts of the body. There is no counterpart for any of this in nature, and it is small wonder that progress has been disappointing. But, recently, a small group of researchers has begun to look back to nature, and, if they persist in this course, they cannot help but succeed eventually. The most promising of all this work lies in the study of the body's natural mechanism for immunity.

All animals contain billions of white blood cells. There are different types such as lymphocytes, leukocytes, and monocytes, but they all serve the same function which is to attack and destroy anything that is foreign and harmful to our bodies. Persons who develop a low white-cell blood count become susceptible to infections of all kinds and, in fact, if the condition is sufficiently severe, they can die from a simple infected cut or a common cold. Since the destruction of foreign bodies is the function of the white cells, it would seem logical, therefore, that they would attack cancer cells also. As one medical journal stated the problem:

“One crucial property our bodies have is the ability to distinguish between self and non-self. In other words, we can recognize (biologically) foreign material that finds its way into our bodies. This ability enables us to fight infections and to build up resistance to future infection. It also means that organ transplantation is not just a simple matter of intricate surgery. As far as the body's defense systems—the immunological apparatus—are concerned, bacteria, viruses, and transplanted organs are all foreign invaders and have to be repelled. What has puzzled immunologists for a very long time is that, although cancer cells are undoubtedly foreign, they seem to escape the lethal attentions of immunological systems. The crucial question is, how?”⁶³⁴

In this otherwise excellent article, we find one of the great false assumptions that plagues almost all orthodox cancer research today: the assumption that cancer cells are foreign to the body. Quite to the contrary, they are a vital part of the life cycle (pregnancy and healing). Consequently, nature has provided them with an effective

⁶³³ A similar substance is produced in the anterior pituitary gland, but it is not the same.

⁶³⁴ “New Assaults on Cancer,” by Roger Lewin, *World of Research*, Jan. 13, 1973, p. 32.

means of avoiding the white blood cells. One of the characteristics of the trophoblast is that it is surrounded by a thin protein coating that carries a negative electrostatic charge. In technical terms this is called the pericellular sialomucin coat. The white blood cells also carry a negative charge. And, since like polarities repel each other, the trophoblast is well protected. The blocking factor is nothing more than a cellular electrostatic field. Commenting on the significance of these facts, Dr. Krebs wrote:

“For three-quarters of a century classical immunology has, in effect, been pounding its head against a stone wall in the vain quest for “cancer antigens,” the production of cancer antibodies, etc., etc. The cancer or trophoblast cell is non-antigenic because of the pericellular sialomucin coat.”⁶³⁵

Part of nature’s solution to this problem, as pointed out by Professor Beard in 1905, is found in the ten or more pancreatic enzymes, of which trypsin and chymotrypsin are especially important in trophoblast destruction. These enzymes exist in their inactive form (as zymogens) in the pancreas gland. Only after they reach the small intestine are they converted to their active form. When these are absorbed into the blood stream and reach the trophoblast, they digest the negatively-charged protein coat. The cancer then is exposed to the attack of the white cells and it dies.^{636 637}

Soon after Beard advanced his startling theory, physicians began experimenting with pancreatic enzymes in the treatment of cancer, and favorable reports began to appear in the medical journals of the day. In 1906, Frederick Wiggins, M.D. described his success in a case of cancer of the tongue and concluded with a hope “that further discussion of and clinical experience with Trypsin and Amylopsin within a reasonable time will demonstrate beyond question that we have at our disposal a sure and efficient remedy for the treatment of malignant disease.”⁶³⁸

Between November, 1906 and January, 1907, the medical journals carried this and three additional reports of cancer successfully treated by pancreatic enzymes.

⁶³⁵ Letter from Dr. Krebs to Andrew McNaughton, the McNaughton Foundation, San Francisco, Calif., dated Aug. 2, 1971.

⁶³⁶ The operation of this mechanism is considerably more complex than this simplified description would indicate, and there is much that is not yet fully understood. For instance, investigators have not yet solved the puzzle of how pregnancy trophoblast cells are protected from chymotrypsin during the initial phase of pregnancy. Obviously they have some kind of extra blocking or that non-pregnancy trophoblast cells do not enjoy. It is possible that it is an increased local level of cobalamin that converts the hydrocyanic acid into thiocyanate (vitamin B12), plus a temporarily high level of rhodanese (protecting enzyme). But this is not at all certain, and it represents an interesting area for future research.

⁶³⁷ In most discussions of this subject, it is assumed that the lymphocytes are the most active counterpart of all the various white blood cells. But opinions on this currently have been in a state of flux. In one study, for example, it was reported that the real aggressor was the monocyte. Although monocytes compose only two or three percent of the total, they were found to be far more destructive of cancer tissue than the lymphocytes which were more numerous. Either way, the end result is the same, see also, “Cancer killing Cells Found to Eat Tumors,” by Harry Nelson, Times Medical writer, LA. Times, April 4, 1973, p. 32.

⁶³⁸ Wiggins, F.H., “Case of Multiple Fibrosarcoma of the Tongue, with Remarks on the Use of Trypsin and Amylopsin in the Treatment of Malignant Disease,” Am. Med. Assoc, December 15, 1906; 47:2003–8.

Regarding the subject of pancreatic enzymes, we find that the trophoblast cells in the normal embryo continue to grow and spread right up to the eighth week. Then suddenly, with no apparent reason, they stop growing and are destroyed. Dr. Beard had the general answer to why this happens as long ago as 1905. But later research provided the specific explanation. It is in the eighth week that the baby's pancreas begins to function. It is significant that the small intestine, near the point where the pancreas empties into it, is one of the few places in the human body where cancer is almost never found. The pancreas itself often is involved with primary malignancy, but this is because the all-important enzymes do not become activated until they leave the pancreas and enter the intestines, or the blood stream. Thus, the small intestine is bathed in these substances, whereas the pancreas itself may receive very little. As one clinician has observed:

“One of the most striking features about the pathology of malignant disease is the almost complete absence of carcinoma [cancer] in the duodenum [first segment of the small intestine] and its increasing frequency throughout the gastrointestinal tract in direct proportion to the distance from this exempt segment.” We note, also, that diabetics—those who suffer from a pancreas malfunction—are three times more likely to contract cancer than non-diabetics.”⁶³⁹

These facts, which have puzzled medical investigators for years, at last can be explained in light of the trophoblast thesis of cancer. This thesis, as Dr. Krebs has asserted, “is not a dogma inflexibly held by its proponents; it is merely the only explanation that finds total congruence with all established facts on cancer.” To which Dr. Stewart M. Jones adds:

“This theory is the oldest, strongest, and most plausible theory of cancer now extant. It has stood the test of seventy years of confrontation with new information about cancer without ever being disproved by any new fact...The voluminous, heterogeneous science of cancer developed since then is coherent only in the light of this theory.”⁶⁴⁰

It is the height of restraint to call this a theory. There comes a time when we must admit that truth is truth and that the search is over. That finally happened on October 15, 1995, in the pages of an orthodox medical journal—93 years after Professor Beard published the theory and 43 years after Dr. Krebs shouted it from the housetops. It was the report of a study at the Allegheny Medical College in Pittsburgh by Doctors Acevedo, Tong, and Hartsock. The study, involving the genetic characteristics of human chorionic gonadotrophin hormone, confirmed that cancer and trophoblast were the same. The report concluded: “After 93 years, Beard has been proven to be conceptually correct.”⁶⁴¹

⁶³⁹ Raab, W.-.Klin. Wchnschr. 14:1633, quoted in Laetriles/Nitrilosides, op. cit., p. 35.; see also, Jones, Nutrition Rudiments in Cancer, op. cit, p. 8.

⁶⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 1, 6.

⁶⁴¹ “Human Chorionic Gonadotropin-Beta Subunit Gene Expression in Cultured Human Fetal and Cancer Cells of Different Types and Origins,” by Herman F. Acevedo, Ph.D., Jennifer Y. Tong, Ph.D., and Robert J. Hartsock, M.D., Cancer, October 15, 1995, Volume 76, No. 8, pp. 1467-1473.

The debate, however, will continue. For many, the search is more exciting (and more profitable) than the discovery. So they will continue to clutter their minds and laboratories with dead-end theories and projects for as long as the money holds out. But the truth is both startling and simple. While most researchers are operating on the assumption that cancer is foreign to the body and part of a process of death and decay, it is, instead, a vital part of the life cycle and an expression of the onrush of both life and healing.

How B-17 Works

As demonstrated above, cancer can be thought of as a kind of over-healing process in which the body produces trophoblast cells as a part of its attempt to overcome specific damage to or aging of normal tissue. These trophoblast cells are protected by an electrostatically charged protein coat. But in the presence of sufficient quantities of the pancreatic enzymes, this protective coating is digested away, exposing the trophoblast to the destructive force of the body's white blood cells. Thus, nature has assigned to the pancreas the vital job of preventing cancer by keeping trophoblast cells under control.

Working within the context of this theory, and encouraged by Dr. Charles Gurchot, a professor of pharmacology at the University of California Medical School, Dr. Krebs began a search for the nutritional factor hinted at by Beard. By 1950 he had identified the specific composition of this substance, had isolated it into crystalline form, had given it the name Laetrile,⁶⁴² and had tested it on animals to make sure it was not toxic. The next step was to prove that it was not harmful to humans. There was only one way to do that. So he rolled up his sleeve and injected it into his own bloodstream. Just as he had predicted, there were absolutely no harmful or distressing side effects. He was now ready for the final state of experiments—cancer patients themselves.

The B17 molecule contains two units of glucose (sugar), one of benzaldehyde, and one of cyanide, all tightly locked together within it. As everyone knows, cyanide can be highly toxic and even fatal if taken in sufficient quantity. However, locked as it is in this natural state, it is chemically inert and has absolutely no effect on living tissue. By way of analogy, chlorine gas also is known to be deadly. But when the chlorine is chemically bound together with sodium forming sodium chloride, it is a relatively harmless compound known as common table salt. There is only one substance that can unlock the B17 molecule and release the cyanide. That substance is an enzyme called beta-glucosidase, which we shall call the "unlocking enzyme."⁶⁴³

When B17 comes in contact with this enzyme in the presence of water, not only is the cyanide released, but also the benzaldehyde, which is highly toxic by itself. In fact, these two substances working together are at least a hundred times more poisonous than either of them separately; a phenomenon known in biochemistry as synergism. Fortunately, the unlocking enzyme is not found to any dangerous degree anywhere in the body except at the cancer cell, where it always is present in great quantity,

⁶⁴² The material was derived from apricot kernels. Because it was levorotatory (left-handed) to polarized light, and because chemically it was a "Mandelo-nitrile," the first and last syllables were united to produce the word Laetrile.

⁶⁴³ This is a generic term applied to a category of enzymes. The specific one that appears to unlock the synthesized B17 known as Laetrile is beta-glucuronidase.

sometimes at levels in excess of one-hundred times that of the surrounding normal cells. The result is that vitamin B17 is unlocked at the cancer cell, releases its poisons to the cancer cell, and only to the cancer cell.⁶⁴⁴ There is another important enzyme called rhodanese, which we shall identify as the “protecting enzyme.”⁶⁴⁵

The reason is that it has the ability to neutralize cyanide by converting it instantly into by-products that actually are beneficial and essential to health. This enzyme is found in great quantities in every part of the body except the cancer cell which, consequently, is not protected.

Let us examine what, at first, may appear to be exceptions to these rules. We have said that the unlocking enzyme is not found to any dangerous degree anywhere in the body except at the cancer cell. That is true, but note the phrase “to any dangerous degree.” The unlocking enzyme actually is found in various concentrations everywhere in the human body. It is particularly prevalent in the healthy spleen, liver, and endocrine organs. In all of these instances, however, there also is present an even greater quantity of the protecting enzyme (rhodanese). The healthy tissue is protected, therefore, because the excess of this protecting enzyme completely neutralizes the effect of the unlocking enzyme. The malignant cell, by comparison, not only has a greater concentration of the unlocking enzyme than found in most normal cells but it is totally lacking in the protecting enzyme. Thus, it is singularly vulnerable to the release of cyanide and benzaldehyde. The non-cancerous organs, therefore, are endowed by nature with the unique capacity of protecting themselves and even nourishing the digestion of the B17 molecule whereas cancerous tissue converts the same vitamin substance into powerful toxins against which it has no defense.

It is no longer a speculation but a fact supported by a mountain of evidence that vitamin B17 is a vital part of an amazing biochemical process that destroys cancer cells while, at the same time, nourishing and sustaining non-cancer cells. Every person possesses trophoblast cells as a result of the continuing and normal regeneration process. These, however, are held in check by a metabolic barrier consisting of the pancreatic enzyme chymotrypsin and the nitriloside food factor vitamin B17. This barrier is an intricate and perfect mechanism of nature that simply could not have been accidental.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, there is much speculation today about carcinogens—the things that supposedly cause cancer. We are told that smoking, or extensive exposure to the Sun, or chemical additives to our food, or even certain viruses all can cause cancer. But, as we have seen, the real cause is an enzyme and vitamin deficiency. These other things merely are the specific triggers that start the process. Anything that produces prolonged stress or damage to the body can trigger the healing process. If this goes unchecked because the body lacks the necessary chemical ingredients to restore the equilibrium, then the result is cancer. Specific

⁶⁴⁴ In passing, it is interesting to note that nature has used this same synergism in a defense mechanism for the poisonous millipede found in Louisiana and Mississippi. The creature is equipped with paired glands located on eleven of its segments. When threatened, it ejects cyanide and benzaldehyde from these glands with a deadly effectiveness that is well known. See “Secretion of Benzaldehyde and Hydrogen Cyanide by the Millipede *Pachydesmus Crassicutis*,” *Science*, 138; 513, 1962.

⁶⁴⁵ Since about 1965, rhodanese has been identified in technical literature as thiosulfate transulfurase.

carcinogens, therefore, like cigarette smoke or viruses, do not cause cancer; they merely determine where it is going to occur. Nature's defenses against cancer include more than just the pancreatic enzymes and vitamin B17.

Nature, fortunately, has provided a metabolic barrier—a complex mechanism to limit and control the growth of these trophoblast cells. Many factors are involved, but the most direct-acting of them appear to be the pancreatic enzymes and the food factor known as a nitriloside or vitamin B17, a unique compound that destroys cancer cells while nourishing and sustaining all others. The answer to cancer, therefore, is to avoid excessive damage or stress to the body, to minimize foods that preempt the pancreatic enzymes for their digestion, and to maintain a diet rich in all minerals and vitamins—especially vitamin B17.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Wilfrid Shute (the world-famous champion of vitamin E therapy for heart patients) reported that, for some reason unknown to him, patients who were on massive doses of E did not appear to contract cancer as often as other patients. Nobel Prize winner Dr. Linus Pauling has suggested that vitamin C might also have value as an anti-cancer agent. Dr. Umberto Saffiotti of the National Cancer institute has blocked lung cancer in mice with vitamin A.⁶⁴⁶ And, as reported in the October, 1971, issue of Biomedical News, massive oral doses of the vitamin-B complex reduced the growth of cancer in experimental mice by as much as seventy percent. It is plain to see that there is much yet to be learned, and no one claims that vitamin B17 is the whole answer.

In addition to hyperthermy and vitamins A, B, C, and E, it is probable that an important role is played by other enzymes, other vitamins, and even pH levels. Vitamin B17 seems to be the most vital and direct-acting of all these factors, but none of them can be ignored, for they are an interlocking part of the total natural mechanism. Fortunately, it is not necessary for man to fully understand every aspect of this mechanism in order to make it work for him. The necessity of eating foods rich in all the vitamins and minerals—particularly vitamin B17—and of minimizing prolonged damage or stress to the body is all that he really needs to know.⁶⁴⁷

The Safety of Vitamin B-17 and Laetrile

Vitamin B-17 is as "harmless as any substance can be" to non-cancerous cells. For example, even life essential water or oxygen can be fatal if taken in unnaturally large doses, and this is true also of Vitamin B-17. For example, a man in California is claimed to have died from eating almost a cup of appleseeds (although the case has never been authenticated), but if he had eaten the apples also, he would have obtained enough extra Rhodanese from the whole fruit to offset the effect of that many seeds in his stomach, but that would have required that he eat several cases of apples which of course would have been impossible in the first place. **Nature can do only so much and it cannot anticipate excess of this kind, therefore it is wise to follow the simple rule that one should not eat at one time more seeds than he likely would consume if he was eating a reasonable quantity of the whole fruit. This is a commonsense rule with a large safety margin that can be followed with complete**

⁶⁴⁶ "Is There An Anti-Cancer Food?" by Gena Larsen, Prevention, April, 1972.

⁶⁴⁷ An excellent guide to the preparation of foods rich in vitamin B17 is June de Spain's The Little Cyanide Cookbook (Westlake Village, CA: American Media, 1975).

confidence.

When it comes to the laboratory forms of Vitamin B-17 known as Amygdalin or Laetrile, there is even less cause for concern. For over one hundred years, standard pharmacology reference books have described this substance as “non-toxic.” After a century of use in all parts of the world, there never has been single reported case of related death or even serious illness. In one series of tests, white rats were fed seventy times the normal human dose of Laetrile, and the only side effects produced were greater appetite, weight gain, and superior health, just what one would expect from taking a vitamin. Aspirin tablets are twenty times more toxic than the equivalent amount of Laetrile, and in fact Dr. Burk of the National Cancer Institute has demonstrated that Laetrile is even less toxic than sugar.

Deception of Sloan-Kettering

For five years, between 1972 and 1977, Laetrile was meticulously tested at Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center in Manhattan under the direction of Dr. Kanematsu Sugiura. As the senior laboratory researcher there, with over 60 years of experience, Dr. Sugiura had earned the highest respect for his knowledge and integrity. In a science laboratory, where truth is sought to the exclusion of all else, he would have been the perfect man for this test. For the purposes of Sloan-Kettering, however, he was the worst possible choice. Sugiura broke his experiments down into a series of tests using different types of laboratory animals and different tumors: some transplanted and some naturally occurring. At the conclusion of his experiment, he reported five results: (1) Laetrile stopped metastasis (the spreading of cancer) in mice, (2) it improved their general health, (3) it inhibited the growth of small tumors, (4) it provided relief from pain, and (5) it acted as a cancer prevention. The official report stated:

"The results clearly show that Amygdalin significantly inhibits the appearance of lung metastasis in mice bearing spontaneous mammary tumors and increases significantly the inhibition of the growth of the primary tumors...Laetrile also seemed to prevent slightly the appearance of new tumors...The improvement of health and appearance of the treated animals in comparison to controls is always a common observation...Dr. Sugiura has never observed complete regression of these tumors in all his cosmic experience with other chemotherapeutic agents."⁶⁴⁸

The reader is advised to go back and read that last section again for, as we shall see, just a few months later, spokesmen for Sloan-Kettering were flatly denying that there was any evidence that Laetrile had any value. To fully appreciate what happened next, a little background is in order.

The board of directors at Sloan-Kettering is virtually controlled by corporate executives representing the financial interests of pharmaceutical companies. Most of that control is held by the Rockefeller dynasty and their cartel partners. At the time of the Sugiura tests, there were three Rockefellers sitting on the board (James, Laurance, and William) plus more than a dozen men whose companies were within the Rockefeller financial orbit. The history of how the Rockefellers became involved in the pharmaceutical

⁶⁴⁸ "Summary of the Effect of Amygdalin Upon Spontaneous Mammary Tumors in mice", Sloane Kettering report, June 13, 1973

industry is contained in Chapter VIII and IX of this document. But, to appreciate how that effects this part of the story, we must know that John D. Rockefeller, Sr., and his son, J.D., II, began donating to Sloan-Kettering Memorial Hospital in 1927. They also gave a full block of land on which the new hospital was built in the 1930s. Nothing was given without something to be received. In this case, was control over one of the great medical centers of the world. How that happened was described by Ralph Moss, former Assistant Director of Public Affairs at Sloan-Kettering. Speaking of the expansion of Sloan-Kettering after World War II, Moss wrote:

“The composition of the board of trustees at that time reveals a kind of balance of power, with the Rockefellers and their allies in overall control, but with those representing the Morgan interests assuming many positions of power...From this period forward the world’s largest private cancer center was ruled by what looks like a consortium of Wall Street’s top banks and corporations. By the mid-1960s, the MSKCC board had begun to take on a rather uniform appearance. What stood out was that many of its leading members were individuals whose corporations stood to lose or gain a great deal of money, depending on the outcome of the “cancer war.”⁶⁴⁹

With this background in mind, it should come as no surprise to learn that Sugiura’s findings did not please his employer. What goes on inside the laboratories is generally of little interest to board members. It is assumed that, whatever it is, it will result in a new patented drug that will keep the cash flow moving in their direction. They were slow to pick up on the implications of Sugiura’s work but, when they did, all hell broke loose in the board room. If a cure for cancer were to be found in an extract from the lowly apricot seed, it would be a terrible economic blow to the cancer-drug industry. Never before had Sugiura’s work been questioned. In 1962, more than 200 of his scientific papers were published in a four-volume set. The introduction was written by Dr. C. Chester Stock, the man in charge of Sloan-Kettering’s laboratory-testing division. Dr. Stock wrote:

"Few, if any, names in cancer research are as widely known as Kanematsu Sugiura’s. Possibly the high regard in which his work is held is best characterized by a comment made to me by a visiting investigator in cancer research from Russia. He said, “When Dr. Sugiura publishes, we know we don’t have to repeat the study, for we would obtain the same results he has reported.”

All that was forgotten now that Sugiura’s findings were threatening the cash flow. The same Dr. Stock who wrote those words (and whom had also suppressed the therapeutic value of ESSIAC) was now a Sloan-Kettering vice-president and part of the pack howling for a whole new series of tests. Sugiura had to be proven wrong!

As it turned out, several others had already duplicated Sugiura’s experiments and had obtained essentially the same positive results. One was Dr. Elizabeth Stockert and another was Dr. Lloyd Schloen. Both were biochemists at Sloan-Kettering when they did the work. Schloen had gone so far as to add proteolytic enzymes to the injections—as is commonly done by Laetrile doctors—and reported a 100% cure rate among his Swiss albino mice! That was not the result they wanted. In fact, it was down-right

⁶⁴⁹ Ralph Moss, *The Cancer Syndrome* (New York: Grove Press, 1980), p. 258.

embarrassing. It would have been nice if they could simply dump these reports into the memory hole and then claim that they never existed. But it was too late for that. They were already in the public record, and too many people knew the facts.

It was now time to bury all of these findings under a mountain of contrary reports and statistics. Even the sweetest smelling rose will be ignored in a heap of garbage.⁶⁵⁰

The easiest thing in the world to accomplish is failure. It is not difficult to fail to make Laetrile work. All that is necessary is to make a few changes in protocol, lower the dose, switch the source of material, change the criteria for evaluation, bungle the procedure, and, if necessary, lie. All of these stratagems were used to discredit Sugiura's findings.

For those who cannot believe that scientists would lie about such important matters, it should be remembered that, in 1974, Sloan-Kettering was the scene of one of the greatest scientific scandals of the century. Dr. William Summerlin, one of the top-ranking researchers there, claimed to have found a way to prevent transplanted tissue from being rejected by the recipient. To prove his case, he displayed white mice with square black patches of fur, claiming that the skin grafts from black mice were now accepted by the white mice. Not so. He had created the black patches with a marker pen.⁶⁵¹

If success can be falsified, so can failure. Dr. Daniel S. Martin at the Catholic Medical Center in Queens, New York, had previously failed to obtain positive results with Laetrile, but had not used the same protocol as Sugiura. To overcome this Problem, Sugiura was asked to participate in a second series of tests by Martin, which he did. This time, however, the results were in favor of Laetrile. By visual examination, there were twice as many new tumors in mice that did not receive Laetrile than in those that did. The next step in the Sugiura protocol would have been to use a microscope to examine the lung tissue (which is where the cancer had been located) to measure the extent of tumor growth at the end of the experiment. Martin, however, refused to accept either visual or microscope examination and insisted instead that a process be used called bioassay. In bioassay, the mouse's lung tissue was shredded and then injected into two other mice. If cancer developed in either of them, it was assumed that the injected tissue was cancerous. This cleared away all the variances between great improvement, small improvement, or no improvement at all. No matter how much the cancer might have been weakened, no matter that it might be in the process of being destroyed altogether by Laetrile, so long as there were any cancer cells left for transfer to the living mice, it was called a failure. Since the original mice were sacrificed before the Laetrile had a long-term chance to do its work, it was assured that virtually all of them, no matter how improved they may be, would still have at least some cancer cells. Therefore, they all would be classified as failures for Laetrile. By this method, Dr. Martin was able to announce with a straight face that there was no difference between

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 139.

⁶⁵¹ See Joseph Hixon, *The Patchwork Mouse; Politics and Intrigue in the Campaign to Conquer Cancer* (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976)

the treated and the control animals.⁶⁵² Once again, science had been used to conceal the truth.

By this time, a group of employees at Sloan-Kettering became angered over the way their top management was attempting to cover up Sugiura's findings. They began to circulate a series of open letters to the public under the name Second Opinion. The identities of the authors were not known, but it was obvious from the data they released that they were well connected within the organization. Photocopies of important internal memos—even copies of Sugiura's laboratory notes—were sent to Laetrile advocates and to selected members of the press. These broadsides became a source of embarrassment to the administrators who were anxious to close the book on the subject and let it fade from public attention. One of the most outspoken proponents of this view was Benno Schmidt, (CFR member) Sloan-Kettering's Vice Chairman. Schmidt was an investment banker with powerful connections in all the right places. He was a close friend of Laurance Rockefeller, a member of SK's board of managers, and Chairman of President Carter's National Panel of Consultants on the Conquest of Cancer. That is the group that dreamed up the so-called "war on cancer" which turned out to be primarily a means for channeling billions of tax dollars into research centers such as Sloan-Kettering. To Schmidt, the only purpose of testing Laetrile was to convince the public that it doesn't work. Whether it might work or not was unimportant. This reality was brought to light—quite accidentally, no doubt—in an interview with Dr. Martin that appeared in the December 23, 1977, issue of Science. When the reporter asked Martin if the Sloan-Kettering tests were aimed primarily at scientists, he replied: "Nonsense. Of course this was done to help people like [Benno] Schmidt and congressmen answer the laetrilists."

Not to advance science, not to test a possible cancer cure, not to find the truth, but to "answer the laetrilists"! In a statement carried in the August 11, 1975, issue of Medical World News, Schmidt said: "Clinical trials? No way! There's no way, I believe, that they can convince the people at Sloan-Kettering there's any basis for going further." Normally, if the Vice Chairman says there's no way, there's no way. But the furor caused by publication of Second Opinion forced the strategists to keep the book open a little longer and to assume the stance of fairness and open-mindedness. And what could be more fair than another test?

So here we go again. On October 6, less than four weeks after the "no basis for going further" statement, Medical World News carried another story explaining that a new round of trials had been scheduled. It said: "He [Sugiura] will have another chance to check [his] belief, in a collaborative experiment with Dr. Schmid."

Franze A. Schmid was a veterinarian with many years of service with Sloan-Kettering. He also was Sugiura's son-in-law who shared his living quarters in Westchester. Needless to say, that relationship was placed under considerable strain in the following months. Schmid was apparently chosen to co-conduct these tests because of two previous Laetrile tests he performed which produced negative results, or at least that's what the press was told. In truth, in the first test, Schmid had not used microscope examination to evaluate the results, so there was no way to know what the results really were. In the second test, he had been instructed to use a dose of Laetrile that

⁶⁵² Moss, Cancer Syndrome, op. cit., p. 140.

was one-fiftieth the amount used by Sugiura. Naturally, there was no positive effect on tumor shrinkage or metastasis. But, in both cases, the Laetrile-treated mice lived longer than the control mice—a fact that was never reported to the public. No one outside the Institute knew of this until a reporter extracted the information from Dr. Stock a year later.

The new test, conducted jointly by Sugiura and Schmid, solidly confirmed Sugiura's original results. There was less than half as much cancer in the mice receiving Laetrile than in those in the control group. The results were promptly leaked to the press by Second Opinion, and the fallout was not good news for SK's damage-control department. In a feature article in the San Francisco Examiner, reporter Mort Young wrote:

"The mice in Doctor Schmid's test divided this way: 100 percent of the control mice had lung metastases, while of the group given Laetrile, 31 per cent had lung metastases...It is a dramatic reversal of Dr. Schmid's previous tests."⁶⁵³

The casual observer might have concluded that the issue was finally settled. Sugiura was vindicated at last. But the casual observer would have been wrong. There was too much at stake here to simply jump over the net and congratulate the victorious opponent. It was a case of "Damn it all. Let's play another round, and another, and another until the proper side wins." Sloan-Kettering handled its defeat in the only way it could—with total silence. Dr. Schmid was told to say nothing to anyone about his results, and he dutifully complied. Management, on the other hand, responded by scheduling still another test to "clarify" the results of the previous one; the implication being that, somehow, it had been flawed. No one would discuss it.

The next test was to be performed at the Catholic Medical Center and supervised, as before, by Dr. Martin. This time, however, Dr. Sugiura was to be what they call "blinded." Blind testing means that the patients and the people administering the program are not informed who is receiving the real medication and who gets the placebo. That serves a valuable function with humans because, otherwise, the patient might be influenced by a subconscious anticipation of what the results are supposed to be. But in this case, the patients were mice. Apparently, it was feared that Sugiura would handle the Laetrile mice more gently, imparting to their little psyches the anticipation of becoming well. Or perhaps his prior knowledge might translate into telepathic power which would corrupt the judgment of the evaluation team. In any event, only Dr. Martin was to know which mice were being treated—or, for that matter, whether any of them were. Ah, isn't science wonderful?

Apparently half of the mice were being given Laetrile in this test because, after four weeks, Sugiura was able to see which cages contained specimens with fewer and smaller tumors. And they were friskier, too. His guess was eventually confirmed by none other than SK's vice president. Sugiura was jubilant when he told the news to Ralph Moss. "Last Friday," he said, "Dr. Stock told me that I picked the controls and the experimental correctly...That means I don't have to rewrite my progress report."⁶⁵⁴ The

⁶⁵³ "Sloan-Kettering Tests Continue," San Francisco Examiner, Nov. 12, 1975, p. 8.

⁶⁵⁴ Moss, Cancer Syndrome, op. cit., p. 147.

tally at the end of the test showed that the Laetrile-treated mice had less than half the number of tumors as the controls. Once again, Sugiura had been proven correct.

The reaction of Sloan-Kettering management was predictable. They had no choice—considering the nature of the economic forces that control them—but to scrap this test, also, and move on to another one. Dr. Stock told reporters that the experiment had to be terminated because Dr. Sugiura had figured out which mice were being treated. “We lost the blindness aspect of it,” he said. In an interview with Science magazine, he added that the experiment went bad because of clumsy injection procedures.”

According to the official Sloan-Kettering report on Laetrile, released at a much later date, Dr. Martin claims that he did not keep all of the Laetrile mice in the same cages but mixed them together with the control mice. Therefore, Sugiura could not have picked the right cages.⁶⁵⁵ Interesting. That means either (1) Dr. Stock lied when he said the blind had been removed, or (2) Dr. Martin lied when he said the mice were mixed, or the report was in error. Most likely, the report was in error. The authors possibly confused the circumstances with the next series of tests (yes, one more) which, indeed, did mix the mice all together. This was also under the supervision of Dr. Martin and it was also blinded to Sugiura, but it was conducted at Sloan-Kettering where things could be watched more closely. Sugiura warned that mixing the mice was very dangerous, because there would be no dependable way to insure that the lab technicians would always make the correct identification. What would happen if the controls were accidentally given Laetrile instead of saline solution? His warnings were ignored, and the experiment proceeded. Martin was in total control. It is apparent that treating the wrong mice is exactly what happened. The data showed that some of the mice supposedly receiving saline solution had their tumors stop growing 40% of the time! That is impossible. Salt water never before in history stopped tumor growth. Yet, in this test, all of a sudden it is a magic bullet. How did the Laetrile mice fare by comparison? Their tumors were arrested only 27% of the time. The untreated mice did better than the treated ones! At last, they had the results they had been waiting for.

Dr. Sugiura was incensed at the audacity of releasing blatantly impossible statistics. He said:

“There’s something funny here. The small tumors stopped growing 40% of the time in the saline control group and only 27% of the time in the treated group. We people in chemotherapy use saline solution because it does not affect tumor growth. Now this happens. They must not forget to mention that there was more stoppage in the controls than in the treated! I won’t give in to this.”⁶⁵⁶

Dr. Stock was not concerned about the integrity of the data. It supported the desired conclusion and was good enough. His final statement was short and to the point: “Results from the experiment do not confirm the earlier positive findings of Sugiura.” Of course, they didn’t. The experiment was rigged.

⁶⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 147.

⁶⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 148.

Once again, truth was sacrificed on the altar of monetary avarice. The book was finally closed. There would be no more tests. Five months later, on June 15, 1977, a news conference was called at Sloan-Kettering to announce the conclusion of the Laetrile trials. All of the key players were in the room: Dr. Robert Good, Director and President of the Institute; Dr. Lewis Thomas, President of the Center; Dr. C. Chester Stock, vice president; Dr. Daniel Martin, from the Catholic Medical Center; and seven others including Dr. Kanematsu Sugiura who had been invited to attend but not to participate.

Dr. Good began the conference by reading aloud the press release which said that, after exhaustive and carefully controlled testing, "Laetrile was found to possess neither preventive, nor tumor-regressant, nor anti-metastatic, nor curative anti-cancer activity. After he was finished with his statement, the floor was opened to questions.

"Dr. Sugiura," someone shouted out suddenly. "Do you stick by your belief that Laetrile stops the spread of cancer?" The television cameras quickly turned to Sugiura for his reply. A hush fell across the room. Sugiura looked at the reporter and, in a loud, clear voice, said: "I stick!"

The following month, in July of 1977, hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, which was under the chairmanship of Senator Edward Kennedy. The nature of the hearings was made obvious by the title under which they were published, which was "Banning of the Drug Laetrile from Interstate Commerce by FDA." One of the experts to testify was Dr. Lewis Thomas, (CFR member) President of Sloan-Kettering. This is what he said:

"There is not a particle of scientific evidence to suggest that Laetrile possesses any anti-cancer properties at all. I am not aware of any scientific papers, published in any of the world's accredited journals of medical science, presenting data in support of the substance, although there are several papers, one of these recently made public by Sloan-Kettering Institute, reporting the complete absence of anti-cancer properties in a variety of experimental animals."

In the following months, the directors and officers at Sloan-Kettering continued to denigrate Sugiura's findings, claiming that no one else had ever been able to duplicate them. In other words, they lied. Not only did they lie, they did so on a subject that directly effects the lives of hundreds of thousands of cancer victims each year.

Ralph Moss was the Assistant Director of Public Affairs at Sloan-Kettering during most of these events. In fact, he was the one who was required to write the press release claiming that laetrile was ineffective. But Moss was one of the leaders in the Second Opinion underground and had helped to get the truth out to the rest of the world. Finally, in November of 1977, he decided to "surface" and go public. He called a press conference of his own and, before a battery of reporters and cameramen, charged that Sloan-Kettering officials had engineered a massive cover-up. He provided supporting documents and named names. Not surprisingly, Moss was fired the next day. What was the official justification? As he explained it: "I had 'failed to carry out my most basic job responsibilities'—in other words, to collaborate in falsifying evidence."⁶⁵⁷

⁶⁵⁷ Ralph Moss, *The Cancer Industry; Unraveling the Politics* (New York: Paragon House, 1989), p. xi.

The mainstream media soon forgot Moss and the other whistle-blowers, and the public has been spared the trouble of hearing any more about it. In the end, the cancer industry had won. As in all wars, it is the victor who writes the accepted history. What follows is the way our medical historians now explain this episode. It was written by Dr. Arnold S. Reimann, and appeared in the New England Journal of Medicine on January 28, 1982:

"Over the past few years we have devoted a lot of attention to Laetrile. By 1978 it had achieved a certain folk status, celebrated as a kind of anti-establishment natural remedy being suppressed by a venal conspiracy between pharmaceutical manufacturers and physicians. According to the folklore, the conspirators were ignoring evidence of Laetrile's effectiveness and attempting to promote their more orthodox (and more toxic) forms of cancer chemotherapy. There have never been any facts to support this folklore. Laetrile, I believe, has now had its day in court. The evidence, beyond reasonable doubt, is that it doesn't benefit patients...No sensible person will want to advocate its further use, and no state legislature should sanction it any longer."⁶⁵⁸

Dr. Ralph Weilerstein, Public Health Medical Officer of the California Food and Drug Administration has said flatly: "Nobody's come up with any reliable data that it is of any value."⁶⁵⁹ The Federal FDA has proclaimed: "The Food and Drug Administration has seen no competent, scientific evidence that Laetrile is effective for the treatment of cancer."⁶⁶⁰ And the American Cancer Society, in an impressive volume entitled *Unproven Methods of Cancer Management*, has stated:

"After careful study of the literature and other information available to it, the American Cancer Society does not have evidence that treatment with Laetrile results in objective benefit in the treatment of cancer in human beings."⁶⁶¹

Commenting on this statement, Dr. Dean Burk of the National Cancer Institute described it as:

" . . . a statement with close to zero scientific worth, however much sheer propaganda value. The fact is . . . there are few "proven" methods operating on a large scale anywhere, so that the word "unproved," as used by the ACS, is a highly and unjustifiably weighted word."⁶⁶²

As far as the general public is concerned, however, if the American Cancer Society classifies vitamin B17 or Laetrile as an "unproven cancer cure," that's all they need to know. Consequently, official pronouncements from prestigious organizations such as

⁶⁵⁸ "Closing the Books on Laetrile," New England Journal of Medicine, January 28, 1982, p. 236.

⁶⁵⁹ "Food additive ban likely," San Jose Mercury (Calif.), Sept. 9, 1972.

⁶⁶⁰ *A Cancer Journal for Clinicians* (published by ACS) July/Aug., 1972.

⁶⁶¹ *Unproven Methods of Cancer Management*, 1971, p. 139.

⁶⁶² Letter from Dr. Dean Burk to Dr. Frank Rauscher, Director of the National Cancer Institute, dated April 20, 1973, reprinted in the *Cancer Control Journal*, Sept./Oct. 1993, p. 5.

these are hard to ignore. But so are the favorable findings of those clinicians who have used Laetrile on their own patients. Somebody is wrong!

It is necessary, therefore, to examine the evidence that vitamin B17 actually does work in practice just as well as it does in theory. The effectiveness of the trophoblast thesis as a basis of cancer therapy has been demonstrated both in the laboratory and in the clinic. In 1935, for example, long before the development of Laetrile, Dr. Isabella Perry of the Department of Pathology at the University of California Medical School conducted a series of experiments in which she subjected tumor-bearing rats to prolonged inhalation of cyanide fumes. Here is what she wrote:

“A considerable percentage of the animals so treated showed complete regression of the tumor. Both regressing and growing tumors in treated animals had little capacity for transplantation.”⁶⁶³

Perry observed that these experiments were probably of little value to humans because, in order to be effective, the level of cyanide fumes had to be dangerously close to lethal—a problem that is not present when the cyanide is released only at the cancer site as it is in the action of vitamin B17. Nevertheless, these rats showed, not only complete tumor regression, but, compared to the control group without cyanide, an average life extension in excess of three-hundred percent.

When we turn to the laboratory reports on Laetrile, the results are even more encouraging, especially since there is none of the danger connected with the inhalation of cyanide fumes.

Dr. Dean Burk, Director of the Cytochemistry Section of the federal government’s National Cancer Institute, reported that, in a series of tests on animal tissue, the B17 had no harmful effect on normal cells, but released so much cyanide and benzaldehyde when it came in contact with cancer cells that not one of them could survive. He said, “When we add Laetrile to a cancer culture under the microscope, providing the enzyme glucosidase also is present, we can see the cancer cells dying off like flies.”⁶⁶⁴

While participating in the Seventh International Congress of Chemotherapy held in Prague in 1971, Dr. Burk declared:

“Laetrile appears to work against many forms of cancer including lung cancer. And it is absolutely non-toxic...In vitro tests with Ehrlich ascites carcinoma [a particular type of cancer culture] revealed that, where cyanide alone killed one percent of the cells and benzaldehyde alone killed twenty percent, a combination of the two was effective against all the cells. Amygdalin [Laetrile] with glucosidase [the “unlocking enzyme”] added also succeeded in killing 100

⁶⁶³ “The Effects of Prolonged Cyanide Treatment on The Body and Tumor Growth in Rats,” American Journal of Cancer, 1935, 25:592.

⁶⁶⁴ “Laetrile Ban May Be Lifted,” Twin Circle, June 16, 1972, p. 11.

percent of the ascites tumor cells, due to the freeing of the same two chemicals.”⁶⁶⁵

In another series of tests, Dr. Burk reported that Laetrile was responsible for prolonging the life of cancerous rats eighty-percent longer than those in the control group not inoculated.⁶⁶⁶ The man who made these findings was one of the foremost cancer specialists in the world. He was the recipient of the Gerhard Domagk Award for Cancer Research, the Hillebrand Award of the American Chemical Society, and the Commander Knighthood of The Medical Order of Bethlehem (Rome) founded in 1459 by Pope Pius the Eleventh. He held a Ph.D. in biochemistry earned at the University of California. He was a Fellow of the National Research Council at the University of London, of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Biology, and also Harvard. He was senior chemist at the National Cancer Institute, which he helped establish, and in 1946 became Director of the Cytochemistry Section. He belonged to eleven scientific organizations, wrote three books relating to chemotherapy research in cancer, and was author or co-author of more than two-hundred scientific papers in the field of cell chemistry. If Dr. Burk says Laetrile works, it works. Dr. Burk is not a physician. He is a biochemist. His experiments have been with cancer cultures and with laboratory animals, not people.

As we have seen, however, the health records of the Hunzakuts, and Eskimos, and other groups around the world are statistically conclusive that vitamin B17—together with other substances associated with it in nature —does control cancer in human beings. But what about cancer that already has started? Can B17 restore a person to health after he has contracted the disease? The answer is yes, if it is caught in time, and if the patient is not too badly damaged by prior X-ray treatment or toxic drugs. Unfortunately, most cancer victims start taking Laetrile only after their disease is so far advanced that they have been given up as hopeless by routine medical channels. Usually they have been told that they have only a few more months or weeks to live. And it is in this tragic state of near death that they turn to vitamin therapy as a last resort. If they die—and, indeed, many of them do—then they are counted as statistical failures for Laetrile. In reality, it is a victory for Laetrile that any of them should be saved at this stage. Once a deficiency disease has progressed so far, the damage it has done simply cannot be reversed. This is similar to a person dying from a gunshot wound even after the bullet has been removed. Likewise, a person can have his cancer destroyed with Laetrile, but still die from the irreversible damage already done to his vital organs.

This, then, is the background on the so-called scientific evidence that Laetrile is a fraud. Based upon this perversion of truth, laws have been passed making it illegal to prescribe, administer, sell, or distribute Laetrile or to “make any representation that said agents have any value in arresting, alleviating, or curing cancer.”⁶⁶⁷

⁶⁶⁵ “Amygdalin Claimed Nontoxic Anti-Cancer Therapeutic Agent,” *Infectious Diseases*, Oct 15, 1971, pp. 1, 23.

⁶⁶⁶ Testimony in Hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Health and environment, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, quoted in *Cancer News Journal*, July-October, 1972, p. 48.

⁶⁶⁷ See Section 10400.1, Title 17, of the Calif. Administrative Code.

Why would anyone, in or out of government, deliberately falsify the clinical results of past Laetrile experiments and then make it impossible for anyone else to do tests of his own? In spite of Dr. Riemann's smug derision, the answer was dramatically revealed at a high-level meeting which was held at Sloan-Kettering on July 2, 1974. The discussions were very private and candid. We would never have known about it except for the fact that the minutes of the meeting were obtained several years later under the Freedom-of-Information Act by Representative John Kelsey of the Michigan House of Representatives. The minutes showed that, even then, numerous Sloan-Kettering officials were convinced of the effectiveness of Laetrile, although there remained some question about the extent of that effectiveness. Then the minutes read: "Sloan-Kettering is not enthusiastic about studying amygdalin [Laetrile] but would like to study CN [cyanide]-releasing drugs."

That is precisely the reason because amygdalin cannot be patented because it is found in nature. Big money can be made only with patented drugs. Therefore, the cancer industry will never be interested in amygdalin, no matter how effective it may be. Instead, they will seek to create a man-made chemical to imitate the mechanism by which it works. Since the mechanism by which amygdalin works is the selective release of cyanide at the cancer site it is logical that the moguls at Sloan-Kettering were "not enthusiastic about studying amygdalin but would like to study CN-releasing drugs instead."

Returning one more time to the vexing question of why the cancer industry wages war on Laetrile, let us listen to the answer given by the unsinkable Dr. Burk in a letter to the Honorable Robert A. Roe, dated July 3, 1973. He said:

"You may wonder, Congressman Roe, why anyone should go to such pains and mendacity to avoid conceding what happened in the NCI-directed experiment. Such an admission and concession is crucially central. Once any of the FDA-NCI-AMA-ACS hierarchy so much as concedes that Laetrile anti-tumor efficacy was even once observed in NCI experimentation, a permanent crack in bureaucratic armor has taken place that can widen indefinitely by further appropriate experimentation. For this reason, I rather doubt that experimentation . . . will be continued or initiated. On the contrary, efforts probably will be made, as they already have, to "explain away" the already observed positive efficacy by vague and unscientific modalities intended to mislead, along early Watergate lines of corruption...There are now several thousand persons in the United States taking Laetrile daily. M.D.'s by the hundreds are studying or even taking it themselves, and certain hospitals are now undertaking its study. FDA or no FDA, NCI or no NCI, obfuscations or no obfuscations. The day may not be far off when face-saving on the part of the NCI-FDA spokesmen of the type just indicated will have lagged beyond possibility, as is already now the case for some Watergate casualties of Courts and Hearings, as a result of persons placing personal integrity secondary to other considerations."⁶⁶⁸

Now, that takes guts. For a man who is employed by the federal government, especially as head of the Cytochemistry section of the National Cancer Institute, to charge openly

⁶⁶⁸ Letter reprinted in Cancer Control Journal, Sept./Oct., 1973, pp. 8-9.

that his superiors are corrupt —well, such a man is, unfortunately, a rare specimen in Washington. Concluding his testimony on Laetrile before a Congressional committee in 1972, Dr. Burk explained:

"I don't think of myself as a maverick. I am just telling you what I honestly think, and when I think something is true, I am quite willing to say so and let the chips fall where they may...And now, I will get back to my laboratory where truth is distilled."⁶⁶⁹

In addition to Essiac, Hoxsey, and Laetrile, there are a number of other natural cancer treatments that have been developed and used successfully to treat patients in the U.S. and other countries over the last hundred years. Even Congress upheld that viewpoint in the Fitzgerald report in 1953 that determined that twelve other alternative treatments, in addition to Hoxsey, were actively conspired against by organized medicine. Many people have been permanently cured of their cancers from these alternative approaches. A cure means that the cancer never comes back. People lived for 20 or 30 years after treatment without a recurrence of cancer. This is in contrast with the modern medical definition of "cure," which is measured in a five-year period.

Here are brief descriptions of four additional suppressed alternative cancer approaches that have shown great promise:

Burzynski –Dr. Stanislaw Burzynski, a physician in Houston Texas, developed his breakthrough cancer therapy in the 1970s, called Antineoplastons. Antineoplastons are a group of naturally-occurring peptides and amino acid derivatives which control tumor growth, and have been proven in clinical studies on a number of advanced cancer cases to be highly effective and non-toxic responsible for curing some of the most incurable forms of terminal cancer. Various cancer survivors have been documented who chose these medicines instead of surgery, chemotherapy or radiation – with full disclosure of medical records to support their diagnosis and recovery – as well as systematic (non-anecdotal) FDA-supervised clinical trial data comparing Antineoplastons to other available treatments—which is published within the peer-reviewed medical literature. Dr. Burzynski was able to initially produce and administer his discovery without FDA-approval from 1977–1995 because the state of Texas at this time did not require that Texas physicians be required to adhere to Federal law in this situation. Burzynski's ability to successfully treat incurable cancer with such consistency baffled the industry. Ironically, this fact had prompted numerous investigations by the Texas Medical Board, who relentlessly took Dr. Burzynski as high as the state supreme court in their failed attempt to halt his practices. Dr. Burzynski was involved in a battle with FDA for several decades in the attempt to get this treatment approved for cancer treatment. The FDA first tried to remove his medical license. When that failed they began working hard to destroy his clinic by cutting off patients from the treatment that he offered. the FDA also engaged in four Federal Grand Juries spanning over a decade attempting to indict Dr. Burzynski, all of which ended in no finding of fault on his behalf. Finally, Dr. Burzynski was indicted in their 5th Grand Jury in 1995, resulting in two federal trials and two sets of jurors finding him not guilty of any wrongdoing. If convicted, Dr. Burzynski would have faced a maximum of 290 years in a federal prison and \$18.5 million in fines. Dr. Burzynski is

⁶⁶⁹ From Hearings, Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress.

still trying to get his treatments approved by the FDA, but it is currently not approved. It's interesting to note that the US Government has filed twelve patents on the use of Antineoplastons even though Dr. Burzynski already had filed his own patents many years earlier.

Gerson therapy - Many of the health food principles, and the nutritional concepts that we share today have a single father, Dr. Maximilian Gerson. Dr. Gerson was the first medical professional to ever suggest that good health depends primarily on a healthy nutrition. Prior to receiving his doctorate, as a medical student Max Gerson suffered from severe and repeated migraine headaches leaving him essentially unable to function for days. After two years of experimenting Dr Gerson was able to eliminate his migraines completely by eating only certain raw fruits and vegetables. By 1918 word was spreading about the Gerson migraine diet. But on one occasion a patient returned with an observation not only had the migraine been relieved but a skin tuberculosis also disappeared. The astounding news spread like wildfire. In April 1924, famous lung specialist Dr Ferdinand Sauerbruch offered to do a clinical trial with 450 incurable skin tuberculosis patients. At the commencement of the study, Sauerbruch said to Gerson privately that if even one patient showed improvement, he would believe every word of Gerson's treatment. 446 out of 450 patients recovered, over 99 percent. Dr Gerson's fame had spread throughout Europe. The Gerson Therapy aims to achieve a complete detoxification of the body through a series of intestinal washes based on organic coffee and a strict diet of raw vegetables and fruits. Dr Gerson's success at his New York clinic stunned the medical community but also evoked the dark forces within it. Dr Gerson was curing patients with cancer and as a consequence he testified before the United States Senate, on July the first, second and third, 1946 along with five of his recovered cancer patients, and the medical records of 5 more. So stunning was his testimony that on the evening of July the 3rd, 1946 renowned ABC news correspondent Raymond Graham Swing declared on his radio broadcast to the entire United States that for the first time in history there had been discovered a cure for cancer. The public response was overwhelming. Two weeks later Raymond Graham Swing was fired from his position at ABC that he had held for over thirty years. Max Gerson was ostracized from the entire medical community, who labelled him a quack and continuously attacked him and harassed him. After being banned from practicing or publishing in the US, he published his research in German medical journals and saw patients privately in his apartment. Following his death, his daughter Charlotte set up a Gerson clinic in Mexico. His followers have also established Gerson clinics in Germany, Spain and Japan. The Gerson therapy is a cleansing diet. It is based on the premise that a person who has cancer has very high levels of toxins in the body and these need to be removed in order for the cancer to be healed. It uses certain combinations of fruit and vegetable juices, and frequent enemas.

Ketogenic Diet in the treatment of cancer - The ketogenic diet was developed originally as a treatment for children with epilepsy. Over the years, it has proven useful for many other conditions. The ketogenic diet is a high fat, moderate protein, low carbohydrate diet. When it is used as a cancer treatment, it is called a restricted ketogenic diet. The restriction means that the number of calories is limited and the amount of carbohydrate is extremely low. This diet brings about important changes in the ways cells in the body are nourished. Healthy cells can use glucose or ketone bodies as their primary energy source. The primary types of ketones that are used as an energy source are acetoacetic acid, and beta-hydroxybutyric acid. Cancer cells are

unable to use ketones for their energy source. They rely on glucose and glutamine for metabolism. Thus, if they do not have access to glucose, they rapidly begin to die. When a person uses the ketogenic diet, they create a condition where there is a reduced level of glucose in the blood and there are elevated levels of ketone bodies. The result is that the cancer cells are denied their primary energy source (starved) while all the healthy cells in the body are nourished by ketones. Researchers found that the ketogenic diet significantly decreased blood glucose, slowed tumor growth, and increased mean survival time by 56.7% in mice with systemic metastatic cancer. While hyperbaric oxygen therapy by itself did not influence cancer progression, when it was combined with the ketogenic diet, it produced a significant decrease in blood glucose, tumor growth rate, and a 77.9% increase in mean survival time compared to controls. Researchers concluded that this combination of therapies had significant anti-cancer effects and should be further investigated as a potential non-toxic treatment or supplemental treatment for patients with systemic metastatic disease.⁶⁷⁰ Unfortunately, the FDA is trying to restrict the use of hyperbaric oxygen therapy (a treatment with virtually no side effects) in cancer treatment. For a thorough discussion of the scientific literature related to the use of the ketogenic diet in cancer treatment see, *Cancer as a Metabolic Disease*, Thomas N. Seyfried, 2012, John Wiley Sons, Hoboken NJ.

Salvestrols – Salvestrols are a class of natural anti-cancer chemicals found in certain dietary plants and fruits. Unlike other natural compounds and phytochemicals that are categorized as a single chemical type of plant compound, salvestrols are defined on the basis of their mechanism of anti-cancer action. Salvestrols have the extraordinary ability to recognize cancer cells...embed themselves in them...and destroy them. The reason why they are able to kill cancer cells specifically—while leaving normal cells unharmed—is because they're able to discern the presence of an enzyme called CYP1B1 (pronounced "sip one bee one"), which is an intrinsic component of cancer cells, but absent in normal cells. When salvestrols come into contact with the CYP1B1 inside human cancer cells, they become "activated"—and cause the cancer cells to stop growing or die. The anti-cancer effect that this activation process brings about is not caused directly by the plant chemicals themselves, but by their metabolites which the salvestrols generate in the human cancer cells. Two scientists in the UK—Gerry Potter (Professor of Medicinal Chemistry) and Dan Burke (Emeritus Professor of Pharmaceutical Metabolism and former head of the School of Pharmacy)—were in the process of developing synthetic pharmaceutical compounds that kill cancer cells without harming normal cells...when they discovered that there already existed similarly structured compounds naturally present in certain plants and fruits. Professor Potter surmised that this could help explain why certain fruits and vegetables exhibit anti-cancer activity. He coined the term "salvestrols" to describe plant chemicals that are activated by CYP1B1 to kill cancer cells. Potter and Burke compare CYP1B1 to a Trojan Horse inside the cancer cells. When salvestrols are eaten, they infiltrate the unsuspecting cancer cells (which they're able to seek out because of their CYP1B1 enzymes) ...and unleash a stream of chemical agents that are deadly to the cancer cells. The two professors also discovered that foods that should have been rich in salvestrols actually showed low concentrations, or had no salvestrols at all. It was then that they realized that modern agricultural (and horticultural) methods...food production...and food processing were removing salvestrols (and Laetrile) from those

⁶⁷⁰ Poff AM1, Ari C, Seyfried TN, D'Agostino DP.; "The ketogenic diet and hyperbaric oxygen therapy prolong survival in mice with systemic metastatic Cancer," PLoS One. 2013 Jun 5, PMID: 23755243.

foods. **Fungicides, for example, which are sprayed on produce to make it look attractive to consumers, deplete the salvestrol content in the produce. Modern food processing and genetic engineering also depletes salvestrols, as evidenced by the fact that salvestrol content is always higher in unprocessed whole foods. Sulpher and pesticides sprayed on green leafy vegetables also destroy the vegetables high salvestrol content.**

Conclusion

See more of the true story about the cancer industry by watching the fascinating, in-depth and well-researched documentaries: [Second Opinion: Laetrile at Sloan Kettering](#) and [Burzynski: Cancer Cure Cover-up](#) (which you can easily rent and watch online at Amazon.com).

Lastly, If you would like to locate a doctor who is experienced in the use of alternative cancer therapies—you are invited to contact The Cancer Cure Foundation. The Foundation is a non-profit organization created in 1976 for the purpose of research and education in the field of cancer therapy. Cancer Cure Foundation (800) 282-2873 or www.cancure.org.

Appendix B

AN IN-DEPTH LOOK AT VACCINE CORRUPTION

The previous chapters on medicine and cancer document how the pharmaceutical industry has come to be influenced by factors other than simple product development and scientific truth, but it also gives us the answer to an otherwise most perplexing question. That question, often asked at the point of first discovering that natural cancer therapy is the target of organized opposition usually is stated something like this:

“Are you suggesting that people in government, in business, or in medicine could be so base as to place their own financial or political interests above the health and well-being of their fellow citizens? That they actually would stoop so low as to hold back a cure for cancer?”

The answer, in the cold light of cartel history, is obvious. If prominent citizens, highly respected in their communities, can plan and execute global wars; if they can operate slave labor camps and gas ovens for the extermination of innocent human beings; if they can scheme to reap gigantic profits from the war industry of not only their own nation, but of their nation’s enemy as well; then the answer is: “You’d better believe it!”

You probably didn’t hear about it because it was suppressed by the controlled mainstream media, but there is a group of anonymous scientists at the US Centers for Disease Control—they call themselves the Spider Group (Scientists Preserving Integrity, Diligence and Ethics in Research)—that penned a letter to the CDC’s chief of staff, Carmen S. Villar on August 29, 2016, stating:

“We are a group of scientists at CDC that are very concerned about the current state of ethics at our agency. **It appears that our mission is being influenced and shaped by outside parties and rogue interests.** It seems that our mission and Congressional intent for our agency is being circumvented by some of our leaders. What concerns us most, is that it is becoming the norm and not the rare exception....Some senior management officials at CDC are clearly aware and even condone these behaviors. Others see it and turn the other way. Some staff are intimidated and pressed to do things they know are not right....We have representatives from across the agency that witness this unacceptable behavior. It occurs at all levels and in all of our respective units.”

You may not have heard of other researchers and scientists who have blown the lid off internal manipulation of vaccine safety at the CDC, but were quickly suppressed by the controlled mainstream media, such as whistleblower Dr. William Thompson, a long-time researcher at the CDC, who, in August of 2014, confessed in writing to massive fraud. He admitted that, in a 2004 study on the safety of the MMR vaccine, that he co-authored, he and his colleagues literally threw vital sheets of data into a garbage can. The study then gave a free pass to the vaccine, claiming it had no connection to autism—when in fact it did.

The following are excerpts from his statement submitted to congress:

“My name is William Thompson. I am a Senior Scientist with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, where I have worked since 1998.

I regret that my coauthors and I omitted statistically significant information in our 2004 article published in the journal Pediatrics. The omitted data suggested that African American males who received the MMR vaccine before age 36 months were at increased risk for autism. Decisions were made regarding which findings to report after the data were collected, and I believe that the final study protocol was not followed.

My concern has been the decision to omit relevant findings in a particular study for a particular sub group for a particular vaccine. There have always been recognized risks for vaccination and I believe it is the responsibility of the CDC to properly convey the risks associated with receipt of those vaccines.

I will not be answering further questions at this time. I am providing information to Congressman William Posey, and of course will continue to cooperate with Congress. I have also offered to assist with reanalysis of the study data or development of further studies. For the time being, however, I am focused on my job and my family.”

On October 14, 2014, other Scientists, Dr. Brian Hooker and Dr. Andrew Wakefield sent an official and detailed complaint to the CDC and the US Dept. of Health and Human Services that provided additional expose of scientific misconduct in that 2004 CDC study.

The complaint references a phone call on May 24, 2014, between whistleblower Dr. Thompson and Dr. Hooker. The call was recorded.

Dr. Thompson references one aspect of the fraud, a group of children with “isolated autism,” who were at higher risk of developing autism after receiving the MMR vaccine—the true data on these children were intentionally omitted from the study. Dr. Thompson says to Dr. Hooker:

“...the effect [autism] is where you would think it would happen. It is with the kids without other conditions [“isolated autism”]...I’m just looking at this and I’m like ‘Oh my God....**I cannot believe we did what we did...but we did** [bury the data on these children]...**It’s all there...It’s all there. I have handwritten notes.**”

Concerning the overall fraud he committed in the 2004 study, Dr. Thompson states, in another phone conversation with Dr. Hooker,

“I have a boss who’s asking me to lie...Higher ups wanted to do certain things and I went along with it. In terms of command, I was 4 out of 5.”

Thompson named several of those higher ups. They were his co-authors on the 2004 study: Coleen Boyle, Marshalyn Yeargin–Allsop, and Frank Destefano. In other words, those co-authors were among those who wanted Thompson to commit fraud.

This is highly significant, because Destefano and Boyle are not merely researchers. They are also high-ranking executives at the CDC, in the area of vaccine safety—

director of the Immunization Safety Office (Destefano) and director of the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities (Boyle).

As the complaint states, Dr. Thompson wrote a note to the head of the CDC at the time (2004), Julie Gerberding. He was very nervous about a presentation he was due to make at a large Institute of Medicine vaccine–autism meeting.

Dr. Thompson wrote: "I will have to present several problematic results relating to statistical associations between receipt of the MMR vaccine and autism." Thompson was considering blowing the whistle, in public. Gerberding never answered his note. Thompson did not make his presentation.

But we know this. After Gerberding stepped down as head of the CDC in 2009, she went to work for Merck, assuming the position of president of Merck Vaccines. Merck manufactures the MMR vaccine. That was, of course, the vaccine at the center of the whole 2004 fraud at the CDC. The vaccine whose connection to autism was buried.

This 2004 study had originally planned to test the hypothesis that the earlier administration of the measles–mumps–rubella (MMR) shot was linked to an increase in autism rates. This research was prompted by the work of Dr. Wakefield and his colleagues, suggesting a link between autism and MMR shots, and his call for additional research to answer the question. The CDC scientists came up with that plan and recorded it in a document dated September 5, 2001, but did not follow it because of troubling findings among certain groups.

When scientists set out to test a hypothesis they come up with a research plan. That plan is supposed to be followed, and if for some reason it is not, there must be an explanation of why not. It is one of the basic tenets in science. You show everything. You do not conceal data. In the eighteenth century, the attorney William Murray, in a case which sought to outlaw slavery in England stated it succinctly, "Let justice be done, though the heavens may fall." With apologies to William Murray, a research plan in science should come with a similar warning, "Let science be done, though the heavens may fall" (or pharmaceutical company profits be thrown into chaos).

In this particular study, two specific groups were the subject of this concealment: African–American males, and a group the CDC termed "isolated autism" (children with no co–morbid developmental disorder such as mental retardation, cerebral palsy, hearing or vision problems, epilepsy, or birth defect) or what the rest of the honest world would generally call "normally developing children." For the African–American males, this was the increased risk of autism by **earlier administration of the MMR vaccine**:

-- MMR vaccination after 36 months – 1.0 risk of autism. (The rate of autism at that time.)

-- MMR vaccination prior to 36 months – **3.86 fold increase in the risk of autism.**

In the data it was shown that the children at greatest risk in both subgroups were those children vaccinated by 18 months, demonstrating a clear trend that the earlier the MMR vaccination, the higher the risk of autism. The withholding of this information

also impacted those seeking compensation for their vaccine-injured children in the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, or what the rest of the world would call "obstruction of justice." It's like a prosecutor failing to turn over a key piece of evidence which exonerates a murder suspect, then saying nothing when the defendant goes to the electric chair. But in this case, the alleged wrong wasn't against just one individual, but an entire generation of children and their families.

In an email to the Complainants, dated August 11, 2014, Dr. Thompson reaffirmed the dishonesty of the Group's actions, stating,

"I was involved in deceiving millions of tax payers regarding the potential negative side effects of vaccines. I regret what I did."

This is a big story. But the controlled mainstream media, who will report and trumpet flimsy scandals with great enthusiasm, have not only instituted and maintained a total blackout on it, but have worked to suppress the story and discredit the scientists who brought it all to light. We have a Whistleblower at the CDC who is still sitting at the CDC, an awarded scientist, who is being protected by whistleblower status, and the media has said that it is all made up. Equally unbelievable, there is no congressional inquiry despite the fact that copies of the missing pages of research was turned over to members of Congress by Dr. Thompson in 2014.

In fact, on July 29, 2014, US Congressman Bill Posey laid bare the lying of the CDC in the now-famous 2004 study that exonerated the MMR vaccine and claimed it had no connection to autism. "No connection to autism" was the lie. CDC whistleblower Dr. Thompson's statement, which Posey read on the House floor, includes this admission:

"However, because I [Dr. Thompson] assumed it [destroying the documents] was illegal and would violate both FOIA and DOJ requests, I kept hard copies of all documents in my office and I retained all associated computer files. I believe we intentionally withheld controversial findings from the final draft of the Pediatrics paper."

Dr. Thompson has the smoking-gun documents. So does Congressman Posey. Yet, our government leaders choose to ignore it.

This calls into question every single CDC study that claims vaccines are safe

More is at stake here than the danger of the MMR vaccine. The CDC has done hundreds of key studies on vaccine safety. They are all thrown into doubt by Thompson's assertion—quoted by Congressman Bill Posey on the floor of the Congress—that Thompson and his colleagues brought a garbage can into a CDC office and **threw out documents that would have shown the MMR connection to autism.**

This speaks of a massive indifference to human life and safety. And what about the fact that the MMR vaccine is one of the shots that has been mandated, by law, in California, in other states, and in other countries?

The most interesting aspect to this tragedy is the mass media's role in all this. For a major researcher (which Dr. Thompson is) at a major government agency (the CDC), admitting to gross fraud in an area as charged as vaccines, is a blockbuster, a page-

one headline. We aren't talking about somebody coming in from the outside and claiming the CDC is cooking their research books. No, this is a house man, a valued member of the research team, blowing the whistle on himself and his highly placed colleagues, at considerable risk to himself. Understand what we are dealing with here, in terms of public exposure: the author of a peer-reviewed and published study; the author who has worked for many years at the CDC; the author who participated in destruction of vital documents; the author has come forward and admitted his crime and the crime of his colleagues. This kind of confession never happens. But it did happen.

And this is not the first incident of massive vaccine data manipulation and cover-up by the CDC either.

The cover-up of the link between mercury and neurological damage in children

The following is an equally fascinating report by Dr. Russell Blaylock, author, U.S. neurosurgeon, and clinical assistant professor of neurosurgery at the University of Mississippi Medical Center and visiting professor in the biology department at Belhaven College. This report provides just another example of the manipulation of the vaccine industry and CDC behind the scenes. Thimerosal is a mercury solution that is used as a preservative in vaccines, and **there is established evidence of the direct link between mercury and neurological damage in children.**

On June 7–8, 2000 a secret conference was held at the Simpsonwood Conference Center in Norcross, Georgia to discuss a study examining the link between increasing doses of Thimerosal and neurodevelopmental disorders. Attending were 51 scientists, representatives of pharmaceutical vaccine manufacturing companies and a representative of the World Health Organization; the public and the media were unlawfully excluded.⁶⁷¹

The conclusions of this meeting were quite startling, since it confirmed a dose-response link between Thimerosal and neurodevelopmental disorders that held up to rigorous statistical analyses. In their discussion, they make plain why the meeting was held in secret: the conclusions would have destroyed the public's confidence in the vaccine program, and more importantly, their faith in vaccine authorities. When the results of this study were published three years later in the journal Pediatrics, the "problem" had been fixed, in that by adding another set of data from a third HMO, reorganizing the criteria for inclusion and restructuring the patient groupings, a less than statistically significant link was demonstrated.⁶⁷²

This top secret meeting was held to discuss a study done by Dr. Thomas Verstraeten and his co-workers using Vaccine Safety Datalink data as a project collaboration between the CDC's National Immunization Program (NIP) and four HMOs. The study

⁶⁷¹ Russell L. Blaylock, MD, author, U.S. neurosurgeon, a clinical assistant professor of neurosurgery at the University of Mississippi Medical Center and visiting professor in the biology department at Belhaven College. Excerpt from peer reviewed report "The truth behind the vaccine cover-up" The History of The Global Vaccination Program In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports And Studies <http://jprager9.wixsite.com/> p. 725–734

⁶⁷² Ibid.

examined the records of 110,000 children. Within the limits of the data, they did a very thorough study and found the following:

1. “Exposure to Thimerosal-containing vaccines at one month was associated significantly with the misery and unhappiness disorder that was dose related. That is, the higher the child’s exposure to Thimerosal the higher the incidence of the disorder. This disorder is characterized by a baby that cries uncontrollably and is fretful more so than that seen in normal babies.
2. A nearly significant increased risk of ADD with 12.5µg exposure at one month.
3. With exposure at 3 months, they found an increasing risk of neuro-developmental disorders, including speech disorders, with increasing exposure to Thimerosal. This was statistically significant. It is important to remember that the control group was not children without Thimerosal exposure but, rather, those at 12.5µg exposure. This means that there is a significant likelihood that even more neurodevelopmental problems would have been seen had they used a real control population. No one disagreed that these findings were significant and troubling. Yet, when the final study was published in the journal Pediatrics, Dr. Verstraeten and co-workers reported that no consistent associations were found between Thimerosal-containing vaccine exposure and neuro-developmental problems. In addition, he lists himself as an employee of the CDC, not disclosing the fact that at the time the article was accepted, he worked for GlaxoSmithKline, a vaccine manufacturing company.”⁶⁷³

So how did they do this bit of prestidigitation? They simply added another HMO to the data: the Harvard Pilgrimage. (Additionally there were other manipulations, e.g., altering inclusion criteria, discarding children receiving the highest total dose, splitting children into separate groups, using only one HMO’s data in some cases, expressing effects ratios in terms of per dose of mercury.) Congressman Dave Weldon noted in his letter to the CDC Director that this HMO had been in receivership by the state of Massachusetts because its records were in shambles. Yet, this study was able to make the embarrassing data from Dr. Verstraeten’s previous study disappear. Attempts by Congressman Weldon to force the CDC to release the data to an independent researcher, Dr. Mark Geier, a researcher with impeccable credentials and widely published in peer-reviewed journals, have failed and the CDC claims that the original data-sets Verstraeten used have been (conveniently) “lost”.⁶⁷⁴

According to Dr. Baylock, it is obvious that a massive cover-up occurred. In his report he explains that “too many vaccines are being given to children during the brain’s most rapid growth period. Known toxic metals are being used in vaccines, interfering with brain metabolism and antioxidant enzymes, damaging DNA and DNA repair enzymes and triggering excitotoxicity. Removing the mercury will help but will not solve the problem because overactivation of the brain’s immune system will cause varying degrees of neurological damage to the highly-vulnerable developing brain.”⁶⁷⁵

⁶⁷³ Ibid.

⁶⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁷⁵ Ibid.

Additional Data Manipulation by the CDC

These examples of fraud with respect to vaccine safety aren't isolated nor the only examples of manipulation that has occurred at the CDC. Let's go back to the late summer of 2009, and the Swine Flu epidemic, which was hyped to the sky by the CDC. The Agency was calling for all Americans to take the Swine Flu vaccine. The problem was, the CDC was concealing a scandal. At the time, CBS investigative reporter, Sharyl Attkisson, discovered that the CDC had secretly stopped counting cases of the illness—while, of course, continuing to warn Americans about its unchecked spread:

“We discovered through our FOI [Freedom of Information] efforts that **before the CDC mysteriously stopped counting Swine Flu cases, they had learned that almost none of the cases they had counted as Swine Flu was, in fact, Swine Flu or any sort of flu at all! The interest in the story from one [CBS] executive was very enthusiastic. He said it was "the most original story" he'd seen on the whole Swine Flu epidemic. But others pushed to stop it and, in the end, no broadcast wanted to touch it. We aired numerous stories pumping up the idea of an epidemic, but not the one that would shed original, new light on all the hype. It was fair, accurate, legally approved and a heck of a story. With the CDC keeping the true Swine Flu stats secret, it meant that many in the public took and gave their children an experimental vaccine that may not have been necessary.”⁶⁷⁶**

It was routine for doctors all over America to send blood samples from patients they'd diagnosed with Swine Flu, or the "most likely" Swine Flu patients, to labs for testing. And overwhelmingly, those samples were coming back with the result: not Swine Flu, not any kind of flu. That was the big secret. That's what the CDC was hiding. That's why they stopped reporting Swine Flu case numbers. That's what Attkisson had discovered. That's why she was shut down. But it gets even worse. Because about three weeks after Attkisson's findings were published on the CBS News website, the CDC, obviously in a panic, decided to double down with an even bigger lie—that an estimated 22 million U.S. residents had come down with H1N1 swine flu by October 17, 2009.⁶⁷⁷

So, as of the summer of 2009, the CDC had secretly stopped counting Swine Flu cases in America, because the overwhelming percentage of lab tests from likely Swine Flu patients showed no sign of Swine Flu or any other kind of flu (i.e. there is no Swine Flu epidemic). Then, after this lie is exposed, the CDC comes out with an even bigger lie—that there are 22 MILLION cases of Swine Flu in the United States.

Additional Data Manipulation by the CDC

Another example of data manipulation is the massive overestimation of flu deaths in the U.S., in order to push the flu vaccine. In December of 2005, the British Medical Journal (online) published a report by Peter Doshi, which created tremors through the halls of the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), where "the experts" used to tell the press that 36,000 people in the US die every year from the flu. Here is a quote from Doshi's report:

⁶⁷⁶ Excerpt from a 2014 interview between Investigative Journalist Jon Rappaport and CBS investigative reporter Sharyl Attkisson.

⁶⁷⁷"22 million cases of Swine Flu in US," by Daniel J. DeNoon. WebMD, November 12, 2009.

"[According to CDC statistics], 'influenza and pneumonia' took 62,034 lives in 2001---61,777 of which were attributable to pneumonia and 257 to flu, and in only 18 cases was the flu virus positively identified."⁶⁷⁸

You see, the CDC has created one overall category that combines both flu and pneumonia deaths. Why do they do this? Because they disingenuously assume that the pneumonia deaths are complications stemming from the flu. This is an absurd assumption. Pneumonia has a number of causes. But even worse, in all the flu and pneumonia deaths, only 18 revealed the presence of an influenza virus.

Therefore, the CDC could not say, with assurance, that more than 18 people died of influenza in 2001. Not 36,000 deaths. 18 deaths. Doshi continued his assessment of published CDC flu-death statistics: "Between 1979 and 2001, [CDC] data show an average of 1348 [flu] deaths per year (range 257 to 3006)." These figures refer to flu separated out from pneumonia. This death toll is obviously far lower than the parroted 36,000 figure.

However, when you add the sensible condition that lab tests have to actually find the flu virus in patients, the numbers of flu deaths plummet even further. In other words, it's all promotion and hype.

The CDC says that 36,000 people die from the flu every year in the US. But actually, it's closer to 20. However, they can't admit that, because if they did, then the whole campaign to scare people into getting a flu shot would have about the same effect as warning people to carry iron umbrellas, in case toasters fall out of upper-story windows. The CDC must turn out a steady stream of lies about the need for vaccines. If they didn't, they'd have no way to justify the billions of dollars they spend every year buying the vaccines from drug companies. Ironically—according to the Department of Health and Human Services HSRA website—88 of the 108 vaccine injury cases settled the first quarter of 2016 were for injuries and deaths due to the flu vaccine, making the flu vaccine one of the most dangerous vaccines in the United States.⁶⁷⁹

In this light, consider the following revealing statements by Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., Harvard educated, environmental activist, author and prominent attorney, and son of Robert F "Bobby" Kennedy and the nephew of former U.S. President John F. Kennedy, in January 2017:

"There have been four separate, intensive federal investigations by the United States Congress—a three year investigation, 2001, 2002, 2003, by the United States Senate, Tom Coburn's committee, by the Inspector General of HHS in 2008, by the Office Integrity in 2014. All of them have painted the CDC as a cesspool of corruption, of an agency that has become an absolute subsidiary of the pharmaceutical industry, and that has become a sock puppet, a spokesperson, a shill for the industry....CDC is not an independent agency. It is a vaccine company. CDC owns over twenty vaccine patents. It sells about \$4.6 billion of vaccines every year. And its primary metric for success in all the

⁶⁷⁸ Peter Doshi, "Are US flu death figures more PR than science?" (BMJ 2005; 331:1412)

⁶⁷⁹ U.S. Dept of Health and Human Services Health Resources and Services Administration Vaccine Injury Compensation Data.

departments in the agency are vaccine sales. The groups, for example the Immunization Safety Office, where the scientists who are supposed to be looking at efficacy and safety in vaccines, they are no longer a public service...agency. They are subsumed in that metric: We have to sell as many of these things as possible. And so they do things to their science to make sure that nothing interferes—no information—interferes with sales.”⁶⁸⁰

See also from Robert F. Kennedy Jr. the incisive and carefully documented 2005 article published by Rolling Stone Magazine that documented the government’s efforts to conceal alarming data about the dangers of vaccines at: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/vaccinations-deadly-immunity/14510>

Knowing Vaccine Risk

Regarding the widespread corruption at the CDC, if you wanted to buy a product, and the main source of research on the product was the company selling it, would you automatically assume the product was safe and effective? Of course not. But that’s just the beginning of the problem when it comes to the issue of Vaccine safety. There is massive structural conflict of interest at the CDC: they are the biggest customer of pharmaceutical companies, as they purchase more than \$4 billion worth of vaccines a year.⁶⁸¹ The CDC at the same time, heads up research on the safety of those very same vaccines. Not surprisingly, the CDC’s position on vaccines is that they are ALWAYS safe ALL the time and should be injected into EVERYONE.

The risks for each vaccine are stated right on the vaccine package inserts but these inserts are not given to parents or even to adults considering the suggested vaccines for them. It is also doubtful that the doctor or nurse dispensing the vaccine has fully read the product insert. For example, do doctors know that Sanofi Pasteur’s Tripedia DTaP vaccine listed **autism** as one of the adverse reactions to their vaccine? If parents knew that, they might have reconsidered giving the child the vaccine.

That particular brand DTaP vaccine is no longer available on the market as of 2014, but the serum’s insert – last updated in December 2005 –under a section on page 11 describing “ADVERSE REACTIONS,” researchers acknowledged “autism,” among other serious complications, had been reported following the vaccine’s administration:

"Adverse events reported during post-approval use of Tripedia vaccine include idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura, **SIDS**, anaphylactic reaction, cellulitis, **autism**, convulsion/grand malconvulsion, encephalopathy, hypotonia, neuropathy, somnolence and apnea."

The document goes on to state that “Events were included in this list because of the seriousness or frequency of reporting,” Meanwhile, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention maintains an entire page dedicated to claims there is no causal link between vaccines and autism.

⁶⁸⁰ RFK Jr.’s seven minute talk on practices at the CDC: <http://www.ageofautism.com/2017/01/7-minutes-on-cdc.html>

⁶⁸¹ "The government's Vaccine for Children Program (a CDC organization) purchases vaccines for about 50 percent of children in the U.S." (The Atlantic, February 10, 2015) "The CDC currently spends over \$4 billion purchasing vaccines [annually] from drug makers..." (Health Impact News, October 24, 2016).

It could be a strange coincidence, but it is worth noting that SIDS, as cited to be a known complication of the Tripedia DTaP vaccine, is most likely to occur between 2 and 4 months of age. DTaP is given at 2,4, and 6 months.

Do vaccines guarantee to provide the benefit of immunity?

A clearer understanding of how vaccines are made and what they do may add some insight into the risk/benefit ratio of vaccines.

Vaccines supposedly work by stimulating and exciting an immune response. The efficacy of a vaccine is measured by the production of antibodies. This stimulation of antibody production is achieved (or not) when either a live or killed virus or other vaccine agent is injected into a child or adult. The theory is that this antibody response will then be replicated to protect the vaccinated individual from future exposures.

For live virus vaccines, a virus is grown on mediums that include aborted fetal tissue and tissues from monkeys, cows, chickens, dogs, mice, and other animals. Growing the live viruses on animal cells is supposed to make them less virulent to humans yet still strong enough to induce an immune response. This virus is then manufactured with a variety of additives and preservatives to make the serum injected as a vaccine. Non-live virus vaccines include bacterial toxins, “killed” whole virus, and proteins (among other things) and require the use of “adjuvants” to stimulate an immune response. These adjuvant-stimulated responses create the antibodies that are the measures of success of the vaccine. However the antibodies are not necessarily effective measures of true immunity from either live or non-live vaccines.

Vaccine makers do not guarantee that their product does anything more than increase antibody levels in most people. They further admit that such antibodies do not necessarily mean immunity from illness.⁶⁸² For example, the Galaxo-Smith-Kline flu vaccine insert states:

“Specific levels of hemagglutination inhibition (HI) antibody titer post vaccination with inactivated influenza virus vaccines have not been correlated with protection from influenza illness but the HI antibody titers have been used as a measure of vaccine activity. In some human challenge studies, HI antibody titers of $\geq 1:40$ have been associated with protection from influenza illness in up to 50% of subjects.”

In simple language this means that the manufacturer does not claim that the flu vaccine protects from the flu; they only claim that it increases antibody activity in some people. However the increased antibody activity has only been associated with protection from the flu for half of the subjects whose antibodies reach the appropriate mark. For the other half, it is useless. The following statement during a 1972 senate hearing on vaccine irregularities provides additional insight on the ineffectiveness of the flu vaccine:

“The first influenza vaccine was licensed in 1945. As of December 1971, there

⁶⁸² Additionally, the concept of Original Antigenic Sin (phenomenon which basically means vaccines lead to a significant decrease in development of protective immunity as a body’s immune system is unable to respond to different viral strains or pathogen variants) calls into question whether the immune response from a vaccine (live virus or otherwise) could ever provide adequate protection.

were outstanding eight licenses to manufacture influenza vaccine, and six companies were actually manufacturing it. In 1970, over 20 million doses of influenza vaccine were sold, making it one of the largest selling vaccines produced in this country. [Yet as] early as 1962 the Public Health Service's Center for Disease Control estimated that the [Flu] vaccine was only 20–25% effective...and A 1969 study published in the Bulletin of the World Health Organization concluded that "optimally constituted influenza vaccines at standard dosage level have little if any effectiveness....".⁶⁸³

Some recent reports from analysis of the effectiveness of flu vaccines shows that they have up to an 84% failure rate. One reason for such a high failure rate is that the antibody against one influenza virus type or subtype confers little or no protection against another virus. Furthermore, the antibody for one antigenic variant of influenza virus might not protect against another antigenic variant of the same type or subtype. Frequent development of antigenic variants through antigenic drift is the virological basis for seasonal epidemics and the reason for the usual replacement of one or more influenza viruses in each year's influenza vaccine.

Merck's chicken pox vaccine has similar wording about effectiveness on its insert:

"VARIVAX induces both cell-mediated and humoral immune responses to varicella-zoster virus. The relative contributions of humoral immunity and cell-mediated immunity to protection from varicella are unknown."

This claims that the vaccine induces both the innate and humoral immune system responses yet they don't know if the contribution is effective protection.

The following statement from a 1972 congressional report sheds additional light on the history of vaccine effectiveness:

"Let me now turn to the substance of the GAO [Government Accounting Office] report. With respect to the effectiveness of vaccines...There are at least 32 vaccines currently on the market that are "generally regarded as ineffective by the medical profession...All of these [vaccines] have been on the market for more than ten years, some of them for decades. Some of them can cause serious side effects....And yet, in all these years, [the CDC] never moved to take a single one of those ineffective [vaccines] off the market, or even to inform the public or the medical profession of their ineffectiveness. In light of this kind of adverse reaction data, it is incredible that [the CDC] could license such biologics as "safe." Since the agency believed that there was no corresponding benefit from the harm suffered by patients, It could have moved to take these drugs off the market under its un-doubted authority and responsibility to withhold licenses for drugs which are unsafe. Instead, the [CDC] maintained that it had no authority to regulate biologics for effectiveness and simply washed its hands of

⁶⁸³ The Executive Reorganization and Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations United States Senate, Ninety-Second Congress, Second Session. Page 432, 434. April 20, 21; and May 4, 1972

the problem.”⁶⁸⁴

“For ten years, beginning in 1962, while memos were quietly exchanged within the bureaucracy, nothing was done to protect the public against [vaccines] that were ineffective. The [vaccines] stayed on the market; people continued to get adverse reactions from them. Those [vaccines] are on the market today...”⁶⁸⁵

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity

Example #1 – Mumps Outbreak in Orthodox Jewish Communities in the United States (2010). A large mumps outbreak occurred among highly vaccinated U.S. Orthodox Jewish communities during 2009 and 2010. Of the teenagers vaccinated:

- 89% had previously received two doses of a mumps-containing vaccine
- 8% had received one dose

Those infected who received a vaccine: 97%.⁶⁸⁶

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #2 – Mumps Epidemic in Iowa (2006). In March, 2006, a total of 219 mumps cases had been reported in Iowa – the largest epidemic of mumps in the United States since 1988. Of the 219 cases reported in Iowa, the average age of infection was 21. Of the 133 patients investigated with a vaccine history:

- 87 (65%) had received 2 doses
- 19 (14%) had received 1 dose
- 8 (6%) had no doses
- 19 (14%) vaccine status could not be documented

Those infected who received a vaccine: 79% (at least).⁶⁸⁷

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #3 – Mumps Outbreak at a Summer Camp in New York (2005). On July 26, 2005, the New York State Department of Health identified 31 cases of mumps. The vaccine coverage for the entire camp was 96%. Of the infected 31:

- 16 (52%) had received 2 doses
- 4 (13%) had received 1 dose
- 9 (29%) had no doses
- 2 (6%) vaccine status could not be documented

⁶⁸⁴ The Executive Reorganization and Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations United States Senate, Ninety-Second Congress, Second Session. Page 432, 434. April 20, 21; and May 4, 1972, p. 431

⁶⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 433

⁶⁸⁶ <http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa1202865>

⁶⁸⁷ <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm55d330a1.htm>

20 of the 31 people infected (65%) of the people infected were vaccinated.⁶⁸⁸

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #4 – Mumps Outbreak in a Highly Vaccinated Population (1989). From October 1988 to April 1989, an outbreak involving 269 cases of mumps occurred in Douglas County, Kansas. Of the 269 cases, 208 (77.3%) occurred among primary and secondary school students, of whom 203 (97.6%) had received a mumps vaccination.⁶⁸⁹

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #5 – Major Measles Epidemic in Quebec Despite 99% Vaccine Coverage (1989). The 1989 measles outbreak infecting 1,363 people in the province of Quebec was attempted to be explained away as occurring because of “incomplete vaccination coverage.” However, upon further investigation, it was discovered the vaccination coverage among cases was at least 84.5%.

Vaccination coverage for the total population was 99.0%.⁶⁹⁰

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #6 – Outbreak of Measles Despite Appropriate Control Measures (1985). In 1985, of 118 cases of measles which occurred on a Blackfeet reservation in Montana, 82% were vaccinated. Twenty-three of those cases occurred in the schools in Browning, Montana, where:

98.7% of students were vaccinated.⁶⁹¹

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #7 – Measles Outbreak in a Fully Immunized Secondary-School Population (1985). In 1985, an outbreak of measles occurred in a secondary school located in Corpus Christi, Texas. More than 99% had records of vaccination with live measles vaccine. The investigators concluded “that outbreaks of measles can occur in secondary schools, even when more than 99 percent of the students have been vaccinated and more than 95 percent are immune.”

Vaccine coverage for school: 99%.⁶⁹²

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #8 – Measles in an Immunized School-Aged Population in New Mexico (1984). The story keeps repeating. In 1984, 76 cases of measles were reported in Hobbs, New Mexico. Forty-seven cases (62%) occurred among students. The school reported that 98% of students were vaccinated against measles before the outbreak began.

Vaccine coverage for school: 98%.⁶⁹³

⁶⁸⁸ <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5507a2.htm>

⁶⁸⁹ <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1861205>

⁶⁹⁰ <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1884314>

⁶⁹¹ <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed?term=3618578>

⁶⁹² <http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJM198703263161303>

⁶⁹³ <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/00000476.htm>

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #9 – Measles Outbreak Among Vaccinated High School Students in Illinois (1984). In 1984, 21 cases of measles occurred in Sangamon County, Illinois:

- 16 (76%) were vaccinated
- 4 (19%) were unvaccinated preschool children
- 1 (5%) vaccinated college student

All 411 students of the local high school were documented as having received the vaccination on or after their first birthday. Investigators remarked, “This outbreak demonstrates that transmission of measles can occur within a school population with a documented immunization level of 100%.”

Vaccine coverage in school children contracting measles: 100%⁶⁹⁴

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #10 – Clinical Presentation of Pertussis in Fully Immunized Children in Lithuania (2001). In 2001, Lithuania's vaccine coverage was 94.6% as a country. From May to December of that year, 53 children showed a serological confirmation of pertussis. Of the 53 children:

- 32 (60.4%) were fully vaccinated
- 21 (39.6%) were partially vaccinated or unvaccinated

Researchers conveniently grouped both partially vaccinated and unvaccinated children together. Vaccinated children (who received at least three DTP vaccine doses) represented 43.2% of all pertussis cases diagnosed in 2001.

Vaccine coverage for Lithuania: 94.6%.⁶⁹⁵

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #11 – Pertussis Infection in Fully Vaccinated Children in Day Care Centers (2000). In 2000, a child died suspected of having pertussis. The baby received the first dose of DTP at two months of age – all family members were completely vaccinated with four doses of DTP. The day care centers that two siblings had attended during the child's illness were investigated. All the children in the day care had been vaccinated in infancy with four doses of diphtheria–tetanus toxoid pertussis (DTP) vaccine, and a booster dose at 12 months of age. Five fully vaccinated children were found to be colonized with *Bordetella pertussis*. At the conclusion of the investigation, researchers stressed the following information:

“Vaccinated adolescents and adults may serve as reservoirs for silent infection and become potential transmitters to unprotected infants. The whole–cell vaccine for pertussis is protective only against clinical disease, not against infection. Therefore, even young, recently vaccinated children may serve as reservoirs and potential transmitters of infection.”

⁶⁹⁴ <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/00000359.htm>

⁶⁹⁵ <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15918913>

Vaccine coverage in daycare: 100%⁶⁹⁶

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #12 – Pertussis Outbreak in Vermont (1996). In 1996, over 280 cases of pertussis cases were identified in Vermont. 174 children were vaccinated and over half (61%) of the school children were considered “fully vaccinated.” It’s also important to keep in mind that in 1996, 97% of children aged 19–35 months in Vermont had received three or more doses of DT or DTP vaccine.

Complete failure in vaccinated children: at least 80.9%⁶⁹⁷

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #13 – Outbreak of Varicella at a Day Care Center Despite Vaccination (2012). In December of 2012, an outbreak occurred in a private day care center in a small community near Concord, New Hampshire. There were a total of 25 cases of varicella reported in children.

- 17 (68%) were vaccinated
- 8 (32%) were unvaccinated – two of these children were vaccinated in late December and classified as “unvaccinated”

The investigators lamented that the vaccine was 44% effective, saying, “The reasons for the poor performance of the vaccine are not apparent...the findings in this investigation raise concern that the current vaccination strategy may not protect all children adequately.”

Vaccine coverage: 73.1%⁶⁹⁸

Vaccine Antibodies Don't Guarantee Immunity Example #14 – An Outbreak of Chickenpox in Elementary School Children with Two-Dose Varicella Vaccine Recipients (2006). Shortly after school had begun, the Arkansas Department of Health was notified of a varicella outbreak in students. Vaccination information was available for 871 (99%) of the 880 children. 97% of the children had been vaccinated for varicella! In this outbreak, 84 cases were reported.

Vaccine coverage: 97%.⁶⁹⁹

Weighing the Benefits of vaccines against the Risks

As you can see from the above examples, vaccines cannot be guaranteed to provide the benefit of immunity for which they are supposedly given. However, the risks associated with vaccines are indeed substantial as a quick scan of the Vaccine Injury Table kept by the Health Resource Center for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services reveals that compensation for injury is possible from a variety of the most common vaccines given to children. The list of adverse side effects for vaccines is long and troubling. Adverse events are the reason the Vaccine Injury Compensation

⁶⁹⁶ http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/6/5/00-0512_article.htm

⁶⁹⁷ <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/00049244.htm>

⁶⁹⁸ <http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa021662>

⁶⁹⁹ <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19593254>

Program has paid out over **3.5 billion** dollars from 1988 – 2016 to individuals and families who have suffered vaccine injury and death despite the fact that only 1 in 5 claims receives any compensation at all.⁷⁰⁰ That is a lot of injury to children caused by vaccines considering that studies reveal that a small fraction of those injured by vaccines ever file any claim at all since most doctors reject the notion that a problem was caused by a vaccine despite the reality that such problems are listed on the manufacturers product insert.

And consider this revealing finding published in the Pace Environmental Law Review,

“Using publicly available information, the investigation shows that the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (VICP) has been compensating cases of vaccine-induced brain damage associated with autism for more than twenty years. This investigation suggests that officials at HHS, the Department of Justice and the Court of Federal Claims may have been aware of this association but failed to publicly disclose it.”⁷⁰¹

A full list of contraindications⁷⁰² and adverse events listed in the package inserts of all vaccines are available at <http://www.immunize.org/packageinserts/>. While the incidence of any particular adverse reaction listed on the insert may not be unacceptable in the eyes of the manufacturer or the CDC, every parent has both the duty and right to know what they are so that they can decide whether the benefit outweighs the risk for their child or themselves.

Pharmaceutical companies don't have liability when their products harm people

In 1986, the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act (NCVIA) was passed which shielded vaccine manufacturers from liability that resulted from administration of a vaccination.

It should be noted that, after the Vaccine Act was passed in 1986 the CDC modified the childhood immunization schedule, greatly increasing the number of vaccines American children receive. In 1983, the CDC recommended 11 doses of 4 vaccines by the time a child was 16. Today the CDC recommends that a child receive 49 doses of 14 vaccines by the age of six, and 69 doses of 16 vaccines by 18 years of age.

No other industry in America—not the automobile industry, firearms industry or even the commercial air travel industry—has ever been granted blanket liability immunity from faulty products. Only the vaccine industry enjoys such extraordinary legal protections—a status that seems wholly unnecessary if vaccines are really as safe as proponents claim them to be.⁷⁰³

Drug companies have unlimited profit-making in a stable, liability-free market for old

⁷⁰⁰ These awards are funded by taxes on vaccines.

⁷⁰¹ Unanswered Questions, A Review of Compensated Cases of Vaccine-Induced Brain Injury by Mary Holland, Louis Conte, Robert Krakow and Lisa Colin, Pace Environmental Law Review, vol. 28, no. 2 • 2011

⁷⁰² A contraindication is defined as a specific situation in which a drug, procedure, or surgery should not be used because it may be harmful to the person.

⁷⁰³ Is this immunity the reason why vaccines are not required to undergo the same rigorous safety testing required for other prescription drugs and products?

and new vaccines recommended and mandated by government. The obvious trend in all this is that vaccines will naturally become more and more dangerous to children for the simple reason that the U.S. government has taken away any incentive for product safety. Because literally no costs are associated with vaccine damage and faulty products, the goal of the vaccine manufacturer is to maximize sales regardless of the side effects, because the company doesn't have any liability when their products harm people. It is reported that the pharmaceutical industry has 271 new vaccines under development at the CDC in the hope of raising annual vaccine sales to \$100 billion.

How are vaccines evaluated for safety?

The manufacturer's package insert provides a glimpse at how vaccines are tested and evaluated. The first item of note in any package insert is the following admission regarding the lack of toxicology testing of vaccines:

"[This] vaccine has not been evaluated for its carcinogenic or mutagenic potential or impairment of fertility."

Because vaccines are to be given to young children who are rapidly developing humans who are more sensitive to adverse effects than adult humans it would seem imperative that any such vaccine be rigorously evaluated in scientifically sound and appropriate toxicology or precautionary studies that would appropriately address carcinogenesis⁷⁰⁴, mutagenesis⁷⁰⁵ (including teratogenicity⁷⁰⁶), and the impairment of fertility before the vaccine formula may ethically be injected into any child, especially since vaccines do contain known neurotoxins, carcinogens, and both human and animal DNA.

Let's first look at some examples on how vaccines are tested for safety:

***The following data** is from the manufacturer's package inserts.

****All studies listed excluded children who weren't healthy—roughly 60% of the general population of infants and children would not be accepted into a vaccine study.**

Hib

ActHIB (Sanofi Pasteur):

For this particular example, ActHib was tested for safety by giving one group ActHib w/ DTP and the CONTROL GROUP was given Hep B w/ DTP: ⁷⁰⁷

From the package insert (page 7):

⁷⁰⁴ Carcinogenic effect is the ability to cause cancer.

⁷⁰⁵ Mutagenic effect is the ability to cause alterations in DNA to include autoimmune disorders and disease.

⁷⁰⁶ Teratogenic effects is the ability to cause harm to a developing fetus in utero.

⁷⁰⁷ DTP is a whole-cell pertussis vaccine that's no longer on the market in the US.

“In a randomized, double-blind US clinical trial, ActHIB® was given concomitantly with DTP to more than 5,000 infants and Hepatitis B vaccine was given with DTP to a similar number. In this large study, deaths due to sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) and other causes were observed but were not different in the two groups. In the first 48 hours following immunization, two definite and three possible seizures were observed after ActHIB® and DTP in comparison with none after Hepatitis B vaccine and DTP. This rate of seizures following ActHIB® and DTP was not greater than previously reported in infants receiving DTP alone. Other adverse reactions reported with administration of other Haemophilus b conjugate vaccines include urticaria, seizures, hives, renal failure and Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS). A cause and effect relationship among any of these events and the vaccination has not been established.”

In summary, Group A received Hib and DTP (DTP is a whole-cell pertussis vaccine, a highly reactive vaccine—no longer on the market in the US). Group B received Hepatitis B vaccine and the same DTP. Vaccine reactions were then compared between the two groups. Both groups reported SIDS deaths and seizures, but these seem to be attributed to the DTP as this had been previously reported for DTP vaccines. Additionally, none of the other adverse reactions that “coincidentally” surfaced in these previously healthy infants during this trial could be causally related to the vaccines. Based on this information, ActHib was judged safe.

Why would a vaccine manufacturer voluntarily give their vaccine at the SAME time as one of the most highly reactive DTP that is no longer on the market in the U.S.? Because a study designed in this manner can disingenuously ensure adverse event outcomes are statistically insignificant between the two groups.

DTaP

Tripedia (DTaP) (Sanofi Pasteur):

One group received Tripedia and the control group received Aventis’ whole cell DTP **[no longer on the market in the U.S.]** vaccine (page 6 of the package insert).

“In a double-blind, comparative US trial, 673 infants were randomized to receive either 3 doses of Tripedia vaccine or AvP’s whole-cell pertussis DTP vaccine (Table 2).

Safety data are available for 672 infants, including 505 who received Tripedia vaccine and 167 who received whole-cell pertussis DTP vaccine. Following all three doses, rates for all reported local reactions, fever 101°F, irritability, drowsiness, and anorexia were significantly less in Tripedia vaccine recipients. Reaction rates generally peaked within the first 24 hours, and decreased substantially over the next two days.

A similar reduction in adverse events was seen in a randomized, double-blind, comparative trial conducted in the US by the NIH when Tripedia vaccine was compared to Lederle Laboratories whole-cell pertussis DTP vaccine.”

DTaP is the acellular version of DTP. Whole cell pertussis vaccines were highly reactive and had to be modified. This study shows that the new DTaP vaccine is not as reactive as the (replaced) DTP. We would hope so. Does this, however, prove to parents that the DTaP is safe?

What this study proves is that x vaccine is safer than the “other” vaccine. This type of testing method used is another example of statistical manipulation in order to make sure adverse event outcomes are statistically insignificant between two groups.

Furthermore, there are no long term studies on vaccines before approval—many are limited to just a few weeks. When a vaccine is tested, it is given to healthy people and they are only given that one injection (not multiple injections at once, like a baby). The current CDC recommended schedule with a number of vaccines injected on a given day has never been tested; it has have not been studied for adverse effects in the combinations in which they’re given (multiple shots in a single day for infants and children); and it cannot be guaranteed to provide the benefit of immunity for which they are given. And again, why have vaccines never been tested for carcinogenicity, mutagenicity, or impairment of fertility, despite the fact they contain ingredients recognized as potential carcinogens, mutagens, and reproductive toxicants? In essence, the current vaccination program is an experiment. The following statement in the 1972 congressional record provides additional insight into how vaccines are approved prior to knowing for sure if it is safe or not:

“We have a measles vaccine that was dangerous. We did not find out about it until 4 years after it was approved. The point is, there is a lot we do not know and there has been a rather unfortunate tendency...once a vaccine is licensed, to pretend it has no further problems. It is really hard to explain, I think, to the public that you are going to license something for use, but yet you are going to continue long term studies on possible safety. In a way it does not make sense, but yet it is something I think we have to face, and I do not think they are facing this adequately.”⁷⁰⁸

Here’s just a few typical vaccine ingredients:⁷⁰⁹

Many of the ingredients in vaccines—including but not limited to aluminum, mercury, formaldehyde, B2 glycoprotein, Triton X-100, Polysorbate or Tween 80, 60 and 20, 2-Phenoxyethanol, etc.—are known carcinogens, or known neurotoxins, toxic to cells, cell structure and neurons. A quick glance at the Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) data for vaccine ingredients reveals that many are clearly KNOWN to cause cancer, are clearly KNOWN to cause alterations in DNA, and are clearly KNOWN to cause harm to

⁷⁰⁸ The Executive Reorganization and Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations United States Senate, Ninety-Second Congress, Second Session. Page 430. April 20, 21; and May 4, 1972

⁷⁰⁹The list of vaccine ingredients comes straight from the CDC. For the full published list of vaccine ingredients see the CDC website: <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/pubs/pinkbook/downloads/appendices/B/excipient-table-2.pdf>

the developing fetus and to children. A brief glance at the MSDS data also reveals that there is a lot that is unknown—where the toxicological properties of many of the substances found in vaccines have not been thoroughly investigated:

Thimerosal: A neurotoxic mercury which has been linked to neurodevelopmental disorders in children⁷¹⁰ Mercury, even in small trace amounts, is harmful. Exposure to any mercury is problematic because like aluminum, it also accumulates in the brain causing many forms of neurological damage that affects movement, learning, and social behaviors. Mercury is 500 times more toxic than lead and is second only to plutonium as the most toxic metal known to man. This substance has quietly been replaced with aluminum in most childhood vaccines. (Thimerosal was not “removed”—these Thimerosal-containing vaccines were used up and the new lots of vaccine were made with a new adjuvant of Aluminum). Though thimerosal is no longer used as a preservative in childhood vaccines, it is still used in Flu vaccines, and it remains present in other childhood vaccines in trace amounts since it is part of the manufacturing process. However, those trace amounts still exceeds the FDA recommended amounts that can be ingested. Vaccines are injected rather than ingested. So is there a safe amount to inject? We don’t know because that research has never been done. There are 25 mcg in one average flu vaccine, and the EPA safety limit is 5 mcg.

2-Phenoxyethanol: Substance classed as “Very Toxic Material” that according to its MSDS can lead to kidney, liver, blood, and central nervous system (CNS) disorders. Studies show this substance produces reproductive and developmental effects in animals.⁷¹¹

Polysorbate 20 (Tween 20): The Polysorbate 20 Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) – Signs and Symptoms of Exposure admits “To the best of our knowledge, the toxicological properties have not been thoroughly investigated.” One study, however, found “On repeated intravenous administration, effects on the liver, spleen and kidneys were seen in premature babies exposed to polysorbate 80: polysorbate 20 mixture and some fatalities occurred.”⁷¹²

Cetyltrimethylammonium Bromide (CTMB): According to it’s Safety Data Sheet we find out several things: CTMB is labeled as “Hazardous”; It is a skin irritant; It is a serious eye irritant; It is hazardous if inhaled; It is harmful if swallowed; It may cause respiratory irritation; It is dangerous to the environment; It is very toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects; It is flammable. It also may cause damage to the following organs: liver, cardiovascular system, central nervous system (CNS). May cause adverse reproductive effects and birth defects based on animal test data. This sounds like some pretty serious stuff, and millions of children and adults are getting this injected

⁷¹⁰ Vaccine Peer Review: History Of Vaccination In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports 1915–2015 (page 725–726) <http://jprager9.wixsite.com/jeffpragerbooks>

⁷¹¹ <http://www.sciencelab.com/msds.php?msdsId=9926486>; See also, pages 558, 769, 834 in Vaccine Peer Review: History Of Vaccination In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports 1915–2015 <http://jprager9.wixsite.com/jeffpragerbooks>

⁷¹²<http://toxnet.nlm.nih.gov/cgi-bin/sis/search/r?dbs+toxline:@term+@DOCNO+RISKLINE/1990100067>

into their bodies.⁷¹³

Aluminum: Aluminum is a known neurotoxin associated with brain dysfunctions, including dementia and Alzheimer's disease that has since been added to a number of childhood vaccines in the United States. Numerous studies show that aluminum found in vaccines can cause long-term neurological damage.⁷¹⁴

⁷¹³<http://www.sciencelab.com/msds.php?msdsId=9923367>

⁷¹⁴ See pages 18–19, 368, 452, 519, 416, 399, in Vaccine Peer Review: History Of Vaccination In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports 1915–2015 <http://jprager9.wixsite.com/jeffpragerbooks>; See also:

- http://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-1-4614-4788-7_89; Autism Spectrum Disorders and Aluminum Vaccine Adjuvants – 2014 “In summary, **research data suggests that vaccines containing Al may be a contributing etiological factor in the increasing incidence of autism.**”
- <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12026-013-8403-1>; Aluminum in the central nervous system (CNS): toxicity in humans and animals, vaccine adjuvants, and autoimmunity – April 2013 “**The literature demonstrates clearly negative impacts of aluminum on the nervous system across the age span. In adults, aluminum exposure can lead to apparently age-related neurological deficits resembling Alzheimer’s.**”
- <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0162013413001773> **Administration of aluminum to neonatal mice in vaccine-relevant amounts is associated with adverse long term neurological outcomes** – Nov 2013 “**These current data implicate Al (aluminum) injected in early postnatal life in some CNS alterations that may be relevant for a better understanding of the aetiology of ASD.**”
- <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264410X1300769X> Kinetics of the inflammatory response following intramuscular injection of aluminum adjuvant – June 2013 “**Recent evidence suggests an important role for inflammation in the immune response to aluminum-adjuvanted vaccines.**”
- <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10565-013-9239-0> **How aluminum, an intracellular ROS generator promotes hepatic and neurological diseases: the metabolic tale** – April 2013
- <http://people.csail.mit.edu/seneff/Entropy/entropy-14-02227.pdf> **Empirical Data Confirm Autism Symptoms Related to Aluminum and Acetaminophen Exposure** – Nov 2012 “It has recently been proposed that **aluminum, commonly used in vaccines as an adjuvant, may be the most significant factor in adverse reactions, and, furthermore, that the nervous system is especially vulnerable to aluminum toxicity.**”
- <http://lup.sagepub.com/content/21/2/118.full> The spectrum of ASIA: ‘Autoimmune (Auto-inflammatory) Syndrome induced by Adjuvants’ – Feb 2012 “During the past year a new syndrome was introduced and termed ASIA, ‘Autoimmune (Auto-inflammatory) Syndrome induced by Adjuvants’. This syndrome assembles a spectrum of immune-mediated diseases triggered by an adjuvant stimulus.”
- <http://lup.sagepub.com/content/21/2/223.abstract> Mechanisms of aluminum adjuvant toxicity and autoimmunity in pediatric populations – Feb 2012 “In summary, **research evidence shows that increasing concerns about current vaccination practices may indeed be warranted. Because children may be most at risk of vaccine-induced complications, a rigorous evaluation of the vaccine-related adverse health impacts in the pediatric population is urgently needed.**”
- <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/early/2011/11/30/peds.2010-3481.abstract?papetoc> Wide Variation in Reference Values for Aluminum Levels in Children – Dec 2011, Full Text “**Further studies of aluminum in children are warranted** and should be considered as part of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Biomonitoring Project.”

Polysorbate 80 (Tween 80): This substance has been found to cause adverse reproductive effects and may cause cancer based on animal test data⁷¹⁵ A study published in the Journal of Food and Chemical Toxicology found that Polysorbate 80 can lead to infertility and reproductive damage in rats.⁷¹⁶ Polysorbate 80 is also known to cause anaphylactic shock. Polysorbate 80 Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) – “Considered a hazardous substance.”⁷¹⁷

Glutaraldehyde: Glutaraldehyde is an organic compound that is used to disinfect medical and dental equipment. In vaccines it is used as a chemical preservative. Its Material Safety Data Sheet states “The substance may be toxic to blood, the reproductive system, liver, mucous membranes, spleen, central nervous system (CNS), Urinary System.” There have been several studies done on Glutaraldehyde and it has been found that exposure to it can cause: asthma, allergic reactions, induced respiratory issues.⁷¹⁸

MSG (monosodium glutamate): Monosodium glutamate is a food and taste-enhancing chemical found in many processed food products. Similar to most vaccine ingredients that have not been tested separately for safety, the long term cumulative effects of

⁷¹⁵ See Material Safety and Data Sheet (MSDS) toxicology section under special remarks on chronic and toxic effects on human, <http://www.sciencelab.com/msds.php?msdsId=9926645>; See also, pages 542, 553, 664, 701, 914, 916, 953 in Vaccine Peer Review: History Of Vaccination In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports 1915–2015 <http://jprager9.wixsite.com/jeffpragerbooks>

⁷¹⁶ <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/m/pubmed/8473002/>

⁷¹⁷ **Delayed effects of neonatal exposure to Tween 80 on female reproductive organs** in rats – March 1993 “Neonatal rats were injected with Tween 80 in 1, 5, or 10% aqueous solution on days 4–7 after birth. Treatment with Tween 80 accelerated maturatio, prolonged the oestrus (menstrual cycle), and induced persistent vaginal oestrus. **The relative weight of the uterus and ovaries decreased relative to the untreated controls. Ovaries were without corpora lutea, and had degenerative follicles.**” <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8473002?dopt=Abstract>;

Polysorbate 80 in medical products and nonimmunologic anaphylactoid reactions – Dec 2005 **“Polysorbate 80 is a ubiquitously used solubilizing agent that can cause severe nonimmunologic anaphylactoid reactions.”** <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16400901>; Evaluation of developmental neurotoxicity of polysorbate 80 in rats – January 2008, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17961976>;

Specific role of polysorbate 80 coating on the targeting of nanoparticles to the brain – Sept 2003. “The specific role of T-80 coating on nanoparticles in brain targeting was thus confirmed.” – meaning polysorbate 80 is a tool used for delivering drugs to the brain. <http://www.drgreenmom.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Specific-role-of-polysorbate-80-coating-on-the-targeting-of-nanoparticles-to-the-brain.pdf>

⁷¹⁸ See, “Glutaraldehyde-induced and formaldehyde-induced allergic contact dermatitis” Scott M. Ravis, M.D., Matthew P. Shaffer, M.D., Christy L. Shaffer, M.D., Seena Dehkhaghani, M.D. And Donald V. Belsito, M.D.; See also, “Glutaraldehyde-induced asthma.” Quirce S, Gómez M, Bombín C, Sastre J. 1999 Oct; 54(10):1121–2.; Genetic toxicity and carcinogenicity studies of glutaraldehyde—a review. Zeiger E, Gollapudi B, Spencer P. Mutat Res. 2005 Mar;589(2):136–51; Divergent immunological responses following glutaraldehyde exposure. Azadi S, Klink KJ, Meade BJ. Toxicol Appl Pharmacol. 2004 May 15;197(1):1–8. Case report: hydroquinone and/or glutaraldehyde induced acute myeloid leukemia? – July 2006 <http://www.occup-med.com/content/pdf/1745-6673-1-19.pdf>; Effects of Glutaraldehyde Exposure on Human Health – March 2006 http://joh.sanei.or.jp/pdf/E48/E48_2_01.pdf; A Critical Review of the Toxicology of Glutaraldehyde 1992 <http://informahealthcare.com/doi/abs/10.3109/10408449209145322>; Genetic toxicity and carcinogenicity studies of glutaraldehyde—a review – March 2005. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1383574205000049>

injecting MSG into the body and how it interacts with other chemicals and ingredients in vaccines is not known. What is known is that MSG is in a special class of chemicals called excitotoxins, which are known to overstimulate certain neurons in the brain causing them to continue firing until they tire themselves and die. This overexcitement of neurons has been suggested to play an important role in neuronal injury associated with a number of neurological disorders. Injections of MSG in laboratory animals have resulted in rapid damage to nerve cells in the brain.⁷¹⁹

Formaldehyde: Highly carcinogenic fluid used to embalm corpses. Ranked one of the most hazardous compounds to human health; can cause liver damage, gastrointestinal issues, reproductive deformation, respiratory distress and cancer. Studies have linked Formaldehyde exposure to leukemia. The Formaldehyde Material Safety Data Sheet states that the substance may be toxic to kidneys, liver, skin, central nervous system (CNS). Repeated or prolonged exposure to the substance can produce target organs damage. Repeated exposure to a highly toxic material may produce general deterioration of health by an accumulation in one or many human organs.”⁷²⁰

Human Tissue:

Many vaccines contain human DNA, human cell lines from aborted infants, or protein from human blood as ingredients (MRC-5, DNA, MRC-5 Cellular Protein, Human Serum

⁷¹⁹ **Locomotor and learning deficits in adult rats exposed to monosodium-L-glutamate during early life** (April 2000) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10771161?dopt=Citation>; The Danger of MSG and How it is Hidden in Vaccines (Dr. Mercola) <http://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2002/06/08/msg-vaccines.aspx>; Monosodium glutamate induced convulsions in rats: Influence of route of administration, temperature and age (1991) <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2FBF00808094>; “Comment: **The combination of MSG and fever or MSG and exercise has a synergistic neurotoxic effect that lowers seizure threshold.**” **Prenatal monosodium glutamate (MSG) treatment given through the mother’s diet causes behavioral deficits in rat offspring** – April 1984; Blaylock R. Excitotoxins: The Taste That Kills. Albuquerque, NM: Health Press 1997. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6541212?dopt=Citation>; Yang WH, Drouin MA, Herbert M, Mao Y, Karsh J. The monosodium glutamate symptom complex: assessment in a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized study. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology* 1997; 99(6 Pt 1): 757-762; Monosodium L-glutamate-induced asthma – 1987, Full Text <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3312372?dopt=Citation>; Schaumburg HH, Byck R, Gerstl R, Mashman JH. Monosodium L-glutamate: its pharmacology and role in the Chinese restaurant syndrome. *Science* 1969; 163(869): 826-828. Xiong J, Branigan D, Li M. Deciphering the MSG Controversy. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Medicine* 2009; 2: 329 -333.

⁷²⁰ See, pages 540, 567, 579, 586, 615, 669, 671, 740, 773, 788, 846 in Vaccine Peer Review: History Of Vaccination In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports 1915-2015 <http://jprager9.wixsite.com/jeffpragerbooks>; See also, International Agency for Research on Cancer (June 2004). IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans Volume 88 (2006): See also, <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol88/index.php>. See also, Report on Carcinogens, Twelfth Edition. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Toxicology Program. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from: <http://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/go/roc12>. **Formaldehyde Impairs Learning and Memory Involving the Disturbance of Hydrogen Sulfide Generation in the Hippocampus of Rats** – Oct 2012 <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12031-012-9912-4>; **Formaldehyde induces neurotoxicity to PC12 cells involving inhibition of paraoxonase-1 expression and activity**, April 2011 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21261675>; Differential effects of formaldehyde exposure on the cell influx and vascular permeability in a rat model of allergic lung inflammation – Sept 2010 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20658762>; Effects of low-level formaldehyde exposure on synaptic plasticity-related gene expression in the hippocampus of immunized mice, May 2007 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165572807001075>; **Measurement of tumor-associated mutations in the nasal mucosa of rats exposed to varying doses of formaldehyde**, July 2010 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0273230010000474>

Albumin). WI-38 and MRC-5 have become the most used Human diploid tissue cultures to make vaccinations. The WI-38 cell line was developed in 1962 by the Wistar Institute in Sweden from the lung cells of an aborted female fetus. Human diploid tissue culture MRC-5 was developed by the Medical Research Council of England from the lung tissue of a fourteen-week old male fetus, removed for psychiatric reasons from the mother in 1970.

The research of Theresa Deisher Ph.D.—who obtained her Ph.D. in Molecular and Cellular Physiology from Stanford University, a genetic engineer with over 20 years’ experience in the pharmaceutical industry whose research and discoveries have led to clinical trials on a number of therapeutic processes and 23 issued US patents—demonstrates a link in her research between the rise in the rates of autism and the use of aborted fetal cells in the production of vaccines.⁷²¹

Bovine Cow Serum: Bovine cow serum is a frequently used vaccine growth medium and the most frequently contaminated animal serums with bacteriophage (bacterial virus contamination of the animal serum).

Bacteriophage Contaminated Vaccines

It may come as a surprise to learn that live human virus vaccines that are injected into our nation's children have been shown to contain bacterial viruses from animals.⁷²²

In February, 1975 New York Times Medicine and Science Journalist, Gina Bari Kolata wrote an article in Science Magazine entitled “Phage in Live Virus Vaccines: Are They Harmful to People?” She wrote:

“Almost 2 years ago, scientists at the Bureau of Biologics of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) reported that **all live virus vaccines are grossly contaminated with phage (viruses that infect bacteria)**...This finding presented a problem since federal regulations forbade extraneous material in vaccines, and no one knew whether phage are harmful to human beings or whether they could be removed from vaccines. The temporary solution was to amend the regulations so as to permit phage in vaccines.”⁷²³

Where did the bacteriophage come from? According to the article, the phages, which are viruses that infect bacteria, contaminate the “fetal bovine serum” collected at the

⁷²¹ See, <http://www.autismone.org/sites/default/files/deisher.pdf>. See also, Dr. Therese Deisher’s testimony at the Minnesota House of Representatives on vaccine safety. <https://youtu.be/I5b9xsGZs1E>. See also a study done by Dr. Helen Ratajczak called Theoretical aspects of autism: Causes—A review: Journal of Immunotoxicology: Vol 8, No 1 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.3109/1547691X.2010.545086>. See also, <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/vaccines-and-autism-a-new-scientific-review/>; See also, Timing of Increased Autistic Disorder Cumulative Incidence by Michael E. McDonald and John F. Paul, NHEERL/EPA, published in February 2010 in Vol. 44 of the Environmental Science Technology journal. It reports that a spike in autism seen in 1995 corresponds with the introduction of human DNA to the MMR vaccine, suggesting a possible link.

⁷²² www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1665461; See also, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10636817; and pages 26, 31, 116 in Vaccine Peer Review: History Of Vaccination In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports 1915–2015 <http://jprager9.wixsite.com/jeffpragerbooks>;

⁷²³ Phage in Live Virus Vaccines: Are They Harmful to People? Science 14 Feb 1975: Vol. 187, Issue 4176, pp. 522–523

slaughterhouse that subsequently is used as vaccine growth medium. The process of bovine “fetus management” was encapsulated in this manner:

“The room is dirty and, according to one spokesman, “one minute you have nothing to do and the next minute you are literally knee deep in fetuses.”⁷²⁴

Kolata noted that one unintended consequence from the contamination was the phage’s ability to trigger a different disease. She explained that a person who was given the polio vaccine contaminated with diphtheria phage could actually contract diphtheria!

FDA’s tolerance of vaccine contaminants manifested years later. For example, a court case decided in 1987 revealed,

“Each seed virus used in manufacture shall be demonstrated to be free of extraneous microbial agents except for unavoidable bacteriophage.”⁷²⁵

It Continues to This Day

This isn’t a problem that magically went away. In fact, a look at the current federal guidelines that regulate the production and testing of vaccines reveals the following statement:

“Each seed virus used for vaccine manufacture shall be prepared from an acceptable strain in monkey kidney cell cultures, derived from animals...or in a cell culture of a type determined to be suitable by the Director...The seed virus used in vaccine manufactures shall be demonstrated to be free of extraneous microbial agents except for the unavoidable bacteriophage.”

And according to the FDA:

“Many novel vaccines are produced in animal cell substrates, and emerging infectious diseases may theoretically be transmitted from animals to humans through these vaccines.”

Vaccines have a long history of being contaminated

The polio vaccine was developed in 1954 by Dr. Jonas Salk (incidentally with heavy funding from the Rockefeller Foundation). In order to make the vaccine, Salk grew the poliovirus on ground monkey kidneys and testicles. It was later discovered by Merck researchers, Benjamin Sweet and Maurice Hilleman, the monkey tissues used for vaccine manufacturing were contaminated with a cancer virus called SV40.⁷²⁶

The untold history is found in the Congressional papers of the Executive Reorganization and Government Research of the Committee on Government

⁷²⁴ Ibid

⁷²⁵ Wade Baker and Rita Baker, Plaintiffs–Appellants, v. United States of America, Defendant–Appellee. No. 86–5578. Submitted Dec. 4, 1986

⁷²⁶ B.H. Sweet M.R. Hilleman, The Vacuolating Virus, S.V.40, 105 Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine 420, 420–27 (1960).

Operations United States Senate, Ninety–Second Congress, Second Session [1972], which states on page 502,

“In 1954 [a scientist, Bernice Eddy], as a polio control officer, found live virus in supposedly killed polio vaccine; in 1955 she was relieved of her duties as polio control officer...After her discoveries concerning the SV40 virus, her staff and animal space were reduced and she was demoted from head of a section to head of a unit.”⁷²⁷

Page 500,

“The next and only serious vaccine crisis that has occurred since the polio episode was the realization in mid–1961 that a monkey virus later shown to cause tumors in hamsters was contaminating both polio and adenovirus vaccines. The virus, known as SV40, was entering the vaccines and, just as in the polio case was surviving the formalin [form of formaldehyde] treatment.”

“There were several states by which the full extent of the SV40 problem became known. First was the discovery in 1959–1960 by a DBS [Division of Biologics Standards] scientist...that an unknown agent in the monkey kidney cells used to produce polio and adenovirus vaccines would cause tumors when the cells were injected into hamsters.”⁷²⁸

Page 505 of the congressional report states:

“There has been a tendency on the part of certain higher government circles to play down any open discussion of problems associated with vaccines...even when the contaminating virus was found to be oncogenic [cancer causing] in hamsters, the DBS [Division of Biologics Standards – National Institute of Health] and its expert advisory committee decided to leave existing stocks on the market rather than risk eroding public confidence by a recall.”

A 2002 report in the San Francisco Chronicle further explained:

“U.S. Public Health Service officials were worried. Tests had found SV40 in both the Sabin and Salk vaccines—it was later estimated that as much as a third of the Salk vaccine was tainted—and that SV40 was causing cancer in lab animals...the public was kept in the dark...officials did not recall contaminated Salk vaccine—more than a year’s supply—still in the hands of the nation’s doctors. And they did not notify the public of the contamination and SV40’s carcinogenic effect on newborn hamsters. [Merck’s Dr. Maurice] Hilleman would

⁷²⁷ The Executive Reorganization and Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations United States Senate, Ninety–Second Congress, Second Session. Page 499–505. April 20, 21; and May 4, 1972

⁷²⁸ Ibid

later explain that government officials were worried that any potentially negative information could ignite a panic and jeopardize the vaccination campaign."⁷²⁹

THIS KNOWN POTENT MONKEY TUMOR VIRUS WAS INJECTED INTO 98 MILLION PERSONS FROM 1955 THROUGH 1963⁷³⁰

And this horrible tragedy didn't just end there (1963). The continued contamination of the Polio vaccine-making process of more recent vaccines is highlighted in two detailed reports by journalist and writer William Carlsen in The San Francisco Chronicle.

"Although manufacturers switched from rhesus monkeys to SV40-free green African monkeys to grow the bulk vaccine in 1961, they have continued to use potentially contaminated polio seed strains originally grown on the rhesus monkey tissue to start the bulk vaccine process. Manufacturers check the purity of their vaccine with a series of 14-day tests to detect whether any SV40 slipped through. But when [Cancer Researcher, Dr. Michele Carbone, MD, PhD] replicated the tests in 1999, he found that the second, slower-growing 'archetypal' strain took 19 days to emerge. It was possible, Carbone noted in a published report, that this second strain of SV40 had been evading manufacturers' screening procedures for years—and infecting vaccine recipients after 1962."⁷³¹

"A monkey virus linked to human cancers may have contaminated the oral polio vaccine for years after the U.S. government ordered manufacturers to remove it, according to drug company documents obtained by The Chronicle."⁷³²

According to an article published and available from The National Center for Biotechnology Information in a 2007 review of numerous studies about SV40 in humans, researchers said the following:

"SV40 footprints in humans have been found associated at high prevalence with specific tumor types such as brain and bone tumors, mesotheliomas and lymphomas and with kidney diseases..." And "Once infected, people with SV40 can pass the virus on to their children."⁷³³

⁷²⁹<http://www.sfgate.com/health/article/Rogue-virus-in-the-vaccine-Early-polio-vaccine-2899957.php>
"Simian Virus in Polio Shots Tied to Cancer: Two Studies Support Widely Disputed Theory" by William Carlsen; San Francisco Chronicle; 3/9/2002; p.A1.);

⁷³⁰Ibid. See also, Vaccine Peer Review: History Of Vaccination In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports 1915–2015 (page 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 75, 78, 91, 93, 101, 116, 112). <http://jprager9.wixsite.com/jeffpragerbooks>

⁷³¹ Ibid

⁷³² "New Documents Show the Monkey Virus is Present in More Recent Polio Vaccine" by William Carlsen; San Francisco Chronicle; 7/22/2001; p. A6.

⁷³³<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1941725/>

And to bring this full circle to the beginning

A **KNOWN** MONKEY CANCER CAUSING VIRUS WAS INJECTED INTO AT LEAST 98 MILLION INNOCENT PEOPLE.⁷³⁴

and,

These vaccines with a known cancer-causing virus were left on the shelf because, if recalled, your confidence in vaccine safety and effectiveness would be eroded.

and,

PRODUCT INSERTS ADMIT VACCINES ARE STILL NOT TESTED FOR CAUSING CANCER⁷³⁵

and,

Innocent children continue to be injected with substances **recognized** to cause cancer such as formaldehyde, Polysorbate or Tween 80, 60 and 20, 2-Phenoxyethanol, Triton X-100, etc.⁷³⁶

and,

PRODUCT INSERTS ADMIT VACCINES ARE ALSO NOT TESTED FOR CAUSING MUTAGENIC EFFECTS SUCH AS AUTOIMMUNE DISEASES AND DISORDERS.⁷³⁷

and,

Innocent children continue to be injected with **known neurotoxins** including aluminum and mercury—all known to be toxic to cells, cell structure and neurons—all with the known ability to cause harm to humans to include autoimmune diseases.

and,

THESE PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES DON'T HAVE ANY LIABILITY WHEN THEIR PRODUCTS HARM PEOPLE

and,

⁷³⁴ <http://www.sfgate.com/health/article/Rogue-virus-in-the-vaccine-Early-polio-vaccine-2899957.php> ("Simian Virus in Polio Shots Tied to Cancer: Two Studies Support Widely Disputed Theory" by William Carlsen; San Francisco Chronicle; 3/9/2002; p.A1.); See also, Vaccine Peer Review: History Of Vaccination In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports 1915-2015 (page 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 75, 78, 91, 93, 101, 116, 112) <http://jprager9.wixsite.com/jeffpragerbooks>

⁷³⁵ See a list of vaccine product inserts here: <http://www.immunize.org/packageinserts/>.

⁷³⁶ View the Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) to learn about each vaccine ingredient.

⁷³⁷ See a list of vaccine product inserts here: <http://www.immunize.org/packageinserts/>.

THE SAME PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES ARE PROFITING HEAVILY FROM THE EXPLOSION OF CANCERS AND AUTOIMMUNE DISORDERS.

and,

The same people and organizations behind these pharmaceutical companies set the precedent for the entire U.S. vaccine program which continues to pump known carcinogens and neurotoxins into innocent children.

and,

These same people and organizations were involved in 98 million innocent Americans being injected with vaccines contaminated with a known cancer-causing monkey virus, SV40.

and,

These are the same people and organizations found holding back promising natural cures for cancer (as cited by the congressional Fitzgerald Report in Appendix I).

and,

Let me repeat that vaccines are kept on the shelves even if they are contaminated or found to be dangerous because **YOU**, the person into whom they would be injected, would lose confidence in the vaccine program!

A look at the Corruption Found in the UK's Vaccination Program

A 2011 investigative report compiled by Dr. Lucija Tomljenovic, Ph.D., Molecular Biologist at the University of British Columbia has revealed 30 years of secret official documents showing that government experts in the United Kingdom have:

1. Known that many vaccines don't work
2. Known they cause the diseases they are supposed to prevent
3. Known they are a hazard to children
4. Colluded to lie to the public
5. Worked to prevent safety studies

Though her paper focuses primarily on the British health system's elaborate cover-up of the dirty truth about its own national vaccination program, **these are many of the same vaccines that are mandated to children in the United States and other countries.**

Dr. Tomljenovic's report shows that Government authorities in Britain, in an ongoing bid to satisfy the private goals of the vaccine industry, have deliberately covered up pertinent information about the dangers and ineffectiveness of vaccines from parents in order to maintain a high rate of vaccination compliance. And in the process, they have put countless millions of children at risk of serious side effects and death.

Through several Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests, Dr. Tomljenovic was able to obtain transcripts of private meetings that were held between the UK's Department

of Health Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunization JCVI—the UK’s so-called “independent expert advisory committee” that makes recommendations to the British government about vaccine policy, and various British health ministers over the years. And after poring through this plethora of information, which had previously been veiled from public view, Dr. Tomljenovic made some disturbing discoveries:

“[T]he JCVI (Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunization) made continuous efforts to withhold critical data on severe adverse reactions and contraindications⁷³⁸ to vaccinations to both parents and health practitioners in order to reach overall vaccination rates which they deemed were necessary for ‘herd immunity,’ a concept which...does not rest on solid scientific evidence....As a result of such vaccination policy promoted by the JCVI and the DH, many children have been vaccinated without their parents being disclosed the critical information about demonstrated risks of serious adverse reactions, one that the JCVI appeared to have been fully aware of. It would also appear that, by withholding this information, the JCVI/DH neglected the right of individuals to make an informed consent concerning vaccination.”⁷³⁹

The transcripts of the JCVI meetings show that many of the Committee members had extensive ties to pharmaceutical companies and that the JCVI frequently co-operated with vaccine manufacturers on strategies aimed at boosting vaccine uptake.

“Official documents obtained from the U.K. Department of Health (DH) and the JCVI reveal that the British health authorities have been engaging in such practice for the last 30 years, apparently for the sole purpose of protecting the national vaccination program.”⁷⁴⁰

The UK Government was fully aware of MMR vaccine dangers as early as 1989, but covered them up

Beginning on page three of her report, Dr. Tomljenovic begins outlining details of meetings held as early as 1981 where the JCVI clearly engaged in fraud, cover-up, and lies about vaccines to protect the vaccine industry, not children, from harm. Minutes from these meetings reveal that the JCVI actively tried to cover up severe side effects associated with common vaccines like measles and whooping cough (pertussis), both of which were clearly linked at the time to causing severe brain damage in a substantial percentage of the children that received them.⁷⁴¹

Of particular concern was how the JCVI handled unfavorable data on the controversial MMR vaccine for measles, mumps, and rubella. 10 years before Dr. Andrew Wakefield published his study on MMR in *The Lancet*, JCVI was already fully aware that the National Institute for Biological Standards and Control (NIBSC) had identified a clear

⁷³⁸ A contraindication is defined as a specific situation in which a drug, procedure, or surgery should not be used because it may be harmful to the person.

⁷³⁹ Dr. Lucija Tomljenovic, Ph.D. Molecular Biologist, Neural Dynamics Research Group, Dept. of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. <https://www.nsnbc.me/wpcontent/uploads/2013/05/BSEM-2011.pdf>

⁷⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁷⁴¹ Ibid.

link between MMR and vaccine-induced meningitis and encephalitis. But rather than come forward with this information and call for further safety assessments on the vaccine, the JCVI instead censored this critical information from the public, and blatantly lied about the safety of MMR for years.⁷⁴²

“The extent of the JCVI’s concerns with the implications of scientific assessment of vaccine safety on vaccine policy explains why they were opposed to any long-term surveillance for severe neurological disorders following vaccination,” writes Dr. Tomljenovic. “[I]nstead of re-evaluating the vaccination policy, at least until safety concerns were fully evaluated, the JCVI chose to support the existing policy based on incomplete evidence that was available at that time.”⁷⁴³

In other words, the JCVI was more concerned with protecting the reputation of the dangerous MMR vaccine, as well as many other questionable vaccines, than with protecting children from sustaining serious injuries as a result of getting the jabs. As far as the MMR vaccine is concerned, this critical piece of information not only reinforces the legitimacy of Dr. Wakefield’s findings from 10 years later, which were illegitimately declared to be fraudulent by the establishment, but also illustrates just how painfully long this scam has been taking place.

Vaccine companies urged to manipulate data sheets, skew safety studies to promote vaccines

Dr. Tomljenovic also drudged up copious amounts of information on the JCVI’s longtime habit of encouraging vaccine companies to deliberately alter their data sheets in order to make dangerous and ineffective vaccines appear safe and effective, in accordance with their recommendations. When the JCVI’s guidance contraindications for MMR, for instance, did not match those of the vaccine’s manufacturer, JCVI apparently instructed the manufacturer to alter its data sheets to avoid “legal problems.”

Similarly, the JCVI’s official policy was to cherry-pick unreliable studies to support its own opinions on vaccines rather than rely on independent, scientifically-sound studies to make vaccine policy recommendations. Once again, the JCVI’s position on the safety and effectiveness of MMR is an excellent example of this, as the group flat out ignored legitimate MMR studies in favor of industry-backed junk studies like the 2005 Cochrane Review, which technically proved nothing about the alleged safety of MMR because the 31 studies it evaluated did not even meet the group’s basic methodological criteria.

“Over the years, the JCVI has consistently promoted the MMR vaccine as safe, based on studies that have been proven to be either irrelevant, inconclusive, or methodologically questionable,” explains Dr. Tomljenovic, adding that “the JCVI routinely chose to rely on flawed epidemiological studies that only identified “association” rather than “causation,” a rather ironic inaccuracy in light of how

⁷⁴² Dr Andrew Wakefield is a British medical researcher who, in 1998, investigated a consecutive series of children with chronic enterocolitis and regressive developmental disorder which appeared to have been linked to MMR vaccination.

⁷⁴³ Ibid.

scrutinizing the establishment typically is of studies that contradict its own positions.”⁷⁴⁴

The study goes on to explain how vaccine schedules were established through the calculated downplaying of vaccine safety concerns and the over-inflating of vaccine benefits; the promotion of dangerous new vaccines into the pediatric schedule through deception; the discouraging of vaccine safety follow-up studies; and the widespread brainwashing of the public through manipulation and scientific sleight-of-hand tricks. The 45 page paper with detailed evidence can be found: <https://www.nsnbc.me/wpcontent/uploads/2013/05/BSEM-2011.pdf>; this paper was presented at and forms part of the proceedings of The 2011 BSEM Scientific Conference, March 2011, by Dr Lucija Tomljenovic, Ph.D. Molecular Biologist, Neural Dynamics Research Group, Dept. of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

A Closer Look at the Vaccine Debate

As you can see, getting credible independent scientific evidence for vaccines is not always easy. Asking the CDC to investigate the role of vaccines in the development of autism is like asking the tobacco industry to investigate the link between lung cancer and smoking. As was the case with the tobacco industry, pharmaceutical companies pay either directly or indirectly for much of the science that is published. The revolving door of officials in government moving into highly paid positions in the pharmaceutical industry or lobbying also is problematic. The government seems to have a vested interest in not publishing information that would show vaccines in a poor light.

The controlled mainstream media, for the most part, is biased in its coverage of the current vaccine debate. The debate is positioned as parents against doctors, with parents supposedly representing emotional pleas, while doctors are supposedly unified in stating that the “science is settled” regarding vaccines, and universally in favor of mandatory vaccination policy removing parental exemptions.

However, any journalist or investigative reporter covering the issues with any integrity at all will quickly discover that doctors are not unified at all on their positions regarding the science of vaccines in spite of what the pharmaceutical industry, federal government, and controlled mainstream media would like the public to believe. Many doctors who consider themselves “pro-vaccine,” for example, do not believe that ever single vaccine is appropriate for every single individual. Also, there are doctors whom recommend a “delayed” vaccine schedule for some patients, and not always the one-size-fits-all CDC childhood schedule, such as prominent pediatrician, Dr. Sears. Other doctors choose to recommend vaccines based on the actual merit of each vaccine, recommending some, while determining that others are not worth the risk for children, such as the suspect seasonal flu shot.⁷⁴⁵

⁷⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁴⁵The Autism Research Institute (www.AutismResearchInstitute.com) has made the following safety recommendations in childhood vaccines: • Never vaccinate a sick child, even if he or she just has a runny nose. • Never give more than two vaccines simultaneously. • Rather than the MMR vaccine, request that these viral vaccines be given separately, preferably six months apart; give measles last; and do not give any other vaccines for at least 1 year after measles. • Administer vitamins A, D and C before and after vaccines. • Never allow a vaccine containing any level of the mercurial compound, Thimerosal.

In fact, there are numerous medical professionals and researchers, such as the International Medical Council on Vaccination, an association of hundreds of doctors and medical professionals that “counter the messages asserted by pharmaceutical companies, the government and medical agencies that vaccines are safe, effective and harmless.” As this medical organization states “Our conclusions have been reached individually by each member of the Council, after thousands of hours of personal research, study and observation have found the following:”

- We are profoundly critical of the practice of vaccination. Vaccination is an unacceptable risk to every member of society, regardless of age.
- As medical professionals, Council members have observed first-hand the health of vaccinated vs. the unvaccinated. We find the latter group to be robust, healthy and drug-free compared to the former group.
- We have reviewed published studies in support of vaccines and have found them wanting in both substance and science.
- We have brought out into the open hundreds of peer-reviewed, published medical articles that document the damage and the diseases caused by vaccines.

Proponents for vaccine safety argue that mandatory vaccination of all infants and children with vaccines that have not been proven to be effective at eradicating serious illness or death, and which have resulted in serious illness or death for a percentage of children makes no sense. In short, the cost (in human life and suffering) is too high.

Proponents of vaccine safety often advocate for individuality in the vaccine schedule, asserting that decisions about what vaccines a child should receive (or not) should be based on careful consideration of the risks of that child contracting a particular illness, the possible harm to that child as a result of having contracted the illness, and the possible threat to the community if others should become infected.

Pro-vaccination parents and organizations say that those who choose not to vaccinate their children according to the CDC’s recommended schedule are putting the general public at risk, but if the vaccines do indeed work, children who are fully vaccinated should not be at risk of contracting illnesses for which they have received vaccinations. As one popular mantra among advocates for more thoughtful vaccination states, “Saying my unvaccinated child is a risk to your vaccinated child is like saying my child must take birth control pills so your child doesn’t get pregnant.” If you’re protected, you’re protected.

Comparison of the State of health of Vaccinated and unvaccinated children

Children’s health advocates, vaccine safety activists, and medical professionals have been calling for a well-designed publically funded large-scale study comparing completely unvaccinated children with fully vaccinated children for years. So far the CDC has refused.

It may seem surprising to learn that such studies have never been done, considering that as recently as 1985, there were only 3 vaccines in the schedule: DTP, MMR and polio. Today, there are 49 doses of 14 vaccines before the age of 6 and 69 doses of 16

vaccines by the 18 years of age. Taken together, more than 70 different chemicals, heavy metals, human cells/DNA, animal cells/DNA, and known carcinogens are injected into children.

While there have been no official US government-sponsored studies comparing the health of vaccinated to unvaccinated children, several independently funded studies have been done in the US and overseas.⁷⁴⁶

What do these studies show? The research demonstrates that unvaccinated children enjoy far superior health when compared to those vaccinated. Unvaccinated children experience almost no incidence of autism, autoimmune disorders, asthma, allergies, diabetes and other common childhood diseases which have reached epidemic proportions in recent years.

The Research Studies

One study is an ongoing comparative survey by German homeopathic physician Andreas Bachmair. Bachmair is conducting an independent study comparing the health of vaccinated to unvaccinated children with 17,461 participants. This research has found a significant increase in the following diseases in those vaccinated: asthma, allergies, bronchitis, otitis media (ear infections), hay fever, herpes, neurodermatitis, hyperactivity, scoliosis, epilepsy, autoimmune disorders, thyroid disease, autism and diabetes.⁷⁴⁷

In addition, a recent peer-reviewed study comparing health outcomes of vaccinated and unvaccinated children, provisionally published⁷⁴⁸ in the journal *Frontiers in Public Health* in 2017, confirmed that completely unvaccinated children have less chronic disease and a lower risk of autism than vaccinated children. The researchers collected health information on over 660 children from a survey conducted in 2012 of mothers of children between six and twelve years old in four states (Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Oregon). According to the abstract, the team of four scientists found that vaccinated children were less likely than the unvaccinated to have had chickenpox and pertussis (temporary discomfort) but, contrary to expectation, were significantly more likely to have been diagnosed with chronic disease, allergies, and brain or central nervous system disorders, including autism (lifetime disorders).

- Vaccinated children were more than twice as likely to have some chronic illness.
- Vaccinated children were nearly four times as likely to have learning disabilities, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and autism spectrum disorder.

⁷⁴⁶ The majority of these studies have been conducted abroad, but many involve American children.

⁷⁴⁷ For comprehensive survey results for this published study, see: <http://web.archive.org/web/20130306034323/>; <http://www.vaccineinjury.info/vaccinations-in-general/health-unvaccinated-children/survey-results-illnesses.html>, See also, <http://www.thehealthyhomeeconomist.com/survey-results-are-unvaccinated-children-healthier/>

⁷⁴⁸ Even when independent studies are conducted, you may never read them. This study passed the rigorous peer-review process and had been accepted for publication. But just a few days after the abstract was posted on-line, it was pulled by the journal's editor without explanation.


- Vaccinated children who were born prematurely were more than six times more likely to have brain or central nervous system disorders, including autism.

You can read the study, done by Anthony R Mawson, Professor at the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health at Jackson State University, in its entirety at <http://archive.is/leoEn>

Like any study, these papers have limitations. The sample size (666 children) is relatively small, and self-reporting surveys can be unreliable. These findings indicate that larger studies comparing the health outcomes of vaccinated and unvaccinated kids should be done.

It should be noted that this is not a radical view: the National Academy of Medicine (formerly the Institute of Medicine), which advises the federal government on health issues, has recommended further study of vaccines. The Academy specifically recommends focusing on the health outcomes of both vaccinated and unvaccinated children, the long-term cumulative effects of vaccines, the timing of vaccinations in relation to the child's age, the total number of vaccines given, the total number of vaccines given at one time, and the effect of vaccine adjuvants.

Here's a visual depiction of what this particular study found:



While government groups maintain that no studies have been done to compare the health of vaccinated to unvaccinated, the reality is that several comparative studies have been completed by independent researchers in the US and in other countries.

Other studies had similar results and are reported below:

- In 1992, the Immunization Awareness Society (IAS) conducted a survey to examine the health of New Zealand's children. The results of their study indicated that unvaccinated children were far healthier than vaccinated children.⁷⁴⁹
- A German study released in September 2011 of about 8000 UNVACCINATED children, newborn to 19 years, show vaccinated children have at least 2 to 5 times more diseases and disorders than unvaccinated children.⁷⁵⁰
- In the Amish community of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, one in 4,875 children were diagnosed with autism. Of the four total Amish children diagnosed, one had been exposed to high levels of mercury from a power plant, and three others, including one adopted outside of the community, had been vaccinated. This rate is extremely low to non-existent compared to vaccinated. Similarly, the Amish of Ohio show that one out of 10,000 children are diagnosed with autism. In the general population, one in 45 children is now being diagnosed with autism.⁷⁵¹
- In a Homefirst Health Services survey in which 90 percent of children have had no vaccinations, none of the 35,000 children had an autism diagnosis. Furthermore, these children had an extremely low asthma rates.⁷⁵²
- In a Cal-Oregon survey of 9,000 boys, those children vaccinated experienced a 155 percent greater chance of having a neurological disorder such as autism or ADHD.⁷⁵³
- A 2004 British study of 8,000 unvaccinated children, which included medical documentation for each child, revealed that vaccinated children experienced two to five times more illness and disorders compared to unvaccinated children.⁷⁵⁴
- A 1992 New Zealand study of 495 children concluded that vaccinated children suffer up to ten times more compared to unvaccinated children when it came to

⁷⁴⁹ <http://www.vaccineinjury.info/images/stories/ias1992study.pdf>

⁷⁵⁰ <http://www.vaccineinjury.info/survey/results-unvaccinated/results-illnesses.html>

⁷⁵¹ <http://www.vaccinationcouncil.org/quick-compare-2/>; <http://www.thevaccinereaction.org/2015/12/cdc-1-in-45-children-diagnosed-with-autism/>

⁷⁵² <http://www.vaccinationcouncil.org/2009/05/22/a-pretty-big-secret/>

⁷⁵³ <http://www.vaccinationcouncil.org/quick-compare-2/>

⁷⁵⁴ McKeever and TM. American Journal of Public Health. June 2004. V 94

diseases studied to include tonsillitis, ear infections, sleep apnea, hyperactivity and epilepsy.⁷⁵⁵

- In a 1997 New Zealand study, 1265 children were surveyed. Of those children who were vaccinated, 23 percent were reported to suffer from asthma and 30 percent suffered from allergies, compared to none in the unvaccinated group.⁷⁵⁶

Since “the long-term effects of individual vaccines and of the vaccination program itself remain unknown” and since the CDC has no credibility, these studies should be given careful consideration by all parents and professionals studying vaccination safety.

Conclusion

This generation of children in the United States is sicker than any previous generation with over 50% of children experiencing one or more chronic illness. Many of those illnesses are autoimmune diseases. Cancer is the leading cause of death by disease among children in the US. The US ranks 19th among developed nations in infant mortality. It also has the most highly vaccinated children beginning on the day a child is born. The CDC states that 1 child in 6 – or more – suffers from learning disabilities. Millions suffer from allergies, asthma, ADD/ADHD, insulin-dependent diabetes, autoimmune disease and cancer. **Since vaccines have never been tested for carcinogenicity (causing cancer) or mutagenicity (causing autoimmune disease), how can there even be at this point any rational, sensible, reasonable claim made regarding the true safety of vaccines? It’s impossible because that research has never been done.** Yet, if you look at the individual components of vaccines such as formaldehyde (carcinogenic), thimerosal (toxic and carcinogenic), phenols (corrosive to skin), aluminum (neurotoxin), methanol (toxic), isopropyl (toxic), 2-Phenoxyethanol (toxic)—**there are numerous studies showing that the individual components of vaccines cause cancer and autoimmune disease.**

Further, vaccination is a medical treatment administered to an otherwise healthy individual. Virtually all other invasive medical interventions occur only once someone has fallen ill. Vaccination, like most medical treatments, can involve some risk. And therefore it should be undertaken only after careful consideration of its risks versus its benefits. Since the CDC has no credibility when it comes to the real determination of vaccine safety, it is highly recommended to watch the in-depth 9-part documentary series ‘Vaccines Revealed’ exposing more of the corruption and the risks and benefits of vaccines. More information on this docu-series can be found at www.vaccinesrevealed.com. And although it has received strong condemnation by the controlled mainstream media, it is also recommended to watch the well-researched documentary: Vaxxed: From Cover-Up to Catastrophe (which can also be rented and viewed online at Amazon.com).

Also included as a resource to help the reader make an informed decision on what is best for you and your family is a web address as a footnote below to a massive free resource Vaccine Peer Review: History Of Vaccination In 1000 Peer Reviewed Reports

⁷⁵⁵ Fallon, Sally, Cowan, Thomas,MD. The Nourishing Traditions Book of Baby Childcare. New Trends Publishing, 2013. 112, 317.

⁷⁵⁶ Kemp, T. et al. Epidemiology. November 1997. 678–80.

1915–2015. This free book contains only published, accepted peer reviewed reports written by hundreds of prominent and duly recognized medical professionals and specialists, scientists, clinicians and researchers from around the world whose integrity hasn't been compromised by influence or wealth.

We'll conclude this chapter by providing a variety of additional views from medical professionals regarding vaccines so the reader can gain more insight on how "settled the science really is" on this issue despite what the controlled mainstream media **wants you to believe**. If readers want to familiarize themselves with the "other" side of the vaccine debate they need only turn to any mainstream media source as the other side has been presented almost without challenge by every conceivable means:

Dr. Harold Buttram, MD, Fellow American Academy of Environmental Medicine
"The harm from vaccines has seriously exceeded the benefit of disease prevention."

Dr. John B. Classen, M.D., noted American Immunologist, former Chief Science Officer for the NIH's department of immunology: "Vaccinating every child against every disease is fundamentally unsound. ... There is a 3.78-fold increased risk of insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus in children from today's vaccines. ... All autoimmune diseases are increasing in incidence. General immune (over) stimulation from vaccines is a cause of autoimmunity."

Dr. Robert Johnson, Immunologist, University of Colorado, in response to results from a secret study that confirmed a dose-response link between Thimerosal and neurodevelopmental disorders in children: "Forgive this personal comment, but I got called out at eight o'clock for an emergency call and my daughter-in-law delivered a son by C-section. Our first male in the line of the next generation and I do not want that grandson to get a Thimerosal containing vaccine until we know better what is going on....I want that grandson to only be given Thimerosal-free vaccines."⁷⁵⁷

Dr. John Clements, vaccines advisor at the World Health Organization in response to results from a secret study that confirmed a dose-response link between Thimerosal and neurodevelopmental disorders in children: "But there is now the point at which the research results have to be handled, and even if this committee decides that there is no association and that information gets out, the work has been done and through the freedom of information that will be taken by others and will be used in other ways beyond the control of this group. And I am very concerned about that as I suspect that it is already too late to do anything regardless of any professional body and what they say ... My mandate as I sit here in this group is to make sure at the end of the day that 100,000,000 are immunized with DTP, Hepatitis B and if possible Hib, this year, next year and for many years to come, and that will have to be with thimerosal containing vaccines unless a miracle occurs and an alternative is found quickly and is tried and found to be safe."⁷⁵⁸

Dr. Peter Fletcher, former Chief Scientific Officer, Department of Health in the UK in his response to a question regarding the high rates of autism among Somali children in Minneapolis: "I have always thought since I first heard about the Somali children that

⁷⁵⁷ Dr. Robert Johnson, Immunologist, University of Colorado, Simpsonwood, GA, June 7, 2000

⁷⁵⁸ Statement by Dr. John Clements, World Health Organization, Simpsonwood, GA, June 7, 2000

this really proves the causal role of vaccines. The Amish children who have no vaccines have no autistic-like disorders and the Somali children who are newly exposed to aggressive vaccine programs have exceptionally high levels! What more evidence is needed?"⁷⁵⁹

Julie Gerberding, Director of the CDC (before she took the revolving door to Merck's vaccine division) on CNN admitting to vaccine damage that include autism-like symptoms: "Now, we all know that vaccines can occasionally cause fevers in kids. So if a child was immunized, got a fever, had other complications from the vaccines. And if you're predisposed with the mitochondrial disorder, it can certainly set off some damage. Some of the symptoms can be symptoms that have characteristics of autism."⁷⁶⁰

Health and Human Services (HHS) officials on CNN trying to explain away compensation for vaccine brain injuries: "The government has never compensated, nor has it ever been ordered to compensate, any case based on a determination that autism was actually caused by vaccines. We have compensated cases in which children exhibited an encephalopathy, or general brain disease. Encephalopathy may be accompanied by a medical progression of an array of symptoms including autistic behavior, autism, or seizures."⁷⁶¹

Dr. Mayer Eisenstein MD, JD, MPH, Founder and Medical Director of the Eisenstein Medical Centers "40 years ago when I started my practice only 1 in 10,000 children had autism. Today it's 1 in 100. What is the only difference we have seen? The inordinate number of vaccines that are being given to children today. My partners and I have over 35,000 patients who have never been vaccinated. You know how many cases of autism we have seen? ZERO, ZERO. I have made this statement for over 40 years: "NO VACCINES NO AUTISM".

Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., Harvard educated, environmental activist, author, attorney: "Searching for children who had not been exposed to mercury in vaccines—the kind of population that scientists typically use as a "control" in experiments - [journalist and United Press International senior editor] Dan Olmsted scoured the Amish of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, who refuse to immunize their infants. Given the national rate of autism, Olmsted calculated that there should be 130 autistics among the Amish. He found only four. One had been exposed to high levels of mercury from a power plant. The other three—including one child adopted from outside the Amish community—had received their vaccines."⁷⁶²

Dr. Mark R. Geier, MD, Ph.D in genetics, President of the Genetic Centers of America, former researcher at the National Institutes of Health, and professor at the Johns Hopkins University: "In my view, this is not a scientific issue. This is about as proven an issue as you're ever going to see, and what's occurring here is a cover up

⁷⁵⁹ <http://m.huffpost.com/us/entry/146717>

⁷⁶⁰ <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0803/29/hcsg.01.html>

⁷⁶¹ http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-31727_162-20016356-10391695.html"

⁷⁶² Rolling Stone Magazine, Deadly Immunity by Robert F. Kennedy JR., June 20, 2005

under the guise of protecting the vaccine program. And I'm for the vaccine program. You keep covering it up and you're not going to have a vaccine program."

Dr. Kenneth Stoller, pediatrician with over two decades specializing in brain injured children, faculty member of Medical Academy of Pediatric Special Needs, and adjunct Assistant Professor at the AT Still School of Medicine: "Some will have you believe that autism is some medical mystery that's always been around, one that we just have managed to get a handle on. So, show me the 30-year-olds with autism, the 40-year-olds with autism, and the 50-year-olds with autism. Guess what? They aren't there for the most part. The explosion in the number of children with autism is real, but most of the scientific community has ignored this. Let's face it: they have been encouraged to ignore it, and anyone getting close to the truth finds that they get their NIH research grants pulled. That's right...science is being manipulated, so that a big lie can stay alive, and those culpable can remain unaccountable.⁷⁶³

Charles Pragnell, prominent UK social worker, child-welfare and protection expert, senior manager of social services, researcher and author who is regularly published in journals in the U.K., South Africa, and online: "There is a pandemic of autism among children in the western world and it is spreading worldwide. Thousands upon thousands of children are being diagnosed as autistic every day in the U.S.A., and the U.K., and increasingly in Australia. A few decades ago the incidence of autism affected only one child in a thousand but now it is more than one child in a hundred. But the first most important question to be asked is, 'Why has this pandemic occurred over the last four decades?' and the answer is simple yet infinitely complex. It has been caused by vaccinations of various kinds, but principally the Measles, Mumps, and Rubella vaccine. [MMR]. This has been known to the pharmaceutical industry, the Western governments, and to health and medical professionals for decades but they mounted one of the most slick and collusive denials and distractive tactics ever known...the evidence that vaccines cause autism is now clear and convincing and irrefutable. And possibly that there are links to other illnesses such as asthma, allergies, diabetes, Crohn's disease and probably a range of other illnesses which are on the increase, It has been admitted in Court Proceedings in America by government medical experts and the cat is finally out of the bag.⁷⁶⁴

Journalist David Kirby wrote in the Huffington Post in 2008: "The Federal Government recently conceded a real vaccine-autism lawsuit in a real court and will soon pay a real (taxpayer-funded) settlement to a real American family and a very real child with autism.....If I were the AAP [American Academy of Pediatrics]...I would feel downright silly stating that "no scientific link exists," so soon after the Journal of Child Neurology⁷⁶⁵ published a study titled, "Blood Levels of Mercury Are Related to Diagnosis of Autism: A Reanalysis of an Important Data Set." I would also worry about parental reaction to learning that researchers had done due diligence and reanalyzed data from a prior, hugely influential study that (erroneously) found zero connection between mercury levels and autism.....Another study, freshly out of Harvard, likewise

⁷⁶³ Throwing Children into Oncoming Traffic: The Truth about Autism by Kenneth Stoller, MD, FAAP with Anne McElroy Dachel

⁷⁶⁴ Charles Pragnell, The Silence of the Media Lambs! March 28, 2008.

⁷⁶⁵ <http://jcn.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/22/11/1308>

shows a potential link between mercury and the autopsied brains of young people with autism. The American Journal of Biochemistry and Biotechnology reports that a marker for oxidative stress was 68.9% higher in autistic brain tissue than controls (a statistically significant result), while mercury levels were 68.2% higher.⁷⁶⁶

Dr. Lucija Tomljenovic, Neural Dynamics Research Group University of British Columbia: “According to the US Food and Drug Administration, safety assessments for vaccines have often not included appropriate toxicity studies because vaccines have not been viewed as inherently toxic. Taken together, these observations raise plausible concerns about the overall safety of current childhood vaccination programs.”⁷⁶⁷

“The argument of forcing a parent to vaccinate their child in the name of the “greater good argument” is flawed both scientifically and ethically. Firstly, all drugs are associated with some risks of adverse reactions...Secondly, medical ethics demand that vaccination should be carried out with the participant’s full and informed consent. This necessitates an objective disclosure of the known or foreseeable vaccination benefits and risks. The way in which pediatric vaccines are often promoted by various health authorities indicates that such disclosure is rarely given from the basis of best available knowledge but rather, largely unproven and/or untenable assumptions on both, vaccine safety and effectiveness.”

Dr. Harold Buttram, MD, Fellow American Academy of Environmental Medicine: “It is now universally recognized that we have a steadily growing epidemic of childhood autism, learning disabilities, and other developmental disorders, with comparable increases in asthma and allergies. By any measure now available, these conditions were rare during the 1930s and 1940s. If this trend is to be reversed, we must seek for causes. As largely disclosed during the U.S. Congressional Hearings on issues of vaccine safety, which took place from 1999 to December, 2004, there are gross deficiencies in vaccine safety testing. Because of this lack, we have no means of identifying or proving adverse reactions when they do occur. Almost totally lacking until now, the great need is for definitive before-and-after tests specifically designed to search for adverse effects of vaccines on the neurological and immune systems as well as genetics of our children, and in findings adverse effects to make appropriate safety modifications in vaccine programs....Safety studies on vaccinations are limited to short time periods only: several days to several weeks. There are NO (NONE) long term (months or years) safety studies on any vaccination or immunization. For this reason, there are valid grounds for suspecting that many delayed-type vaccine reactions may be taking place unrecognized as to their true nature....It is almost inconceivable that these heavy burdens of foreign immunologic materials, introduced into the immature systems of children, could fail to bring about disruptions and adverse reactions in these systems...When arbitrary decisions in the mandating of vaccines are made by government bureaucracies, which frequently work hand-in-glove with the pharmaceutical industry, with no recourse open to parents, we have all the potential ingredients for a tragedy of historic proportions.”⁷⁶⁸

⁷⁶⁶ See <http://m.huffpost.com/us/entry/83472>

⁷⁶⁷ From the Journal *Lupus*, February 2012 by Lucija Tomljenovic CA Shaw, Neural Dynamics Research Group

⁷⁶⁸ Harold Buttram, “Vaccine Scene 1999: Overview and Update.”

Dr. Eric Faure, molecular biologist and researcher, University de Provence, France
“Reports of multiple sclerosis developing after hepatitis B vaccination have led to the concern that this vaccine might be a cause of multiple sclerosis in previously healthy subjects. We hypothesise that some of the apparent adverse reactions to the vaccine could be due to a process called of molecular mimicry, the Hepatitis B Virus polymerase, which could be a contaminant in the recombinant or plasma-derived vaccines, could act as autoantigens and induce autoimmune demyelinating diseases such as multiple sclerosis.”⁷⁶⁹

A 2010 article in the international peer reviewed BMJ (formerly known as the British Medical Journal): “The large number of children suffering harms — and subsequent suspension of the vaccine — challenges the assumption that regulators are ensuring the safety and efficacy of all marketed therapeutics....There are actually relatively little data on the effects of vaccinating young children against influenza. Some manufacturers have even withheld data from public scrutiny amidst general indifference. Evidence from all comparative influenza vaccine studies shows that harms, when they are investigated, are not reported consistently and systematically. As pandemic vaccines are provided to governments and not individuals and manufacturers are indemnified for damages caused to users, there seem to be few incentives for investigation of harms.”⁷⁷⁰

Dr. Bernard Rimland, American research psychologist, author, and Director of the Autism Research Institute: “Much attention has been focused on the MMR shot itself, whereas in all probability it is a combination of...the increasing number of vaccines, the large amount of mercury, and the inherent danger of the triple vaccine...The MMR vaccine is also especially suspect because laboratories in England, Ireland, and Japan have found evidence of MMR vaccine viruses in the intestinal tracts of autistic children, but not in control group, non-autistic children...Autism is not the only severe chronic illness which has reached epidemic proportions as the number of (profitable) vaccines has rapidly increased. Children now receive 33 vaccines before they enter school — a huge increase. The vaccines contain not only live viruses but also very significant amounts of highly toxic substances such as mercury, and formaldehyde. Could this be the reason for the upsurge in autism, ADHD, asthma, arthritis, Crohn’s disease, lupus and other chronic disorders?”⁷⁷¹

Dr. Archie Kalokerinos, MD, medical researcher, physician, Fellow of the International Academy of Preventive Medicine, and recipient of the Australian Medal of Merit for Outstanding Scientific Research: “The further I looked the more shocked I became. I found that the whole vaccine business was indeed a gigantic hoax. Most doctors are convinced that they are useful, but if you look at the proper statistics and study the instances of these diseases you will realize that this is not so.”⁷⁷²

⁷⁶⁹ Faure E., E.R. Biodiversity and Environment, case 5, University of Provence, Place Victor Hugo 13331 Marseilles cedex 3, France

⁷⁷⁰ “Australia suspends seasonal flu vaccination of young children” by Melissa Sweet, BMJ • May 2010

⁷⁷¹ Bernard Rimland, Testimony before House Committee on Government Reform, April 6, 2000, see also, Autism Research Institute, press release, February 12, 2001.

⁷⁷² Archie Kalokerinos, Interview, International Vaccine Newsletter, June 1995,

Dr. Robert Mendelsohn, MD, American pediatrician, and associate professor of pediatrics at the university of Illinois College of Medicine: “There is no convincing scientific evidence that mass inoculations can be credited with eliminating any childhood disease....The greatest threat of childhood diseases lies in the dangerous and ineffectual efforts made to prevent them through mass immunization....There are significant risks associated with every immunization and numerous contraindications that may make it dangerous for the shots to be given to your child...There is growing suspicion that immunization against relatively harmless childhood diseases may be responsible for the dramatic increase in autoimmune diseases since mass inoculations were introduced. These are fearful diseases such as cancer, leukemia, rheumatoid arthritis, multiple sclerosis, Lou Gehrig’s disease, lupus erythematosus, and the Guillain–Barré syndrome.”⁷⁷³

Dr. Viera Scheibner, PhD, research scientist, author, International Medical Counsel on Vaccination: “I did not find it difficult to conclude that there is no evidence whatsoever that vaccines of any kind are effective in preventing the infectious diseases they are supposed to prevent. Further, adverse effects are amply documented and are far more significant to public health than any adverse effects of infectious diseases. Immunizations not only did not prevent any infectious diseases, they caused more suffering and more deaths than has any other human activity in the entire history of medical intervention. It will be decades before the mopping-up after the disasters caused by childhood vaccination will be completed....[E]ver since any measles vaccines have been introduced and used in mass proportions, reports of outbreaks and epidemics of measles in even 100% vaccinated populations started filling pages in medical journals. It is less well known to the general public that vaccinated children started developing an especially vicious form of measles, due to the altered host immune response caused by the deleterious effect of the measles vaccines. It resisted all orthodox treatment and carried a high mortality rate. It has become known as atypical measles (AMS). In the meantime, outbreaks of measles in vaccinated children have continued and intensified to this day....Polio has not been eradicated by vaccination, it is lurking behind a redefinition and new diagnostic names like viral or aseptic meningitis...According to one of the 1997 issues of the MMWR, there are some 30,000 to 50,000 cases of viral meningitis per year in the United States alone. That’s where all those 30,000–50,000 cases of polio disappeared after the introduction of mass vaccination.”⁷⁷⁴

Dr. Philip Incao, MD, researcher, author, who has been studying children’s health, the immune system, infections, and vaccinations since 1970: “The best way to determine the risk–benefit profile of any vaccination is well known and in theory is quite simple: Take a group of vaccinated children and compare them with a matched group of unvaccinated children...Incredible as it sounds, such a common–sense controlled study comparing vaccinated to unvaccinated children has never been done in America for any vaccination. This means that mass vaccination is essentially a large–scale experiment on our nation’s children...A critical point which is never mentioned by those advocating mandatory vaccination of children is that children’s health has declined significantly since 1960 when vaccines began to be widely used. According to

⁷⁷³ Robert S. Mendelsohn, “The Medical Time Bomb of Immunization against Disease,” East West Journal, November 1984.

⁷⁷⁴ Viera Scheibner, Vaccination: 100 Years of Orthodox Research (Co–Creative Designs, 1993),

the National Health Interview Survey conducted annually by the National Center for Health Statistics since 1957, a shocking 31% of U.S. children today have a chronic health problem, 18% of children require special health care or related services and 6.7% of children have a significant disability due to a chronic physical or mental condition. Respiratory allergies, asthma and learning disabilities are the most common of these...⁷⁷⁵

According to Dr. Hugh Fudenberg, MD, the world's leading immunogeneticist and 13th most quoted biologist of our time (nearly 900 papers in peer review journals), "if an individual has had five consecutive flu shots between 1970 and 1980 (the years studied) his/ her chances of getting Alzheimer's Disease is ten times higher than if they had one, two or no shots due to the mercury and aluminum that is in every flu shot (and most childhood shots). The gradual mercury and aluminum buildup in the brain causes cognitive dysfunction. Is that why Alzheimer's is expected to quadruple?"⁷⁷⁶

Dr. Howard B. Urnovitz, PhD in microbiology and immunology, senior scientist at the Institute of Cancer Research, Scientific Director, Chronic Illness Research Foundation: "Had my mother and father known that the poliovirus vaccines of the 1950s were heavily contaminated with more than 26 monkey viruses, including the cancer virus SV40, I can say with certainty that they would not have allowed their children and themselves to take those vaccines. Both of my parents might not have developed cancers suspected of being vaccine-related, and might even be alive today."⁷⁷⁷

Dr. Eva Snead, MD, author, physician and researcher and well nown public speaker in health issues: "Within a few years of the polio vaccine we started seeing some strange phenomena like the year before the first 300,000 doses were given in the United States childhood leukemia had never struck in children under the age of two. One year after the first onslaught they had the first cases of children under the age of two that died of leukemia."⁷⁷⁸

Dr. Gordon Stewart, MD, Emeritus Professor of Public Health, University of Glasgow: "My own view, based upon some years of observation and experience, is quite firm. I supported the use of the vaccine in 1951 and subsequently with very little hesitation until about 1972, and gave pertussis vaccine between 1951 and 1956 to each of my four children. I would not dream of doing so again because it has become clear to me not only that the vaccine is incompletely protective, but also that the side-effects which I thought to be temporary are in fact dangerous, unpredictably so. There is no doubt in my mind that in the UK alone some hundreds, if not thousands, of well infants have suffered irreparable brain damage needlessly and that their lives and

⁷⁷⁵ Philip Incao, testimony for Ohio House of Representatives, March 1, 1999.

⁷⁷⁶ "Recorded from Dr. Fudenberg's speech at the NVIC International Vaccine Conference, Arlington, VA, September 1997. Alzheimer's to quadruple statement is from Johns Hopkins Newsletter Nov 1998."

⁷⁷⁷ Testimony of Howard B. Urnovitz, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, House of Representatives, August 3, 1999.

⁷⁷⁸ Radio interview of Eva Snead by Laura Lee, September 19, 1992.

those of their parents have been wrecked in consequence.”⁷⁷⁹

Dr. David Ayoub, MD, physician and researcher specializing on the additives and preservatives used in vaccines: “I am no longer “trying to dig up evidence to prove” vaccines cause autism. There is already abundant evidence...This debate is not scientific but is political.”⁷⁸⁰

Dr. Boyd Haley, PhD, Chairman of Chemistry Department, University of Kentucky: “I have encouraged parents of autistic children in the USA to get urinary porphyrin profiles done to determine if their child shows signs of mercury toxicity. It is almost 100% that these children, at least those that have reported back to me, are moderate to extremely mercury toxic with regards to this clinical testing procedure. Just where would children less than 7 years of age obtain enough mercury to inhibit their porphyrin pathways? So the IOM [Institute of Medicine] suggests looking everywhere except where the most logical place would be, in the vaccines given to these children that contained thimerosal. The IOM ought to be ashamed of itself, if not for doing something scientifically dishonest, then for being so inept as to think vaccine exclusion from consideration of exclusion for autism causation would be accepted by the American public. Most importantly, while they are looking everywhere else these children lose time before an acceptable treatment for mercury toxicity can be developed –and at least a significant number of autistic children are definitely mercury toxic.”

Dr. Thomas Levy, J.D., M.D., board certified cardiologist and bar certified attorney, author, medical researcher and inductee in the Orthomolecular Medicine Hall of Fame: “Statistically speaking, the data regarding DPT vaccinated infants is absolutely frightening. The death rate is eight times greater than normal within only three days of receiving a DPT shot. The dreaded Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS) clusters very strongly around the typical time frame of DPT shot administration. DPT vaccinations are usually given at ages two months, four months, and six months. SIDS occurs mostly during the same time frame (85% from one to six months), with the largest incidence occurring at two and four months, in a bimodal fashion. This means that most of the SIDS cases actually cluster directly after the injections, and not in smooth fashion over the entire time period. One study showed that of 103 infants who died of SIDS, 70% had received the DPT vaccine within three weeks.”⁷⁸¹

Dr. Gerhard Buchwald, MD, German physician, specialist of Internal disease, author of nearly 200 scientific papers concerning vaccinations and damage caused by them: “The “victory over epidemics” was not won by medical science or by doctors –and certainly not by vaccines...the decline...has been the result of technical, social and hygienic improvements and especially of improved nutrition...Consider carefully whether you want to let yourself or your children undergo the dangerous, controversial, ineffective and no longer necessary procedure called vaccination, because the claim that vaccinations are the cause for the decline of infectious diseases

⁷⁷⁹ Gordon Stewart, “Danger,” Here’s Health, March 1980.

⁷⁸⁰ David Ayoub, “Discovering the Causes, Treatment of Autism,” July 9, 2006.

⁷⁸¹ Thomas Levy, “Vaccination –the Shot that Keeps on Shooting.”

is utter nonsense.”⁷⁸²

Dr. Peter Morrell, medical historian, Staffordshire University, UK: “In truth, every major infection for which vaccines exist was originally in massive decline before a single vaccine was introduced. This certainly applies to Diphtheria, Tuberculosis, Whooping Cough and Measles.”⁷⁸³

Dr. Russell L. Blaylock, MD, author, U.S. neurosurgeon, a clinical professor of neurosurgery at the University of Mississippi Medical Center and visiting professor in the biology department at Belhaven College: “They say that if children are not vaccinated against measles millions of children could die during a measles epidemic. They know this is nonsense. What they are using is examples taken from developing countries with poor nutrition and poor immune function in which such epidemic death can occur. In the United States we would not see this because of better nutrition, better health facilities and better sanitation. In fact, most deaths seen when measles outbreaks occur in the United States occur either in children in which vaccination was contraindicated, the vaccine did not work or in children with chronic, immune-suppressing diseases. In fact, in most studies these children catching the measles or other childhood diseases have been either fully immunized or partially immunized. The big secret among “vaccinologists” is that anywhere from 20 to 50% of children are not resistant to the diseases for which they have been immunized.”⁷⁸⁴

Laboratory of Signal Transduction, Department of Cell Biology, Institute for Virus Research, Kyoto University: “Many live attenuated vaccines for animals (including humans) are manufactured by using cell lines from animals, which are known to produce infectious ‘endogenous retroviruses’ (Remnants of ancestral exogenous retroviral infections fixed in the germline DNA); however, the risks of infection by ERVs from xenospecies through vaccination have been ignored.”

Inmaculada de Melo-Martín and K. Intemann, Division of Medical Ethics “Dissent is crucial for the advancement of science. Disagreement is at the heart of peer review and is important for uncovering unjustified assumptions, flawed methodologies and problematic reasoning.”⁷⁸⁵

⁷⁸² Gerhard Buchwald, *The Vaccination Nonsense: 2004 Lectures* (Norderstedt, Germany: Books on Demand GmbH, 2004), 108.

⁷⁸³ Peter Morrell, “Vaccination: The Wider Picture,” (October 13, 2000)

⁷⁸⁴ Russell Blaylock, “The Truth Behind the Vaccine Cover-up,” 2004.

⁷⁸⁵ I. de Melo-Martín K. Intemann, Division of Medical Ethics, Department of Public Health, Weill Cornell Medical College, NY.

Appendix C

A CLOSER LOOK AT COMMON CORE EDUCATION

In America we actually have a 1965 federal statute that prohibits the Federal Government from creating a national curriculum, or national education standards. Common Core was a successful attempt to circumvent that through the commissioning of private entities to construct the curriculum and the standards.⁷⁸⁶

A small number of individuals within two Washington DC lobbyist groups connected to the Carnegie Foundation crafted the Common Core standards behind closed doors. They were paid by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, to the tune of initially one \$150 million in 2009.

The History of Bill Gates and UNESCO

To understand Bill Gates' part in the transformation of public education, in 2004, Bill Gates initially contracted with UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) to fulfill part of UNESCO'S Millennium Campaign Goals—universal education and educating for a global economy. Mr. Gates was tasked to develop a “master curriculum” for teacher training in information technologies based standards, guidelines, benchmarks, and assessment techniques.

It's interesting to note right away that the United States withdrew from UNESCO on December 31, 1984 with the issuance of the formal announcement:

"Unesco has extraneously politicized virtually every subject it deals with, has exhibited hostility toward the basic institutions of a free society, especially a free market and a free press..."

Nearly twenty years later, in 2002, President Bush announced that America would rejoin UNESCO and “participate fully in its mission. . . .” On September 10, 2003 the United Nations declared 2005 through 2015, “The Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD).” The UN also named UNESCO as the lead agency for this global effort. On October 3, 2003, celebrating our new partnership with UNESCO, then-Secretary of Education Rod Paige addressed the UN Round Table on Education. He explained:

"The United States is pleased to return to UNESCO . . . There and here, we agree that we must make education a universal reality. Our governments have entrusted us with the responsibility of preparing our children to become citizens of the world. . . . UNESCO . . . knows the importance of education on a global level by coordinating the Education for All initiative (EFA). EFA is consistent with our recent legislation, the No Child Left Behind Act."

The official launch ceremony for this UN led educational transformation took place on March 1, 2005 in New York City. According to UNESCO, “The Decade of ESD is a far-reaching and complex undertaking. that potentially touches on every aspect of life. The basic vision . . . is a world where everyone . . . learns the values, behavior, and lifestyles required for a sustainable future and for positive societal transformation.”

⁷⁸⁶ Moreover, in 1979 the law that created the Department of Education forbids it to exercise “any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum” or “program of instruction” of any school system. Furthermore, the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees that the states have sovereignty over educating their children. The power to oversee education belongs to the states or to the people themselves, not to the federal government.

Unfortunately for America, the "values, behavior, and lifestyles" that UNESCO requires for "societal transformation" run contrary to American principles of liberty. In fact, one of the early mottos of UNESCO was essentially "your children are our children"—that idea that we're all one body, all kids belong to the same world view, and that is who Bill Gates linked up with back in 2004, with this drive towards broadening American education so that it was geared towards the world—and not to be a citizen in this country **but to becoming a citizen of the world**.

Even from its inception, in one of its first efforts in 1949, the UNESCO textbook titled "Toward World Understanding," which used to teach teachers what to teach, said:

"As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in the world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism."

And going back even before UNESCO, the Rockefeller sponsored and financed 'founding fathers of American public education,' Horace Mann, and John Dewey, both wanted American public education precisely to make it more global and less uniquely American.

The actual implementation of Common Core

The federal program "Race to the Top" (RTTT) was used to get it into the schools. This was during the economic crisis of 2009 and the President was stimulating the economy and spending billions of taxpayer dollars on bailing out companies and banks. RTTT, was designed to take billions of American taxpayer dollars and hand it out to the states, simply for their education budgets. States could spend that money on whatever they wanted, with no strings attached, except one: any state that took Race to the Top money, in any form at all, was obligated to adopt the Common Core State Standards when they were finally written. Most of the states who simply took the money out of desperation for their state education budgets agreed to take Common Core, sight unseen—as this was before the Common Core Standards were ever written. By now, over eight years later, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has spent over \$6.0 billion on lobbying, implementation, and donating to educational groups on the condition that they support the Common Core Standards.

The Common Core State Standards were written in secret by a small group of individuals, and then copyrighted by two Washington lobbyists group (the National Governors Association (NGA), and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)), making it devoid of any government ownership. This copyright is not held by the Department of Education or the Congress of the United States, it is not held by the States or the teachers, or the moms and dads. It means the standards cannot be changed or altered, and the individuals who own the copyright are not accountable to the American taxpayer, to the American voter. These private organizations transformed the formal education of tens of millions of elementary, middle-school, and high-school students in America overnight, and we the people can't get at them. And all of this was done because the Federal Government simply couldn't do their own national standards; they are legally prohibited from doing so. So they did the next best thing: they enabled people close to them, without any oversight or any way for American

citizens electorally to get at them.⁷⁸⁷

Proponents of the Common Core standards insist they are merely benchmarks, simple guideposts that teachers can follow to improve student learning. But this is untruthful as the curriculum and the standards are intertwined and are not easily separated. So if the federally funded Common Core group controls the standards, which come before the teaching, and they control the test, which comes after the teaching, then they will control the teaching, which is the curriculum. As both Common Core architect David Coleman and Common Core financier-in-chief Bill Gates affirmed:

“When the standards are aligned to the tests, the curriculum will line up as well, and the teachers will have no choice but to teach to the tests.”

Given that the only real way to measure the effectiveness of Common Core is the exams, it is clear that whoever controls the tests controls what happens in the classroom. And despite eight years and counting for the Common Core era, that alignment between tests and standards did not begin in earnest for most states until spring 2015. This long postponement of the tests was by design: the engineers of Common Core knew exactly how arbitrary, stressful, and transformative the tests would be, and therefore delayed them until the elaborate and expensive infrastructure was set firmly in place—and nearly impossible to remove. Moreover, even the Architect of Common Core, David Coleman has publically admitted:

“...teachers will teach towards the test. There is no force strong enough on this earth to prevent that. There is no amount of hand-waving, there’s no amount of saying, ‘They teach to the standards, not the test; we don’t do that here.’ Whatever. The truth is – and if I misrepresent you, you are welcome to take the mic back. But the truth is teachers do.”⁷⁸⁸

This is the reason Common Core has such shadowy and corporate origins, tacitly underwritten with government input, money, and support. Robert S. Eitel and Kent D. Talbert, former deputy general counsel and general counsel, respectively, of the U.S. Department of Education, questioned its legality:

“These standards and assessments will ultimately direct the course of elementary and secondary study in most states across the nation, running the risk that states will become little more than administrative agents for a nationalized K–12 program of instruction and raising a fundamental question about whether the Department is exceeding its statutory boundaries.”⁷⁸⁹

⁷⁸⁷ The copyright states: NGA Center/CCSSO shall be acknowledged as the sole owners and developers of the Common Core State Standards, and no claims to the contrary shall be made. Any publication or public display shall include the following notice: “Copyright 2010. National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers. All rights reserved.” States and territories of the United States as well as the District of Columbia that have adopted the Common Core State Standards in whole are exempt from this provision of the license.

⁷⁸⁸ David Coleman, Carnegie Corporation and architect of Common Core, 2011 Keynote Speech; Institute for Learning

⁷⁸⁹ Eitel, Talbert, and Evers, “The Road to a National Curriculum: The Legal Aspects of the Common Core Standards, Race to the Top, and Conditional Waivers.”

The fact that something as transformative as Common Core could be conceived, funded, and implemented long before the overwhelming majority of politicians, educators, academics, and moms and dads had any idea about its origins, its creators, its financing, or even its ambitions (educational and otherwise), is a sobering fact about Common Core. Common Core was never featured on C-SPAN or in national media prior to its adoption. There were no hearings before Congress, no Supreme Court decisions or town hall meetings, and definitely no consultations with parents and local school boards, the primary stakeholders in our increasingly ineffective public schools.

It bears repeating what Diane Ravitch, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Education stated in regards to the implementation of Common Core:

“I have long advocated for voluntary national standards.....For the past two years, I have steadfastly insisted that I was neither for nor against the Common Core standards. I was agnostic. I wanted to see how they worked in practice...I have come to the conclusion that the Common Core standards effort is fundamentally flawed by the process with which they have been foisted upon the nation.....[The President and Education Secretary] often say that the Common Core standards were developed by the states and voluntarily adopted by them. This is not true. ...Their creation was neither grassroots nor did it emanate from the states...Federal law prohibits the U.S. Department of Education from prescribing any curriculum, but in this case the Department figured out a clever way to evade the letter of the law. Forty-six states and the District of Columbia signed on, not because the Common Core standards were better than their own, but because they wanted a share of the federal cash... The Common Core standards have been adopted...without any field test. They are being imposed on the children of this nation despite the fact that no one has any idea how they will affect students, teachers, or schools. We are a nation of guinea pigs...”⁷⁹⁰

Bill Gates—the unelected individual who bought and paid for Common Core—affirmed that the children of this nation are indeed acting as guinea pigs, stating in 2012: “It would be great if our education stuff worked, but we won’t know for probably a decade.”⁷⁹¹

So, we aren’t going to know the outcome of this grand experiment in school reform until 2022.

As Ms. Ravitch alluded to (page 196), the actual writing of Common Core has been traced back to a very small group of unelected individuals, chief of whom is David Coleman, who has deep connections to the Carnegie Corporation. He has never been elected to anything; he has never been appointed to anything; and he doesn’t have the kind of educational background that would qualify him to oversee the writing of national standards in anything. In remarks at a 2011 Institute for Learning Senior

⁷⁹⁰ Former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Education Diane Ravitch, who was appointed to office under both President Clinton and George H.W. Bush “Why I Oppose Common Core Standards,” February of 2013, in which she summarized many of the concerns that most critics of Common Core have.

⁷⁹¹ Washington Post article titled “Bill Gates: ‘It would be great if our education stuff worked but...’”, Valerie Strauss, September 27, 2013.

Leadership Meeting, the co-director of the Institute of Learning at the University of Pittsburgh admitted David Coleman:

“Has been involved in virtually every step of setting the national standards, and he doesn’t have a single credential for it. He’s never taught in an elementary school ... He’s never edited a scholarly journal, ... And a variety of other things that ...everybody here has done some of, he hasn’t done.”⁷⁹²

Nonetheless, he was put in charge of five individuals who oversaw the writing of Common Core. These individuals whom wrote the Common Core State Standards had no educational credentials or scholarly qualifications as admitted by David Coleman himself:

“One is we’re composed of that collection of unqualified people who were involved in developing the common standards. And our only qualification was our attention to and command of the evidence behind them. That is, it was our insistence in the standards process that it was not enough to say you wanted to or thought that kids should know these things, that you had to have evidence to support it, frankly because it was our conviction that the only way to get an eraser into the standards writing room was with evidence behind it, cause otherwise the way standards are written you get all the adults into the room about what kids should know, and the only way to end the meeting is to include everything...I probably spend a little more time on literacy because as weak as my qualifications are there, in math they’re even more desperate in their lacking.”

Far too few people realize that immediately after overseeing the creation of Common Core, David Coleman became the ninth president of the College Board, the organization that designs the SAT exams used in the college application process, and that manages all the Advanced Placement (AP) courses that high-school students take to earn college credit. That Coleman could orchestrate the Common Core Standards, and then be allowed to oversee the entity that creates the exams that students take as part of the college admission process, is alarming. No one will escape their reach, whether they attend public or private or home school.

The Common Core set of standards is very much philosophically related to the outcome-based education approach as was “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB). In America we undoubtedly have a remarkably heterogeneous group of students. It’s not like Finland or Thailand, or some countries that have relative stability and relative homogeneity in their student populations. America, as we know, is incredibly diverse: racially, ethnically, religiously, and certainly monetarily diverse in terms of backgrounds. So, the problem with outcome-based education is that you are not dealing with kids as they are, and specifically addressing their needs; you are trying to get them all to end up in the same place. And, the only way you’re going to get sixty million American kids to the same place is if you have the standards set relatively low. The higher the standard, the fewer the kids who can make it. And that’s what educators experienced with NCLB for about a dozen years: however high they said the standards were going to be, of necessity they had to keep declining in order to get

⁷⁹² Remarks by Lauren Resnick, co-director of the Institute of Learning at the University of Pittsburgh at 2011 Institute for Learning Senior Leadership Meeting

more kids to meet them. So this is a problem with standards-based education. Also the only way to measure a standard that broadly is through high-stakes testing, what we call the standardized testing. As many education professionals have pointed out: if you're simply educating kids to the point that they can take a test, you're not really educating them at all; you're just preparing them for the test.

So NCLB was a failure for a lot of reasons, and many of the worst aspects of NCLB: the one-size-fits-all education; the outcome-based education; the meaningless high-stakes testing, all of that is back in Common Core. The only difference being that, because Common Core is so top-down, it eliminates the ability of states and local school boards, and local school districts, to have any meaningful impact on fixing it when it doesn't work.

It bears repeating that there are many problems with the way Common Core was implemented. After the standards had been paid for by the Gates Foundation and drafted, they convened a committee of twenty-nine individuals called the Validation Committee, whose job was to validate the standards. They were given carte blanche. They were told: "If the standards are inadequate, unhelpful and don't work, get rid of them. You have complete carte blanche to do whatever you think is necessary." Well, unbelievably, of the twenty-nine people that Common Core brought to Washington, there was only two individuals with any type of education credentials or scholarly background. There was only one expert in English, and one expert in Math (These were the two sets of standards being validated at the time—English and Math). Professor James Milgram from Stanford University was the Math expert, and professor Dr. Sandra Stotsky from the University of Arkansas was the English Language Arts expert.

Well, both Stotsky and Milgram **voted absolutely No on the Common Core Standards**. Milgram said "It's an absolute joke to think that Common Core math will prepare American children for college, careers, for college math, or for STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) careers." "An absolute joke", Milgram called it. Dr. Stotsky said: "Common Core English will set our kids two years behind the two years they're already behind the rest of the world in reading, writing and comprehension." But what the Validation Committee did was: rather than allow Stotsky and Milgram—the only two experts—to rewrite the Standards completely (which is what they wanted to do), the Committee just erased their comments from the entire procedure. Stotsky, Milgram and the others who voted No were, in effect, written out of the Validation Committee document. The remaining members went ahead and validated the document without any input whatsoever, or even any mention at all of the objections of the two experts and the people they had convinced.⁷⁹³ Moreover, there are many curriculum experts in addition to Dr. Stotsky and Dr. Milgram who have since gone on to testify with a warning voice to state legislatures and school boards about the inadequacy of the standards.

⁷⁹³Dr. Sandra Stotsky Denver Post, December 17, 2013 "[Dr] Milgram and I were members of Common Core's Validation Committee, which was charged with reviewing each successive draft of the standards. We both refused to sign off on the academic quality of the national standards, but made public our explanation and criticism of the final version of Common Core's standards. ... State and national policy makers, educators, and the general public have been misinformed and are thoroughly confused...They do not seem to understand that [the] Common Core's standards do not prepare high school students for STEM [Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths] areas in college."

Jason Zimba—the man most responsible for the Math Standards—has publicly admitted “It’s true, Common Core Math is not going to prepare American kids for college level math.” He says, “at best the brightest of the American students after Common Core might be ready to start math at a two-year technical college.”⁷⁹⁴

So it’s not preparing children for three-to-four-year university courses—that’s actually not the ambition of Common Core whatsoever. Professor Milgram says that Common Core requires the very youngest kids to do math way beyond their ability, but as they get older they do much less math; so it’s completely backward. They’re being assigned things they can’t possibly do at ages five to seven, and then by the time they’re ten to thirteen, they’re doing absolutely remedial math. To provide an example: In every single high-achieving math country, kids routinely start serious algebra at 7th, or even 6th, grade. In NCLB America, our schools kids didn’t begin serious algebra until 8th grade, and under Common Core serious algebra is pushed into high school. That prompts the question, as Milgram pointed out: If your kids don’t start algebra until their Freshman Year of high school, how are they going to cope with calculus and advanced math in preparation for college math? They won’t. Even Common Core math architect, Jason Zimba himself, conceded:

“If you’re a young person who wants to become an engineer, or who wants admission to an elite university, you would be advised to take mathematics beyond the (Common Core requirement) level... you will need to take more mathematics than is in the Common Core.”

The absurdity surrounding Common Core math is further illustrated by an acknowledgment by Ze'ev Wurman, former U.S. Department of Education official:

"Common Core replaces the traditional foundation of Euclidean geometry with an experimental approach. This approach has never been successfully used in any sizable system; in fact, it failed even in the school for gifted and talented students in Moscow, where it was originally invented. Yet Common Core effectively imposes this experimental approach on the entire country, without any piloting."⁷⁹⁵

One of the features with Common Core is that the standards were written in conjunction with global text book companies like Pearson Education; the committee wrote the Standards, and then the text book companies started to provide curriculum and instruction to support the Standards. So really, it's impossible to consider the Standards apart from the supporting curriculum. That having been said, when you look at the Standards and curriculum together, you find that in the Common-Core-related education, up to fifty-percent of the classical literature that kids historically read in English class—literature that exposes them to 2000 years of Judeo-Christian Western

⁷⁹⁴As documented in the official minutes and recording of a Massachusetts Board of Education March 2010 meeting. Even back in 2010, prior to the roll out of Common Core Standards, Jason Zimba, the lead writer for Common Core Math, admitted the standards are “not only not for STEM, they are also not for selective colleges.”

⁷⁹⁵ As quoted in the Pedagogical Agenda of Common Core Math Standards –Education News. In addition to being a senior policy advisor for the Department of Education, Mr. Wurman is an executive in the high-tech industry in Silicon Valley and was a member of the 2010 California Academic Content Standards for California and has specified widespread criticism of the Common Core Math Standards.

history and 250 years of American identity and American experience—is removed. Up to fifty percent of that literature is replaced with informational texts, a huge percentage of which comes directly from Federal Government. So, kids as young as six-to-eight are now reading government pamphlets in their English classes, a large majority of which is one-sided literature dealing with highly politicized issues at the federal level. They're even reading Presidential executive orders. No critical thinking is involved; they're not reading books or pamphlets that challenge prevailing orthodoxies. All the character and moral development of classical literature is being removed in favor of government literature, and it's being handed directly to our kids.

796

Sandra Stotsky, professor emerita and professor of Education Reform at University of Arkansas, who refused to approve Common Core, concluded:

"An English curriculum overloaded with advocacy journalism or with 'informational' articles chosen for their topical and/or political nature should raise serious concerns among parents, school leaders, and policymakers. Common Core's standards not only present a serious threat to state and local education authority, but also put academic quality at risk. Pushing fatally flawed education standards into America's schools are not the way to improve education for America's students."

Dr. Stotsky says her two big complaints about the Common Core English Standards are: one, genuine literature is replaced with tendentious political pamphlets; and two, the literature that remains is developmentally inappropriate in terms of violence and sexual content at almost every grade level. Some of the books have highly erotic material. An example is Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye*. It's a great book, and Toni Morrison is a great, Nobel-prize-winning African-American novelist, but educators wouldn't assign a book like that to freshmen in college. It's about a twelve-year-old girl who is the victim of rape and incest, and over the course of the novel she comes to bond with her rapist, and describes in graphic detail the nature of the sexual encounters. This Common-Core-recommended book has even been found in American middle schools. Other books would include *Dreaming in Cuban* and *Black Swan*, and the list goes on; they're sexually inappropriate, and way beyond the kids' level.

Then at the lowest levels too—even for kids as young as third, fourth and fifth grade—they're getting all sorts of suggestion and risqué statements. One example is there was a Common Core lesson for fourth graders where kids took home a long paragraph and the job was to read the paragraph and determine the situation from the context. And the paragraph was about a young mother who comes home and sets about making the bed and finds a pubic hair in the bed that is not hers, and over the course of seven or eight sentences the kids are forced to conclude that dad is having an adulterous affair

⁷⁹⁶ Pearson Education—a major donor and listed business and industry partner to Common Core—is the largest education product sales company in the world, has a monopoly on education products, including textbooks, curriculum, worksheets, and, importantly, the assessment. Pearson is led by globalist Sir Michael Barber who speaks glowingly of public-private partnerships, of "global citizenship" and a need for having **global** data collection and **one set of educational standards for the world**. Bill Gates—who almost single-handedly funded and marketed the entire Common Core movement going back to UNESCO and its goal to bring a master curriculum worldwide—has joined forces with Pearson to create a **one size fits all curriculum**.

in mother's bed—for kids as young as third and fourth graders.

According to clinical social worker and psychologist Mary Calamia, in testimony before the New York State Assembly in 2013, (New York was the second state to adopt Common Core in 2010):

“Children are being exposed to age-inappropriate lessons geared to adult learning patterns, not childhood ones. Children are not capable of engaging in the critical thinking the Common Core requires...a developmental milestone that does not occur until early adulthood. Since the implementation of Common Core I have documented a 200%–300% increase in new referrals of adolescents who are self-mutilating. The majority of which are honors students with no prior history...A 200%–300% increase in new referrals of elementary school children due to refusal and anxiety.”

Critiques of the Common Core Standards by numerous educators, pediatricians, developmental psychologists, and researchers, curriculum designers and educators have noted that the process for creating the Common Core K–12 standards involved too little research, public dialogue, or input from educators. Nowhere was this more startlingly true than in the case of the early childhood standards—those imposed on kindergarten-through-grade-3. Not a single person on the committees that wrote and reviewed the Common Core Standards was a K–3 classroom teacher or early childhood professional. When the standards were first revealed in March 2010, many early childhood educators and researchers were shocked that the Common Core standards are not age inappropriate. “The people who wrote these standards do not appear to have any background in child development or early childhood education,” wrote Stephanie Feeney of the University of Hawaii, chair of the Advocacy Committee of the National Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators.

Not only were childhood professionals excluded from the crafting of Common Core Standards, but grave doubts by some of the most knowledgeable education and health experts **were actually raised well before Common Core was ever implemented.** It bears repeating that in 2010 more than 500 early childhood professionals submitted serious concern that the imposition of these standards were developmentally inappropriate and endangers children. The Joint Statement of Early Childhood Health and Education Professionals on the Common Core Standards Initiative was signed by educators, pediatricians, developmental psychologists, and researchers, including many of the most prominent members of those fields. Their statement reads in part:

“We have grave concerns about the core standards for young children.... The proposed standards conflict with compelling new research in cognitive science, neuroscience, child development, and early childhood education about how young children learn, what they need to learn, and how best to teach them in

kindergarten and the early grades...."⁷⁹⁷

It is clear that the drafters of the standards at the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) were aware of the Joint Statement well before their summary of public feedback was written. Copies of it were hand-delivered to eleven officials at those two organizations, including Gene Wilhoit, executive director of the CCSSO, and Dane Linn, director of the Education Division of the NGA, who were primarily responsible for the creation of the standards.

Unbelievably, instead of answering the serious criticism and warnings, those behind the Common Core hijacking of our nation's schools crafted the following Limitation of Liability:

"Under no circumstance shall NGA Center or CCSSO...be liable for any...damages however caused and on any legal theory of liability...arising in any way out of the use of the Common Core State Standards, even if advised of the possibility of such risk and potential damage..."⁷⁹⁸

Even people who have no issues with subjects of sexuality think that to teach five-year-olds about mature sexual topics is to go beyond what these kids can process. But that's exactly what the National Sexuality Standards do, and that's exactly what is seen in Common Core classrooms. The Government is actually forcing kids to deal with sexual issues beyond their ability. There are numbers of clinical psychologists and child development specialists affirming that:

"This is not just developmentally inappropriate, it's bordering on child abuse."
"Why do we care if [Common Core standards] are age inappropriate? Well, you can answer that with one word - stress," according to Dr. Megan Koschnick
"This can cause major stress for the child because they are not prepared for this level of education."

What's also interesting about the Sexuality Standards is that they were not designed to stand alone; they were not meant to be taught in health or biology classes. In fact, if you open the National Sexuality Standards, you will see that one of the things that they consulted, when they wrote the National Sexuality Standards, was Common Core Standards for English and Math. The reason for this is that in order to get kids to that level of knowledge about sexual issues, the only way to do it is to make it part of every aspect of the curriculum. Why is there so much sex in Common Core English? Because you have to teach the Sexuality Standards in Common Core English. The same is true for Common Core Math, History and Science.

⁷⁹⁷ The Joint Statement opposing the standards was signed by three past presidents of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) (the foremost professional organization for early education in the U.S) Yet it had no role in the creation of the K-3 Core Standards.—David Elkind, Ellen Galinsky, and Lilian Katz—and by Marcy Guddemi, the executive director of the Gesell Institute of Human Development; Dr. Alvin Rosenfeld of Harvard Medical School; Dorothy and Jerome Singer of the Yale University Child Study Center; Dr. Marilyn Benoit, past president of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry; Professor Howard Gardner of the Harvard Graduate School of Education; and many others.

⁷⁹⁸ [www.corestandards.org/public -license](http://www.corestandards.org/public-license)

And Stotsky's point was: Why? Why so little literature altogether, and why is the literature that remains in Common Core so inappropriate?

To answer this question: Horace Mann and John Dewey, the Rockefeller sponsored so-called 'founders of American public education,' were Marxists. They have pointed out for over a hundred years that the foundational role of Judeo-Christian values of America are the biggest threat to communist statist control. One of the reasons why socialist state programs are so heavily sex-based—as seen in the Soviet Union and Mao Tse-tung's China—is because if you can get kids to become sexually libertine at young ages, it's then very easy to dislodge any subsequent moral renants of the faith systems in which they were raised. The first step is to sweep away the student's normal support base, undermining such things as the family, spirituality, morality—that's the child's intellectual and emotional life raft. Every person needs one of those, and if you sweep it away then they are left in no man's land. That is why many of the traditional categories of society in America are coming under attack through Common Core.

Another thing is that there's a much greater emphasis on writing rather than reading in Common Core. At every grade level, Common Core lowers the overall level of reading by fifty per cent, and elevates the overall level of writing by fifty per cent. So, in every class, including math, kids are writing as much, or more, than they are reading (or doing math). So, they're not really reading enough, and one of the reasons for this, as Dr. Stotsky has pointed out, is: If kids are writing more than they're reading, then they're necessarily going to be writing about whatever is ideologically being presented to them in the classroom. They are not writing about books any more, they're not writing about character and morality and the large issues that are historically discussed in reading the great books (those books that constitute an essential foundation in the literature of Western culture). Now they're discussing the ideology and the politics that have subsumed the subject matter under Common Core.

When it comes to Common Core math, the emphasis is now on process math. For example: one of the primary ways that elementary school math is being taught under Common Core is the so-called Pair and Share program. The job of the facilitators (teachers are often re-labelled "facilitators" under Common Core) in Common Core math in elementary school is rather than teach kids mathematical concepts, and work through problems on the blackboard, you put kids in groups of two and three, and you hand them math problems. The main purpose of that assignment is to get every kid in that group to agree on what they think is the right answer, not necessarily to get the right answer. The bulk of the reward for the assignment comes through agreement, not necessarily correctness. For example, there was a situation publicized in New York where a little third grade boy gave the correct answer of "forty-two" to the math problem of "six times seven". He got it marked wrong, and in red pencil the teacher wrote: "the other two children in your peer group agreed on a different answer." So they were given credit for the answer, but because the little boy, who actually got the number right, was not able to convince the other two kids he was right, he got it marked wrong. There are numerous examples similar to that to children as early as third grade. Professor Milgram calls it Communal Math with an emphasis on commune. The purpose of Common Core math now is to make every American kid comfortable with a low level of math, because it is just not fair that some kids can do better and get ahead. Similarly, kids won't be allowed to fall too far behind, although with the standards this low that's unlikely. This explains why Common Core does not get to

algebra until ninth grade; the emphasis is much more concerned about keeping it low and basic so that every kid can feel comfortable.

And this Pair and Share paradigm isn't really about math at all. The most important thing is to produce consensus within the group so that people are not thinking about things independently at all; they're just thinking what the group is thinking, as dictated, of course, by the facilitator. That's what Dr. Milgram, Professor Stotsky, and others fighting this, call the single biggest problem with Common Core. Forty or fifty years ago, the American education system was focused on providing kids their ABCs and their 123s. Now with Common Core it's reached the point where the ABCs and 123s—the nuts and bolts of education—are subordinated to the larger ideological narratives that is trying to be imposed on our children. We're not concerned any more that they read, write and think very well; we're concerned to teach them 'communal thinking'.

The desk has given way to the "group-table-designed classroom" and the "teacher" has become the "facilitator" for peer to educate peer in group work. In this group learning style, there is more peer pressure to think similarly, to create a consensus. Those that don't think along the lines of the group or who are outspoken tend to stick out like a sore thumb; they may have a difficult time or be ostracized. Facilitators establish a 'we're-all-in-this-together' mentality, eventually people band together to save themselves the embarrassment of being rejected. This is especially true in America, because here we have been raised culturally to think that popularity and status are important things. It's an important stimulus—even Karl Marx's theory of alienation said that people will do just about anything to avoid ostracism and ridicule. He was right. It's more important for us to be liked, than to be right. And when the teenage years kick in, of course, it becomes even more difficult to endure raised eyebrows—nobody wants to stand out. The point is the mindset has changed from that to a we-all-must-think-alike mindset.

Turning to examples of the common core math worksheets being used in schools, reports show that children have to follow a really tedious, prescriptive method of arriving at an answer, often involving drawing boxes and coloring things in. In Common Core Math, it is much more important that you do all that extraneous stuff. You have to draw the right sketches and follow the lugubrious process; even getting the right answer isn't that important. An example of this feature of Common Core is of a little boy who had an addition question and the answer was "one hundred and eleven", so the little boy wrote "111". Yet again he got it marked wrong because the math assignment called for him to draw rather than write numbers. He had to draw one hundred and eleven circles.

Sometimes it's dots, dashes, cubes and cones; other times it's drawing animals. There's an example of one elementary school where kids are only allowed to add and subtract by drawing cows. You have to draw enough cows so as to count the legs to get the answer, but if you don't draw the cows you don't get credit for the answer, even if the answer's right.

So the only thing that's important in this is that you are doing as you're told; you're not to have any individuality in this whatsoever. Professor Milgram makes this point. That some kids learn differently from other kids, and that some kids might actually

benefit by using visual aids to help them learn math, but the problem with Common Core math is that the standard way of doing math (adding in columns, subtracting, multiplying and dividing in the way it's been done for hundreds of years)—in Common Core kids are not only not exposed to it, they are not allowed to do it. If you try to add up a Common Core math question by doing it the way we all learned how to do it, you will get it marked wrong even if you get the right number. The only way you will get credit in Common Core is if you avoid the previous ways of doing them, and do them exclusively the Common Core way. As Professor Milgram points out, there's no justifiable reason for doing this. If you did both, maybe you could make an argument for it. As Milgram points out, this leads to a situation in which American moms and dads can no longer help their kids, even at the lowest levels, with their math homework, because there's no one way of doing it. Here's an example of a Common Core third-grade math problem:

“Add $26 + 17$ by breaking apart numbers to make a ten. Use a number that adds with the 6 in 26 to make a 10. Since $6 + 4 = 10$, use 4. Think: $17 = 4 + 13$. Add $26 + 4 = 30$. Add $30 + 13 = 43$. So $26 + 17 = 43$.”

Also, almost every textbook in every school uses a different set of markers, or a different set of illustrations, or a different set of exercises to get to the answer. And, as Professor Milgram pointed out about this math curriculum is that it clearly forces kids to rely only on the schools. You've got Certified Public Accountants, medical doctors, and math professors who cannot help their kids with their math homework. And, as Milgram says, that is not a flaw, that's a feature of the Common Core, that the only way the kids can get help is through the Government schools. Again, they can't get help from mom and dad or from grandpa; they can't hire private tutors to help them. The only ones who have the key to this very arcane math is the federal school; that's a characteristic of it. It serves to convince our American school children that they belong first and foremost to the government, not to their moms and dads, not to their local communities, not to the faith systems in which they were raised; they are agents who owe their allegiance, and whatever success they will enjoy, to the Government.

One of the other things about Common Core is how it provides for a 'one-world' or globalist world view as opposed to an Americanist world view. Common Core textbook material has a tendency to undercut Judeo-Christian values, and they are being used to insidiously unmake the founding documents of America. For example: Common Core prohibits teaching cursive writing—everything is printed or typed on computers or iPads. The interesting part of this is that—despite the fact that many child development specialists point out is that when kids learn how to write in cursive, there are all types of brain connections that occur that help them remember what they are doing, much more than when they are printing, but regardless of that—all of the founding documents of this country were hand written in cursive. And so now, in our middle and elementary schools, kids cannot read our founding documents, unless they have been transcribed. And the Common Core textbooks—all written by the same globalist multinational corporations—have, for example, paraphrased and printed excerpts of the U.S. Constitution rather than expose kids to the actual handwritten passages and they've changed the meaning in subtle ways. So, it's being used as a way of dismantling constitutional values, dismantling history, rewriting the sort of basic idea of America for our little kids that aligns it not with American history and American documents but with larger broader one-world agendas.

And by controlling the Advanced Placement Exams, David Coleman's College Board now has another tool to shape curriculum in the classroom. The first AP course revised under Coleman was Advanced Placement U.S. History (APUSH), and the new tests jettison fact-based history and civics in favor of "constructing historical narratives," all of them dealing with the presumed racism, sexism, imperialism, and homophobia that drove American expansionism, military supremacy, and economic success. The tests no longer measure quantifiable knowledge about American history—from dates to places to facts to people—but instead require students to write highly opinionated essays conforming to anti-America bias that drive the course. The great popularity of AP courses—which provide college credits for high school-based courses—means that schools have changed the way they teach American history so as to prepare their students for the politicized exams.

According to Wall Street Journal writer David Feith, the focus of Common Core is instead on:

"an obsession with race, class, gender and sexuality as the forces of history and political identity. "He continues, "Nationalizing education via Common Core is about promoting an agenda of anti-capitalism, sustainability, white guilt, global citizenship, self-esteem, affective math, and culture sensitive spelling and language."

The ancient Greeks—particularly Plato and Aristotle—understood that, in a society, open debate and discussion were essential to progress. They recognized that the development of logic and critical thinking was a necessary partner in the pursuit of freedom. But this one-world agenda that's being instituted in our public schools via Common Core doesn't present different world views. It doesn't promote critical thinking. For instance, now, in our elementary school books—for first, second, and third graders (6, 7, 8 year olds), it's all full of politicized issues. Which by itself is not necessarily a bad thing except the challenges or other side of such a debated topic is not provided anywhere. To have critical thinking there has to be dissent, there has to be exposure to other ways of seeing things, and what makes Common Core common is that its common in the sense that every kid gets exposed to the same world view perspective and there is no genuine debate, there is no genuine engagement with ideas that are different, even ideas that on occasion we might find unwholesome—all that's gone now. It's all coming from one perspective, one angle, and kids are being tested, not on how well they know material but how well they parrot the world view. There is no room for the development of logic, reasoning, critical thinking, independent intellect in Common Core education.

One way to look at the notion of critical thinking, is to go back to the definition of understanding that is often used which is the ability to be able to tell the difference between things—an understanding of "X" being the opposite of "non-X"—one can build a framework to understand the world by seeing the differences between things. But "one-world" citizenship seems to fit more in a sense of a "oneness view" of the world where all differences are dissolved. Then it follows why critical thinking would be bad for a global citizen because it would enable people to see differences between things—and as you have differences—you have reason for strife and reason for dissent.

In the name of "tolerance" Common Core schools are teaching four and five-years-olds

sexual postures, ideologies and worldviews, so that they will tolerate everything. What you're really doing is levelling moral distinctions. As long as you're a tolerant person, you accept everything, and therefore you can do no wrong. That's why they're removing the classic literature that helped with ethical and moral decision-making. This is a redefinition of tolerance. Classically, you tolerate someone who has different views from yours by agreeing to differ. But here it seems that you are not allowed to be different from anybody else: all differences in culture and understanding are unacceptable. Tolerance is one of the great virtues. But, interestingly, all these virtues only exist if other ones exist: so tolerance, as a virtue, only exists if you can still have chastity. If you can still have chastity, modesty, or humility, then tolerance has a place. We don't have to tolerate improper behavior, but we do need to tolerate people whose ideas are different. But Common Core schooling is attempting to get rid of all those other virtues. Chastity now means you're biased against people who are promiscuous; humility means you see yourself as better than people who are proud. This tolerance movement has eliminated every other virtue, and now tolerance means everybody's got to be the same all the time. So you get rid of any differences between opposites as it were.

Because there's a large and growing movement of people in America who despise of Common Core, the people in charge of it decided that it is not in their best interest to push any new standards. For example, when American states took Common Core back in 2009, they only agreed to take English and Math. No American state ever agreed to take anything else. And presumably if they were to come out now with a Common Core History or Science the states wouldn't take them, it's just too controversial. So they've done the next best thing—they've renamed the science standards. So we now have Common Core science in our schools, but it's not called Common Core Science—it's called the 'Next Generation Science' standards. They've just simply renamed them. If you go to the Next Generation Science Standards you will see all throughout their explanatory document that the whole thing is Common Core they've just given it another name.

And with History, they've done something even more alarming. They've decided that they are not going to come out with History standards—what they're going to do is subordinate the teaching of History to the English Language Arts Program that States already adopted. In other words, the teaching of History and Social Studies now becomes part of the entire English paradigm that was already adopted by Common Core. This way they can slip in Common Core History into the existing English standards and not have to justify what they've done by having to go back to the States. What essentially they have done is melded the entire humanities curriculum into this broad rubrick called English Language Arts. So, what they've done is they've destroyed the idea that in the Humanities you have discrete disciplines, that history requires a different understanding than literature—they have amalgamated them all. And so you now have a situation where the only history that gets taught is history that enforces what is being taught in English, which is predominately sociology, not literature and art. And all that gets reinforced in other subject areas. So kids are getting a comprehensive humanistic education that every discrete subject area now is telling them exactly the same thing in exactly the same way. They're only getting enough history they need to understand narratives that the architects of Common Core want taught. There is repetitious exposure to what the course organizers want children to believe, and repetition across the curriculum as well. That means that similar messages

are reinforced across different subjects such as math, english, science and history lessons. It's interspersing and identifying things across the spectrum in every course. In other words, give it as many formats as possible and pretty soon children will believe it, because they've seen it in so many different formats.

Conclusion

The Common Core State Standards are not more rigorous than all of the states' previous standards, they are just different. Rather than pushing all states toward high standards, Common Core is actually encouraging a race to the mediocre middle.

Since the implementation of Common Core, it has been reported that more Gifted and Talented programs have been lost more than in the previous forty years combined, because when you have this kind of rigid standards-based-outcome system, it is as devastating to the system if kids accelerate the standards as it is if they fall behind them. If you think about it—for a scheme like Common Core—you'd much rather have kids fall short of the standard, because you can always lower the standard, at which point you bring more kids to the standard. But if you've got a bunch of kids who are capable of accelerating, and do accelerate the standards—well, that raises the standard! And if you raise the standard then you're losing more kids at the bottom. This is Outcome Based Education. This is one-size-fits-all education. The premise of Common Core is that it is unjust that some kids can do math at a high level and most of us can't. So rather than create a math paradigm that allows kids to really thrive, a math paradigm has been created that insists that every kid is going to be comfortable with a little math, and no kid gets to do math that their peers can't do. It can't be understated that when this kind of outcome-based system is put in place, so rigidly controlled, with such sociological and one-sided aims to it, kids who go ahead screw that up. Kids that excel break the paradigm; that cannot be allowed to happen.

We used to define cohesion as allowing kids to be educated, to discover their talents, and to go and make a life and career. Cohesion now seems to mean everybody at the same level all the time; nobody standing out too far from their peers; everybody having a low level of competence and knowledge; and nobody allowed to excel. Consider the benefit of this for those who control Government: if everybody is only minimally functional, then people are much more likely to be dependent upon the Government, and look to the Government to take control of things that otherwise free people would have handled for themselves. So, people won't be finding their natural place in the order of things; they'll be obeying Government dictate, so they can play the part of a compliant drone in the beehive.

The Rockefeller sponsored educator John Dewey argued more than a hundred years ago for a standardized curriculum in order to prevent one student from becoming superior to another, and envisioned a workforce filled with people of “politically and socially correct attitudes” who would respond to orders without question. The traditional, American values of rugged individualism, self-reliance, and personal responsibility are to be rejected and children are to be educated to accept a collectivist world view. As Dewey proclaimed:

“You cannot make socialists out of individualists. Children who know how to think for themselves spoil the harmony of the collective society.”

The stated goal of Common Core is to prepare the youth of America for work in a global economy, but should job preparation for a “global economy” really be the ultimate educational goal? In the ancient world people knew that in order for humans to be truly free, they must have a generous education that includes study of literature and history, mathematics and science, music and art. Education meant expanding the power of intellect, the ability to acquire knowledge. And so, traditionally, education meant learning to read well and fluently so that by reading and writing one could strengthen the powers of mind, increase one’s knowledge of the world, and seek one’s purpose in life. It was an affirmation of an individual’s freedom to control his or her own personal destiny.

But that traditional view of education has been transformed behind the scenes by those in power who believe that the purpose of schooling is training an individual to be a useful, politically correct social component in the global economy. It was Rockefeller backed John Dewey who first proposed the shift away from providing children with the determination of their own futures through real and solid education. That philosophy has finally blossomed into Common Core, in which the government trains individuals to serve the State and the economy.⁷⁹⁹

With Common Core there is also a clear intention to mold people through schooling, to overthrow accepted custom and traditional values, and to weaken parental influence. An example of the latter is the development of a curriculum that is so foreign to the parent that the parent cannot help the child with homework assignments. Furthermore, there is no room in the Common Core system for the development of an independent intellect. Again, this is not a flaw, but a desired feature of Common Core. The creators of Common Core acted by design, not blunder, as the dumbing down of society has been the elitist goal since the beginning of the Twentieth Century when John D. Rockefeller established his General Education Board, and stated, “I don’t want a nation of thinkers. I want a nation of workers.” The plan for American education was further enunciated by Woodrow Wilson in 1909:

“We want to do two things in modern society: **we want one class of persons** to have a liberal education; **we want another class of persons**, a very much larger class of necessity in every society, to forego the privilege of a liberal education and fit themselves to perform specific difficult manual tasks...We are either trying to make liberally-educated persons out of them, or **we’re trying to make skillful servants of society** along mechanical lines.”⁸⁰⁰

In conclusion, the situation with the Common Core standards is far worse than critics have imagined, because the concerns about the stealthy ‘global’ takeover, the quality, and the constitutionality of Common Core pale in comparison to the concern for the hearts, minds, and souls of America’s children.

⁷⁹⁹ Training means developing skills that will be used more for social and economic reasons than for the self. (Which means that education should come first, training later).

⁸⁰⁰ Woodrow Wilson (implementer of the fraudulent Federal Reserve and Federal Income Tax) in his 1909 address to the New York High School Teachers’ Association.