Your Own Mind is Your Most Important Freedom Resource

This chart illustrates the dominance by –

The Council on Foreign Relations,
The Trilateral Commission and The Bilderberg

- in the major decision making processes and institutions of the United States of America over the last seventy years.

Members are identified by "C", "T", or "B".

U. S. Presidents

George Walker Bush - non-member
William Jefferson Blythe Clinton - B,C,T
George Herbert Walker Bush - C,T
James Earl Carter - C,T
Gerald R. Ford, Jr. - B,C
Richard Milhous Nixon - C
Dwight D. Eisenhower - C
Herbert Clark Hoover - C

U. S. Vice Presidents

Richard B. Cheney - C,T
George H. W. Bush - C,T
Walter Mondale - C,T
Nelson Rockefeller -

CIA Directors

George J. Tenet - C
William O. Studerman - C
John M. Duetch - B,C,T
James Woolsey - C
Robert M. Gates - C
William H. Webster - C
William J. Casey - C
Stansfield Turner - C
George H.W. Bush - C
William E. Colby - C
James Schlesinger - C
Richard Helms - C
John A. McCone - C
Allen W. Dulles - C
Walter Bedell Smith - C

Secretaries of Commerce

Ronald H. Brown - C
Juanita M. Kreps - C,T
Elliot Lee Richardson - C,T
Peter G. Peterson - C
John Thomas Conner, Jr. - C
Barbara Hackman Franklin - C

Secretaries of Defense

Donald Rumsfeld - B
William S. Cohen - C,T
William J. Perry - B,T
Les Aspen - C
Richard B. Cheney - C,T
Frank C. Carlucci, III - C,T
Casper W. Weinberger - C,T
Harold Brown - C,T
Donald H. Rumsfeld - C
James R. Schlesinger - C
Elliot L. Richardson - C,T
Melvin R. Laird - T
Robert S. McNamara - B,C,T
Neil H. McElroy - C
Charles E. Wilson - C
George C. Marshall - C
James V. Forrestal - C

Chairmen Joint Chiefs of Staff

John M. Shalicashvilli - C
Colin L. Powell - B,C
William J. Crowe, Jr. - C,T
John W. Vessey - C
David C. Jones - C
Maxwell D. Taylor - C
Lyman Lemnitzer - C

Chiefs of Staff - Air Force

Ronald R. Fogleman - C
Merrill A. McPeak - C
John T. Chain, Jr. - C
Lew Allen, Jr. - C
Michael J. Dugan - C
Charles A. Gabriel - C
Larry D. Welch - C

Chiefs of Staff - Army

Dennis J. Reimer - C
Gordon R. Sullivan - C
John A. Wickham, Jr. - C
Edward C. Meyer - C

Secretaries of Energy

William B. Richardson - B,C
James R. Schlesinger - C
Charles W. Duncan, Jr. - C

Directors of the FBI

William H. Webster - C
William D. Ruckelshaus - C,T

Secretaries of Health & Human Services

Donna E. Shalala - C,T
Joseph A. Califano, Fr. - C
Casper A. Weinberger - C,T
Elliot L. Richardson - C,T
Abraham A. Ribicoff - C

Secretaries of HUD

Henry G. Cisneros - C,T
Carla A. Hills - C,T
James T. Lynn - C,T

**Secretary of Interior**

Bruce E. Babbitt - C,T

**Attorneys General**

Richard Thornburgh - C
William P. Rogers - C
Elliot L. Richardson - C,T
Nicholas deB. Katzenbach - C

**Secretaries of Labor**

Elaine L. Chao - C
Lynn Martin - C

**Secretaries of State**

Colin Powell - B,C
Madeline Albright - C
William B. Richardson - C
Warren M. Christopher - C,T
Lawrence S. Eagleburger - C,T
George P. Schultz - C
Alexander M. Haig, Jr. - C,T
Edmund S. Muskie - C
Cyrus R. Vance - C,T
Henry A. Kissinger - B,C,T
William P. Rogers - C
Dean Rusk - B,C
Christian A. Herter Jr. - B,C
John Foster Dulles - C
Dean G. Acheson - C
George C. Marshall - C
Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. - C
Cordell Hull - C
Henry L. Stimson - C
Frank B. Kellogg - C

**Current U.S. Senators**

Evan Bayh (D) IN - B
Hillory Rodham Clinton (D) NY - B
Christopher J. Dodd (D) CT - C
Dianne Feinstein (D) CA - C,T
Bob Graham (D) FL - C
Chuck Hagel (R) NE - B
John F. Kerry (D) MA - C
Joseph I. Lieberman (D) CT - C
John McCain (R) AZ - C
John D. Rockefeller, IV (D) WV - C,T
Paul Sarbanes (D) MD - C
Charles Schumer (D) NY - C
Olympia J. Snowe (R) ME - C
Robert G. Torricelli (D) NJ - C

Current U.S. House Members

Douglas K. Bereuter (R) NE - C
Howard L. Berman (D) CA - C
Sanford D. Bishop, Jr. (D) GA - C
Norman D. Dicks (D) WA - C
Barney Frank (D) MA - C
Richard A. Gephardt (D) MO - C
Amory Houghton, Jr. (R) NY - C
Henry Hyde (R) IL - C
Nancy Lee Johnson CT - C
James T. Kolbe (R) AZ - C
James A.S. Leach (R) IA - T
John P. Lewis GA - C
Robert T. Matsui (D) CA - C
James A. McDermott (D) WA - C
Eleanor Holmes Norton (D) DC - C
Ed Pastor (D) AZ - C
Thomas E. Petri (R) WI - C
Charles B. Rangel (D) NY - T
Carlos A. Romero-Burcelo (D)PR - C
John M. Spratt, Jr. (D) SC - C

Former U.S. Senators

Lloyd Bentsen (D) - B
David L. Boren (D) - C
Rudy Boschwitz (D) - C
Edward Brooke (R) - B
William L. Bradley (D) - C
John H. Chafee (R) - B,C,T
William S. Cohen (R) - C,T
Dick Clark (D) IA - C
Alan Cranston (D) CA - T
John C. Culver (D) IA - C, T
John C. Danforth (R) MO - T
Fred R. Harris (D) OK - B
Gary Hart (D) CO - C
J. Bennett Johnston (D) LA - B
Charles McC. Mathias (D) MD - B, C
George S. McGovern (D) SD - C
George J. Mitchell (D) ME - C
Daniel Moynihan (D) NY - C
Sam Nunn (D) GA - B
Claiborne Pell (D) RI - C
Charles H. Percy (R) IL - C
Larry Pressler (R) SD - C
Abraham Ribicoff CT - C
Donald W. Riegle MI - B
Charles S. Robb (D) VA - C, T
Terry Sanford (D) NC - C
Hugh Scott PA - B
Adlai E. Stevenson, III (D) IL - B, C
William V. Roth, Jr. (R) DE - C, T
Timothy Wirth CO - C
Harris L. Wofford PA - C

**Former House Members**

John B. Anderson IL - C
Michael D. Barnes MD - C
Anthony C. Beilenson (D) CA - C
Landrum R. Bolling MT - C
John Brademas NY - B, C, T
Thomas J. Campbell (R) CA - C
Richard B. Cheney (R) WY - C
William F. Clinger, Jr. (R) PA - C
Barbara B. Conable (D) NY - T
Mervyn M. Dymally CA - C
Dante B. F. Gasce FL - C
Geraldine A. Ferraro (D) NY - C
Thomas S. Foley (D) WA - C, T
Donald M. Fuhrer MN - T
Sam Gejdenson (D) CT - C
Newton L. Gingrich (R) GA - C
William H. Gray, Ill LA - T
Bill Green NY - C
Lee H. Hamilton (D) IN - B, T
Jane Lakes Harmon (D) CA - C
Mel Levine CA - C
Dave K. McCurdy OK - C
Susan K. Molinari (D) NY - C
Jim Moody WI - C
Donald M. Payne (D) NJ - C
John Edward Porter (R) IL - C
Ogden R. Reid - C
William B. Richardson (D) NM - C
Patricia Scott Schroeder (D) CO - C
Charles Schumer (D) NY - C
Peter Smith VT - C
Stephen J. Solarz (D) NY - C
Louis Stokes (D) OH - C
Esteban Edward Torres (D) CA - C
Robert G. Torricelli (D) NJ - C
Vin Weber MN - C
Charles W. Whalen, Jr. OH - C
Howard Wolpe MI - C

Federal judiciary

Stephen G. Breyer
Assoc Jus S.Ct - C
Ruth Bader Ginsburg
Assoc Jus S.Ct - C
Sandra Day O'Connor
Assoc Jus S.Ct - C
Felix Frankfurter
Fmr. Assoc. Jus S. Ct - C
Charles E. Hughes
Fmr. Assoc. Jus S. Ct - C
Dudley Baldwin Bonsal
Dist Ct Judge, NY - C
Jose Alberto Cabranes
Dist Ct Judge, CT - C
William W. Schwarzer
Dist Ct Judge, CA - C
Laurence Hirsch Silberman
Cir Ct Ap Judge, WA - C
Barrijngton D. Parker
Dist Ct Judge, - C
Richard Clark Allison
US Claims Tribunal Judge
The Hague - C
Stephen Myron Schwebel
Int Ct Judge, The Hague - C
Theodore Tannenwald, Jr.
Tax Ct. Sr. Judge - C

**Federal Reserve System**

Alan Greenspan  
Chairman Bd Gov - C,T  
Alice Mitchell Rivlin  
Vice Chmn Bd Gov - C,T  
Alan Stuart Blinder  
Vice Chairman - C  
Paul Adolph Volcker  
Chairman Bd (frmr) - B,C,T  
Eugend R. Black  
Chairman Bd Gov (frmr) - C  
Author F. Burns  
Chairman Bd Gov (frmr) - C  
William McC. Martin  
Chairman Bd Gov (frmr) - C  
Thomas B. McCabe  
Chairman Bd Gov (frmr) - C  
Eugene Meyer  
Chairman Bd Gov (frmr) - C  
G. William Miller  
Chairman Bd Gov (frmr) - C  
Ellen Victoria Futter  
Chairman FRB, NY - C  
Maurice R. Greenberg  
Dep. Chairman (frmr)  
FRB, NY - B,C,T  
William J. McDonough  
Pres FRB, NY - B,C  
Dorothy Meadow Sobol  
FRB, NY - C  
Willene A. Johnson  
Sr. Officer, FRB, NY - C  
Ernest T. Patrikis  
Dep. Gen Counsel, FRB, NY - C  
Harold W. Anderson  
Pres FRB, Kansas City (frmr) - C  
Robert Patrick Forrestal  
Pres FRB, Atlanta - C  
Warren Bruce Rudman  
Dep Chmn, FRB, Boston - C  
A. William Reynolds  
Chmn, FRB, Cleveland - C  
Margaret L. Greene
Dep Mgr. FRB, Foreign Ops - C
Sam Y. Cross
Mr. Fed Open Mkt Acct - C

Export-Import Bank

John D. Macomber
President & Chairman - C
Kenneth D. Brody
President & Chairman - C
Eugen K. Lawson
1st VP, V. Chairman - C
William Richard Cline
Mem. Adv. Board (former) - C
Rita Maria Rodriguez
Director - C

International Monetary Fund

William Brown Dale
Dep. Mng. Director, Geneva - C
Helen B. Junz
Spec. Trade Rep., Geneva - C
Richard David Erb
Dep Mng. Director, Wash - C

The World Bank

Jessica P. Einhorn
Managing Director - C,T
James David Wolfensohn
President - B,C
Robert Strange McNamara
President (former) - B,C,T
Raymond Vernon
Visiting Professor (former) - B,C
John M. Page, Jr.
Chief Economist - C
David A. Wirth
Economist Assistant - C
Barbara Herz
Division Chief - C
Ann O. Hamilton
Director - C

Int'l Bank of Reconstruction
& Develop.

Lewis Thompson Preston, Pres - C
Andrew M. Kamarck, Wash. Off. - C

**Bank of America**
(Bankamerica Corp)

A.W. Clausen
Chairman & CEO (frmr) - T
Nicholas Burhs Binkley
Chairman & CEO - C
Rudolph A. Peterson
Chairman Exec Comm - B,C
George William Coombe, Jr.
Exec VP (frmr) - C
Ignazio E. Lozano, Jr.
Director - C

**Bankers Trust Company**

Charles S. Sanford, Jr.
Chairman & CEO - C
George J. Vojta
Vice Chairman - C
Donald L. Staheli
Director - C

**Brown Brothers Harriman**

Robert Livingston Ireland, III
General Partner - C
Alexander Tonio Ercklemtz
Partner - C
Walter H. Brown
Ltd. Partner - C
Frank W. Hoch
Ltd. Partner - C

**Chase Manhattan Bank**

David Rockefeller
Chmn Int Adv Comm - C,T
Walter Vincent Shipley
Chairman & CEO - C,T
Thomas O. Lebrecque
President & COO - C,T
Robert Royal Douglas
Vice Chairman (frmr) - C
John Donald Wilson
Sr. VP (frmr) - C
John P. Lipsky
Chief Economist - C
Riorden Roett
Director - C
Marina Von N. Whitman
Director - C,T

Citigroup

Walter Bigelow Wriston,
former Chairman - B
William Reginald Rhodes,
Vice Chairman - C
Richard A. Freytag
President & CEO - C
Leslie Elizabeth Bains
Managing Director - C

Federal nat'l Mortgage Assoc.
(FNMA)

Franklin Delano Raines,
Chairman & CEO - C

Commercial Banks

Almalgamated Bank
Jack Sheinkman,
Chairman - B,C
Banc Pop. de Pureto Rico
Richard L. Carrion,
Chairman & CEO - C
Capital Trust
Obeh Felix Aburdene,
Managing Partner - C
Citibank, NYC
Mitchell W. Hedstrom,
Vice President - C
Continental Bank Corp.
Richard Leslie Huber,
Vice Chairman
Esp. Santo Bank, FL
Jackson B. Gilbert,
2nd Chairman - C
Federal Home Loan Bank, Boston
Eli Shapiro,
fmr Chairman - C
Federal National Payables
John Robert Petty,
Chairman - C
First Boston Corp.
Maynard J. Toll, Jr,
Managing Director - C
CS First Boston
Richard C. Holbrooke,
Vice Chairman - B,C
CS First Boston
John M Hennessy,
President & CEO - C
First City Bankcorp, Hou
Alfred R. Abboud,
(fmr) Chairman & CEO - C
1st Fidelity Bankcorp, NJ
Anthoney P. Terracciano,
Chairman, President, CEO - C
Irving Bank Corp
Joseph A. Rice,
fmr Chairman & CEO - C
J.P. Morgan & Co.
Dennis Weatherstone,
Chairman & CEO - C
Greenpoint Financial Corp
Thomas S. Johnson,
Chairman & CEO - C
Mfr & Traders Trust, Buffalo
Robert G. Wilmers,
President & CEO - C
Mercantile Bankshares
Henry Furlong Baldwin,
Chairman - C
Michilin Financial Corp
Alexander M. Vagliano,
Chairman - C
Morgan Guarantee Trust
Rimmer de Vries,
Sr. Vice President - C
National City Bankcorp
Frederick L. Deming,
Director- C
The Private Trust Co.
Richard E. Beeman,
Chairman & CEO - C
National Leadership Bank
Robert H. Knight,
Director - C
NationsBank Corp
Hugh L. McColl, Jr.,
Chairman, Pres & CEO - C,T
Offit Bank, NYC
Morris Wolf Offit,
President - C
Republic Bank of NYC
Leslie Elizabeth Bains,
Executive Vice President - C
Riggs Bank of Washington
Joe Lewis Allbritton,
Chairman - C
USAA, San Antonio
M. Straser Holcomb,
Exec.Vice President - C

College & University Presidents

Bowdoin College
Robert Hazard Edwards - C
Brown University
Vartan Gregorian - C
Cal. State, Bakersfield
Thomas Abel Arciniega - C
Carlton College
Stephen Richard Lewis, Jr. - C
CUNY Grad School
Joseph S. Murphy - C
CUNY
Bernard Warren Harlston - C
Colby College
William Reckling Cotter - C
Colorado University
Quigg Newton - C
Columbia
Michael Ira Sovem - C
Connecticut College
Claire Lynn Gaudiani - C
Cooper Union
John Jay Iselin - C
Cornell University
Frank Harold Trevor Rhodes - C
Drew University
Thomas H. Kean - C
Duke University
Nannerl O. Keohane - C,T
Emory University
Thomas James Laney - C
Fordham University
Joseph Aloysius O'Hare - C
George Washington University
Stephen Joel Trachtenberg - C
Georgetown University
Gwendolyn Mikell - C
Harvard University
Lawrence Summers - C
Harvard University
Neil L. Rudenstine (frmr) - C
Johns Hopkins University Center
Strat & Int. Students
David M. Abshire - C,T
Johns Hopkins University
Robert Bruce Zoellick - B,C,T
Johns Hopkins University
Steve Muller - C
Lafayette College
Robert Irvin Rotberg - C
Lewis & Clark College
James Albert Garner (frmr) - C
Lincoln University
Niara Sudarkasa - C
Long Island University
David Joel Steinberg - C
Michigan State University
Melville Peter McPherson - C
MIT
Julius Adams Strattan (frmr) - C
MIT
Jerome Bert Weisner (frmr) - C
Mt. Holyoke College
Elizabeth Topham Kennan - C
Muhlenberg College
Arthur Robert Taylor - C,T
New York University
Lawrence Jay Oliva - C
Northwestern University
Henry S. Bienen - C
Pamona College
Peter William Stanley - C
Princeton University
Harold Tofler Shapiro - C
Rockefeller University
Frederick Seitz (frmr) - C
Rockefeller University
Torsten Nils Wiesel - C
SMU
August Kenneth Pye - C
SW Medical School
Claud Kern Wildenthal - C
Spelman College
Donald M. Stewart (frmr) - C
Spelman College
Johnetta Betsch Cole - C
Stanford University
Gerhard Casper - C
Stanford University
Richard Wall Lyman (frmr) - C
Tufts University
Leila Fawaz - C
University California
Paul Harold Boecker - C
University Chicago
Hanna Holbern Gray - C
University Hawaii
James Harlan Cleveland - B,C
University Miami
Edward Thaddeus Foote, II - C
University Notre Dame
Theodore Martin Hesburgh - B,C,T
University Pennsylvania
Martin Meyerson (frmr) - C
University So California LA
Steven Browning Sample - C
University Tulsa
Robert Herschel Donaldson - C
University Wisconsin
Katherine Culbert Lyall - C
Virginia Comm University
Eugene Paul Trani - C
Washington University
Carroll Quigley, Professor of History at Georgetown University, stated, "The Council of Foreign Relations is the American Branch of a society which originated in England and believes national boundaries should be obliterated and one-world rule established."

**The Council on Foreign Relations and the New World Order**

By Charles Overbeck

The Council on Foreign Relations, housed in the Harold Pratt House on East 68th Street in New York City, was founded in 1921. In 1922, it began publishing a journal called Foreign Affairs. According to Foreign Affairs' web page (http://www.foreignaffairs.org), the CFR was founded when "...several of the American participants in the Paris Peace Conference decided that it was time for more private American Citizens to become familiar with the increasing international responsibilities and obligations of the United States."

The first question that comes to mind is, who gave these people the authority to decide the responsibilities and obligations of the United States, if that power was not granted to them by the Constitution. Furthermore, the CFR's web page doesn't publicize the fact that it was originally conceived as part of a much larger network of power.

According to the CFR's Handbook of 1936, several leading members of the delegations to the Paris Peace Conference met at the Hotel Majestic in Paris on May 30, 1919, "to discuss setting up an international group which would advise their respective governments on international affairs."
The Handbook goes on to say, "At a meeting on June 5, 1919, the planners decided it would be best to have separate organizations cooperating with each other. Consequently, they organized the Council on Foreign Relations, with headquarters in New York, and a sister organization, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, in London, also known as the Chatham House Study Group, to advise the British Government. A subsidiary organization, the Institute of Pacific Relations, was set up to deal exclusively with Far Eastern Affairs. Other organizations were set up in Paris and Hamburg..."

The 3,000 seats of the CFR quickly filled with members of America's elite. Today, CFR members occupy key positions in government, the mass media, financial institutions, multinational corporations, the military, and the national security apparatus.

Since its inception, the CFR has served as an intermediary between high finance, big oil, corporate elitists and the U.S. government. The executive branch changes hands between Republican and Democratic administrations, but cabinet seats are always held by CFR members. It has been said by political commentators on the left and on the right that if you want to know what U.S. foreign policy will be next year, you should read Foreign Affairs this year.

The CFR's claim that "The Council has no affiliation with the U.S. government" is laughable. The justification for that statement is that funding comes from member dues, subscriptions to its Corporate Program, foundation grants, and so forth. All this really means is that the U.S. government does not exert any control over the CFR via the purse strings.

In reality, CFR members are very tightly affiliated with the U.S. government. Since 1940, every U.S. secretary of state (except for Gov. James Byrnes of South Carolina, the sole exception) has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and/or its younger brother, the Trilateral Commission. Also since 1940, every secretary of war and every secretary of defense has been a CFR member. During most of its existence, the Central Intelligence Agency has been headed by CFR members, beginning with CFR founding member Allen Dulles. Virtually every key U.S. national security and foreign policy adviser has been a CFR member for the past seventy years.

Almost all White House cabinet positions are occupied by CFR members. President Clinton, himself a member of the CFR, the
Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberg Group, employs almost one hundred CFR members in his administration. Presidents come and go, but the CFR's power--and agenda--always remains.

Closed Circuit--the shroud of secrecy around the CFR

On its web page, the CFR boasts that its magazine, Foreign Affairs, "is acclaimed for its analysis of recent international developments and for its forecasts of emerging trends." It's not much of a challenge to do so, though, when you play a part in determining what those emerging trends will be. This point is underscored a paragraph later on their web page: "Perhaps best known for the history-making "X" article by George Kennan, that defined Cold War containment policy, a recent Foreign Affairs article by Harvard's Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" has already helped define the post-Cold War debate."

So are they predicting trends or creating them? The answer is fairly obvious to anyone who has earnestly reflected on the matter.

The CFR fancies itself to represent a diverse range cultural and political interests, but its members are predominantly wealthy males, and their policies reflect their elitist biases. The CFR attempts to maintain the charade of diversity via its Non-Attribution Rule, which allows members to engage in "a free, frank, and open exchange of ideas" without fear of having any of their statements attributed in public. The flip side of this, obviously, is a dark cloud of secrecy which envelopes the CFR's activities.

CFR meetings are usually held in secret and are restricted to members and very select guests. All members are free to express themselves at meetings unrestrained, because the Non-Attribution Rule guarantees that "others will not attribute or characterize their statements in public media forums or knowingly transmit them to persons who will," according to the Council on Foreign Relations' 1992 Annual Report.

The report goes on to forbid any meeting participant "to publish a speaker's statement in attributed form in any newspaper; to repeat it on television or radio, or on a speaker's platform, or in a classroom; or to go beyond a memo of limited circulation."

The end result is that the only information the public has on the CFR is the information they release for public consumption, which
should send up red flags for anyone who understands the immense effect that CFR directives have on America's foreign policy. The public knows what the CFR wants the public to know about the CFR, and nothing more.

There is one hole in the fog of secrecy, however: a book entitled Tragedy and Hope, written by an "insider" named Dr. Carroll Quigley, mentor of Bill Clinton.

**Tragedy and Hope--a glimpse behind the scenes of global management.**

Dr. Quigley knew a lot about the behind-the-scenes work of global power because he was a part of that power network for most of his life. In his book, Tragedy and Hope, Quigley states:

"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 aversions 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 ... 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."

The "Hope" in the title of Quigley's book represents the thousand-year reign of a collectivist one-world society which will be created when the "network" achieves its goal of world government. Quigley believed that the "network" is so powerful at this point that resistance by the common people is futile. Hence, those who resist the schemes of the globalist planners represent the "Tragedy." By Dr. Quigley's logic, there is no point in struggling against the noose around our necks, because resistance will merely guarantee strangulation.

Dr. Quigley identified the "network" as the "international bankers," men who were "different from ordinary bankers in distinctive ways: they were cosmopolitan and international; they were close to governments and were particularly concerned with questions of government debts...; they were almost exclusively devoted to secrecy and the secret use of financial influence in political life. These bankers came to be called international bankers, and, more particularly, were known as merchant bankers in England, private bankers in France, and investment bankers in
the United States."

The core of control, according to Dr. Quigley, resides in the financial dynasties of Europe and America who exercise political control through international financial combines. The primary tactic of control is lending money at high interest to governments and monarchs during times of crisis. An example of this is the current national debt in the U.S., which is at five trillion dollars right now. Every penny of it is owed to the Federal Reserve, a corporation comprised of thirteen private banks.

According to Dr. Quigley, the Council on Foreign Relations is one of several front organizations set up by the network's inner circle to advance its schemes. The ultimate goal: a New World Order.

The Council on Foreign Relations and the New World Order

According to State Department Publication 2349, submitted by secretary of State and CFR member Edward Stettinius, a committee on "post-war problems" was set up before the end of 1939 at the suggestion of the CFR. In other words, two years before the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, the CFR was planning how to order the world after the war ended.

In 1946, the Rockefeller Foundation spent almost $140,000 to produce a history of how the United States entered World War II. This history was intended to counter "revisionist" historians who argued that the U.S. was "tricked" into the war by the Roosevelt Administration. The Rockefeller family has always taken a lead role in the CFR.

In the 1960s, while American men and women were dying in the jungles of Vietnam and while the military/industrial complex was sucking trillions of dollars out of American taxpayers' wallets, the Rockefeller dynasty was financing Vietnamese oil refineries and aluminum plants. If there had ever been a formal declaration of war, the Rockefellers could be tried for treason. Instead, they reaped dividends.

These are just a few of the abuses of power which demonstrate the results of the power elite's manipulations of our destiny as a society. If you've ever wondered why you don't hear about this network of power, just take a look at the CFR's membership roster (posted online in ParaScope). Many of the chief executives and newspeople at CBS, NBC/RCA, ABC, the Public Broadcast Service, the Associated Press, the New York Times, Time magazine, Newsweek, the Washington Post, and many other key
media outlets are CFR members.

Even if these members of the media's elite had the inclination to report on what they saw and heard at CFR meetings, they are prevented from doing so by the Non-Attribution Rule. To put this in perspective: many of the people who are trusted to provide information about national and world politics are deliberately withholding crucial information from the public because of membership in a secretive globalist organization.

This organization has taken it upon itself to participate in the manufacturing of a new vision for humanity, and dissidence will not be tolerated. If you believe the words of Carroll Quigley, all resistance is futile and doomed to failure. If you believe the rhetoric of internationalists in our own government, the current "trend towards isolationism" will result in a loss of American hegemony in the New World Order, leaving the United States a wrecked Third World wasteland.

World government can come in time, piece by piece, arrived at through the full participation and consensus of the human beings who will be affected by the negotiations. But the idea of the world's elite determining what path that the common herd should follow is repulsive to the human spirit. The story of the CFR goes far deeper than this brief report, and is interlocked with several other international power groups.

International power orgs depend on the masses remaining ignorant for their plans to come to fruition. It's up to you to do your own research and draw your own conclusion. But remember: there's a hell of a lot more to the story than Dan Rather will ever tell you. Educate yourself, or remain a passive consumer. The choice is entirely yours.

The Council on Foreign Relations

The Council on Foreign Relations was founded on July 29, 1921 in New York City by Col. Edward Madell House, chief adviser to President Woodrow Wilson in league with the same stockholders of The Federal Reserve. Through its membership, meetings, and studies, it has been called the most powerful agent of United States foreign policy outside the State Department.
The CFR is a serpentine network of international revolutionaries and fascist ideologues whose goal is to end American sovereignty and bring about a global, Marxist paradise. House, a socialist, wrote in his book, Philip Dru: Administrator, that he was working for "Socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx." He told of a "conspiracy" which would gain control of both political parties, and use them as instruments in the creation of a socialist world government. (John McManus, The Insiders, pg. 7.)

The founders included many of those who had been at the signing of the Treaty of Versailles after World War I, including Colonel Edward House and Walter Lippmann. Finances for the CFR came from the same players that set up the Federal Reserve System in America: J.P. Morgan; John D. Rockefeller; Bernard Baruch; Paul Warburg; Otto Kahn; and Jacob Schiff.

The roster of CFR members is thoroughly impressive - so are the power groups who have representatives in it. Its current membership, all 2905 of them, is like reading a "who's who" of the elite politicians, media, financiers, businessmen, and educators. From the CFR comes 90% of the people in the State Department and key positions in the Executive Branch.

International banking organizations that currently have men in the CFR include Kuhn, Loeb & Co; Lazard Freres (directly affiliated with Rothschild); Dillon Read; Lehman Bros.; Goldman, Sachs; Chase Manhattan Bank; Morgan Guaranty Bank; Brown Bors. Harriman; First National City Bank; Chemical Bank & Trust; and Manufacturers Hanover Trust Bank. The CFR is totally interlocked with the major foundations (Rockefeller, Ford, Carnegie) and the so-called think tanks (Rand, Hudson Institute, Brookings Institute). The left has been systematically infiltrating wealthy and powerful tax-free foundations and government agencies where taxpayers' funds would begin to pour out to support the liberal agenda at home and abroad.

Bill Clinton: former president of the United States, also a member of David Rockefeller's Bilderberger group and was in 1992 the only State Governor listed in the membership role of the Trilateral Commission.
Colin L. Powell United States Army (Ret.)
Robert E. Rubin Co-Chairman; Director and Chairman of the Executive Committee, Citigroup, Inc.
Madeleine K. Albright: former Secretary of State, a former Georgetown University professor, United Nations Ambassador. She is also a member of the Trilateral Commission.
Christine Todd Whitman: former governor of New Jersey
Warren Christopher: former Secretary of State; CFR Vice Chairman
Robert Reich: former Secretary of Labor (also TC and Rhodes scholar)
George Stephanopoulos: former Clinton Communications Director (also Rhodes scholar)
Clifton Wharton: Deputy Secretary of State
Peter Tarnoff: Under Secretary for Political Affairs (Current President of CFR - also TC)
Winston Lord: Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs; (past President of CFR - also TC)
Vernon Jordan: Clinton transition boss (also TC)
Lloyd Bentsen: former Secretary of Treasury
Admiral William Crow, Jr.: Head of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (also TC)
Anthony Lake: National Security Advisor
Samuel Berger: Deputy National Security Advisor
Les Aspin: Secretary of Defense
Donna Shalala: Secretary of Health and Human Services. An influential member of the CFR and the Trilateral Commission, Shalala chaired the CFR committee which set the New World Order agenda for Africa.
Strobe Talbott: Aid Coordinator to the commonwealth of Independent States (also TC)
Bruce Babbitt: Secretary of Interior (also TC)
Ron Brown: Secretary of Commerce
James Woolsey: CIA Director (also Rhodes scholar)
Roger Altman: Deputy Secretary of Treasury
Henry Cisneros: Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (also TC)
Robert Rubin: National Economic Council; Soviet Investment Expert
Dr. Jocelyn Elders: former Surgeon General
John Gibbons: White House Science Advisor
Alice Rivlin: Deputy Budget Director. She is also a member of both the CFR and Trilateral Commission.
Laura Tyson - Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors is a former Berkeley professor and is a fan of Stalin's communist economy.
Johnnetta Cole - Clinton transition coordinator for education, arts, labor and humanities.
W. Bowman Cutter: National Economic Council Deputy Assistant (also Rhodes scholar).
Nancy Soderberg: National Security Council Staff Director.
Ira Magaziner: Senior Adviser for Policy Development (also Rhodes scholar).
Bruce Reed: Domestic Policy Council Deputy Assistant (also Rhodes scholar).
Mike Espy: Agriculture Secretary (also served on the Rhodes Scholarship Selection Committee).
Representative Thomas Foley: Former Speaker of the House of Representatives (also TC)
Henry S. Bienen President, Northwestern University
Tom Brokaw NBC News

The CFR's Study No. 7, published November 25, 1959, openly declared its true purpose: "...building a New International Order [which] must be responsive to world aspirations for peace, [and] for social and economic change...an international order [code for world government]...including states labeling themselves as 'Socialist.'" One could safely say that a nutshell descriptor of the CFR is "to bring about a New World Order through the manipulation of U.S. foreign policy and relations and through international economic interdependence."
The CFR's Annual Report in 1974 says the project for the CFR in the '80's will be "The management of the International economy, global poverty, environment and the new "common"... the oceans, the seabeds, and space, and interstate violence, including arms control. What they are saying is "The management of your money, your land, your groceries, and your guns."

In 1975, the Rockefeller Foundation Report discusses the "Interdependece" of the countries of the world on each other. That we are of one world and shall become a nation state world under one government. They also say, we must reach a zero state population growth. The Rockefeller Foundation stated that they have in excess of 747 million dollars to achieve this with.

**Obama: Trilateral Commission Endgame**

By Patrick Wood, Editor
January 30, 2009

[Ed. note: For clarity, members of the Trilateral Commission appear in bold type.]

As previously noted in *Pawns of the Global Elite*, Barack Obama was groomed for the presidency by key members of the Trilateral Commission. Most notably, it was Zbigniew Brzezinski, co-founder of the Trilateral Commission with David Rockefeller in 1973, who was Obama's principal foreign policy advisor.

The pre-election attention is reminiscent of Brzezinski's tutoring of Jimmy Carter prior to Carter's landslide election in 1976.

For anyone who doubts the Commission's continuing influence on Obama, consider that he has *already* appointed no less than eleven members of the Commission to top-level and key positions in his Administration.

According to official Trilateral Commission membership lists, there are only 87 members from the United States (the other 337 members are from other regions). Thus, in less than two weeks since his inauguration, Obama's
appointments encompass more than 12% of Commission's entire U.S. membership.

Is this a mere coincidence or is it a continuation of dominance over the Executive Branch since 1976? (For important background, read The Trilateral Commission: Usurping Sovereignty.)

- Secretary of Treasury, Tim Geithner
- Ambassador to the United Nations, Susan Rice
- National Security Advisor, Gen. James L. Jones
- Deputy National Security Advisor, Thomas Donilon
- Chairman, Economic Recovery Committee, Paul Volker
- Director of National Intelligence, Admiral Dennis C. Blair
- Assistant Secretary of State, Asia & Pacific, Kurt M. Campbell
- Deputy Secretary of State, James Steinberg
- State Department, Special Envoy, Richard Haass
- State Department, Special Envoy, Dennis Ross
- State Department, Special Envoy, Richard Holbrooke

There are many other incidental links to the Trilateral Commission, for instance,

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is married to Commission member William Jefferson Clinton.

Geithner's informal group of advisors include E. Gerald Corrigan, Paul Volker, Alan Greenspan and Peter G. Peterson, among others. His first job after college was with Henry Kissinger at Kissinger Associates.

Brent Scowcroft has been an unofficial advisor to Obama and was mentor to Defense Secretary Robert Gates.

Robert Zoelick is currently president of the World Bank.
Laurence Summers, White House Economic Advisor, was mentored by former Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin during the Clinton administration.

There are many other such links, but these are enough for you to get the idea of what's going on here.

Analyze the positions

Notice that five of the Trilateral appointees involve the State Department, where foreign policy is created and implemented. Hillary Clinton is certainly in line with these policies because her husband, Bill Clinton, is also a member.

What is more important than economic recovery? Paul Volker is the answer.

What is more important than national intelligence? Gen. James Jones, Thomas Donilon and Adm. Dennis Blair hold the top three positions.

What is more important than the Treasury and the saving of our financial system? Timothy Geithner says he has the answers.

The State Department is virtually dominated by Trilaterals: Kurt Campbell, James Steinberg, Richard Haass, Dennis Ross and Richard Holbrooke.

This leaves Susan Rice, Ambassador to the United Nations. The U.N. is the chosen instrument for ultimate global governance. Rice will help to subvert the U.S. into the U.N. umbrella of vassal states.

Conflict of interest

Since 1973, the Commission has met regularly in plenary sessions to discuss policy position papers developed by its members. Policies are debated in order to achieve consensuses. Respective members return to their own countries to implement policies consistent with those consensuses.

The original stated purpose of the Trilateral Commission was to create a "New International Economic Order." Its current statement has morphed into fostering a "closer cooperation among these core democratic industrialized areas of the world with shared leadership responsibilities in the wider international system.” (See The Trilateral Commission web site)
U.S. Trilateral members implement policies determined by a majority of non-Americans that most often work against the best interests of the country.

"How," you say?

Since the administration of Jimmy Carter, Trilaterals held these massively influential positions:

- Six out of eight World Bank presidents, including the current appointee, Robert Zoelick
- Eight out of ten U.S. Trade Representatives
- President and/or Vice-President of every elected administration (except for Obama/Biden)
- Seven out of twelve Secretaries of State
- Nine out of twelve Secretaries of Defense

Is this sinking in? Are you grasping the enormity of it?

Endgame is at hand

For the Trilateral crowd, the game is about over. The recent reemergence of original members Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Brent Scowcroft and Paul Volker serves to reinforce the conclusion that the New International Economic Order is near.

The Trilateral Commission and its members have engineered the global economic, trade and financial system that is currently in a state of total chaos.

Does that mean that they have lost? Hardly.

As I recently wrote in Chorus call for New World Order, they are using the crisis to destroy what remains of national Sovereignty, so that a New World Order can finally and permanently be put into place.
Conclusion

The Obama presidency is a disingenuous fraud. He was elected by promising to bring change, yet from the start change was never envisioned. He was carefully groomed and financed by the Trilateral Commission and their friends.

In short, Obama is merely the continuation of disastrous, non-American policies that have brought economic ruin upon us and the rest of the world. The Obama experience rivals that of Jimmy Carter, whose campaign slogan was "I will never lie to you."

When the Democrat base finally realizes that it has been conned again (Bill Clinton and Al Gore were members), perhaps it will unleash a real political revolution that will oust Trilateral politicians, operatives and policies from the shores of our country.

If the reader is a Democrat, be aware that many Republicans and conservatives are still licking their wounds after finally realizing that George Bush and Dick Cheney worked the same con on them for a disastrous eight years of the same policies!

Obama and McCain: Pawns of the Global Elite?

By Patrick Wood, Editor

August 5, 2008

Will it matter if Obama or McCain are elected in November? Hardly.

Both are rigidly backed by important members of the Trilateral Commission who hijacked the Executive Branch of the U.S. government starting in 1976 with the election of Jimmy Carter.
In Obama’s case, Zbigniew Brzezinski (co-founder of the Commission in 1973) is emerging as his principal advisor on foreign policy. Ex-Fed Chairman Paul Volker has made a once-in-a-lifetime, glowing endorsement of Obama. Madelyn Albright is seen sitting next to Obama in several conferences. Shoot, even Jimmy Carter himself endorses Obama. All are top members of the Commission.

John McCain is being supported by several Trilateral Commission giants including: Henry Kissinger, George Schultz, Lawrence Eagleburger and Alexander Haig. All of these are ex-Secretaries of State who issued a joint endorsement of McCain early-on in his campaign.

And, unless Obama shoots both of his own feet (or…?) before the general presidential election in November, he is most likely to be the next president of the United States.

You would think that Americans would want to know who the “special interests” are that are embodied by this Trilateral Commission, and what they intend to do or not do with America.

**What is the Trilateral Commission?**

The Trilateral Commission was founded by the persistent maneuvering of David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski in 1973. Rockefeller was chairman of the ultra-powerful Chase Manhattan Bank, a director of many major multinational corporations and "endowment funds" and had long been a central figure in the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Brzezinski, a brilliant prognosticator of one-world idealism, was a professor at Columbia University and the author of several books that have served as "policy guidelines" for the Trilateral Commission.

Brzezinski served as the Commission’s first executive director from its inception in 1973 until late 1976 when he was appointed by President Jimmy Carter as Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

The initial Commission membership was approximately three hundred, with roughly one hundred each from Europe, Japan and North America. Membership was also roughly divided between academics, politicians and corporate
magnates; these included international bankers, leaders of prominent labor
unions and corporate directors of media giants.

The word commission was puzzling since it is usually associated with
instrumentalities set up by governments. It seemed out of place with a so-called
private group unless we could determine that it really was an arm of a
government - an unseen government, different from the visible government in
Washington. European and Japanese involvement indicated a world government
rather than a national government. We hoped that the concept of a sub-rosa
world government was just wishful thinking on the part of the Trilateral
Commissioners. The facts, however, lined up quite pessimistically.

If the Council on Foreign Relations could be said to be a spawning ground for
the concepts of one-world idealism, then the Trilateral Commission was the
"task force" assembled to assault the beachheads. Already the Commission had
placed its members in the top posts the U.S. had to offer.

**Jimmy Carter: The first Trilateral president**

President James Earl Carter, the country politician who promised, "I will never
lie to you," was chosen to join the
Commission by Brzezinski in 1973. It
was Brzezinski, in fact, who first
identified Carter as presidential timber,
and subsequently educated him in
economics, foreign policy, and the ins-
and-outs of world politics. Upon Carter's
election, Brzezinski was appointed
assistant to the president for national
security matters. Commonly, he was
called the head of the National Security Council because he answered only to
the president - some said Brzezinski held the second most powerful position in
the U.S.

Carter's running mate, Walter Mondale, was also a member of the Commission.
(If you are trying to calculate the odds of three virtually unknown men, out of
over sixty Commissioners from the U.S., capturing the three most powerful
positions in the land, don't bother. Your calculations will be meaningless.)

was a powerful Trilateral, named President Carter "Man of the Year." The
sixteen-page article in that issue not only failed to mention Carter's connection with the Commission but also stated the following:

“As he searched for Cabinet appointees, Carter seemed at times hesitant and frustrated disconcertingly out of character. His lack of ties to Washington and the Party Establishment - qualities that helped raise him to the White House - carry potential dangers. He does not know the Federal Government or the pressures it creates. He does not really know the politicians whom he will need to help him run the country.”

Was this portrait of Carter as a political innocent simply inaccurate or was it deliberately misleading? By December 25, 1976 - two weeks before the Time article appeared - Carter had already chosen his cabinet. Three of his cabinet members – Cyrus Vance, Michael Blumenthal, and Harold Brown - were Trilateral Commissioners; and the other non-Commission members were not unsympathetic to Commission objectives and operations. In addition, Carter had appointed another fourteen Trilateral Commissioners to top government posts, including:

- C. Fred Bergsten (Under Secretary of Treasury)
- James Schlesinger (Secretary of Energy)
- Elliot Richardson (Delegate to Law of the Sea)
- Leonard Woodcock (Chief envoy to China)
- Andrew Young (Ambassador to the United Nations).

As of 25 December 1976, therefore, there were nineteen Trilaterals, including Carter and Mondale, holding tremendous political power. These presidential appointees represented almost one-third of the Trilateral Commission members from the United States. The odds of that happening “by chance” are beyond calculation!

Realities of the New World Order

In 1972, Brzezinski's wrote that "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."
The late Senator Barry Goldwater (R-AZ) was one of a very few people who understood what Brzezinski was alluding to, when he issued a clear and precise warning in his 1979 book, With No Apologies:

“The Trilateral Commission is international and 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.”

Trilateral Entrenchment: 1980-2008

Every Administration since Carter has had top-level Trilateral Commission representation through the President or Vice-President, or both! George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, Al Gore and Dick Cheney are all members.

In turn, these have appointed their Trilateral cronies to top positions in their Administrations.

For instance, six out of seven World Bank presidents have been members of the Commission. Eight out of ten USTR’s (U.S. Trade Representative) have been members.

Secretaries of State include Henry Kissinger, Cyrus Vance, Alexander Haig, George Schultz, Lawrence Eagleburger, Warren Christopher and Madeleine Albright. Yep, all members of the Trilateral Commission.

Follow the money, follow the power

You decide which is scarier: Obama and Brzezinski or McCain and Henry Kissinger?

Either way, Americans will continue to lose…

Every major crisis we face today is directly attributable to policies put forth and executed by members of this Trilateral Commission: Banking/lending/mortgage
crisis, energy/gas price crisis, food/shortage/price crisis.

In addition, in the last fifteen to twenty years we have lost of millions of prime manufacturing jobs to China, India and Mexico. Our prime assets are being purchased by sovereign wealth funds and foreign investors. Our currency has all but been destroyed throughout the world.

Remember Brzezinski's vision that "international banks and multinational corporations are acting and planning in terms that are far in advance of the political concepts of the nation-state"?

Well, that’s been true enough. But, for all their acting and planning at the expense of our own prosperity and Sovereignty, who wants or needs more of the same under Obama or McCain? With friends like this, who needs enemies?

For several Presidential elections now, this writer has voted according to the philosophy of voting for the “lesser of two evils.” Never again!

A vote for either Obama or McCain is a vote for the complete destruction of America!

The Trilateral Commission: Usurping Sovereignty

By Patrick Wood

[Editor’s note: For ease of reading, all members of the Trilateral Commission appear in bold type]

“President Reagan ultimately came to understand Trilateral’s value and invited the entire membership to a reception at the White House in April 1984”
— David Rockefeller, Memoirs, 2002

According to each issue of the official Trilateral Commission quarterly magazine Trialogue:
The Trilateral Commission was formed in 1973 by private citizens of Western Europe, Japan and North America to foster closer cooperation among these three regions on common problems. It seeks to improve public understanding of such problems, to support proposals for handling them jointly, and to nurture habits and practices of working together among these regions.”

Further, Trialogue and other official writings made clear their stated goal of creating a “New International Economic Order.” President George H.W. Bush later talked openly about creating a “New World Order”, which has since become a synonymous phrase.

This paper attempts to tell the rest of the story, according to official and unofficial Commission sources and other available documents.

The Trilateral Commission was founded by the persistent maneuvering of David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski. Rockefeller was chairman of the ultra-powerful Chase Manhattan Bank, a director of many major multinational corporations and "endowment funds" and had long been a central figure in the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Brzezinski, a brilliant prognosticator of one-world idealism, was a professor at Columbia University and the author of several books that have served as "policy guidelines" for the Trilateral Commission. Brzezinski served as the Commission's first executive director from its inception in 1973 until late 1976 when he was appointed by President Jimmy Carter as Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

The initial Commission membership was approximately three hundred, with roughly one hundred each from Europe, Japan and North America. Membership was also roughly divided between academics, politicians and corporate magnates; these included international bankers, leaders of prominent labor unions and corporate directors of media giants.

The word commission was puzzling since it is usually associated with instrumentalities set up by governments. It seemed out of place with a so-called private group unless we could determine that it really was an arm of a government - an unseen government, different from the visible government in Washington. European and Japanese involvement indicated a world government rather than a national government. We hoped that the concept of a sub-rosa world government was just wishful thinking on the part of the Trilateral Commissioners. The facts, however, lined up quite pessimistically.

If the Council on Foreign Relations could be said to be a spawning ground for the concepts of one-world idealism, then the Trilateral Commission was the
"task force" assembled to assault the beachheads. Already the Commission had placed its members in the top posts the U.S. had to offer.

President James Earl Carter, the country politician who promised, "I will never lie to you," was chosen to join the Commission by Brzezinski in 1973. It was Brzezinski, in fact, who first identified Carter as presidential timber, and subsequently educated him in economics, foreign policy, and the ins-and-outs of world politics. Upon Carter's election, Brzezinski was appointed assistant to the president for national security matters. Commonly, he was called the head of the National Security Council because he answered only to the president - some said Brzezinski held the second most powerful position in the U.S.

Carter's running mate, Walter Mondale, was also a member of the Commission. (If you are trying to calculate the odds of three virtually unknown men, out of over sixty Commissioners from the U.S., capturing the three most powerful positions in the land, don't bother. Your calculations will be meaningless.)

On January 7, 1977 Time Magazine, whose editor-in-chief, Hedley Donovan was a powerful Trilateral, named President Carter "Man of the Year." The sixteen-page article in that issue not only failed to mention Carter's connection with the Commission but also stated the following:

“As he searched for Cabinet appointees, Carter seemed at times hesitant and frustrated disconcertingly out of character. His lack of ties to Washington and the Party Establishment - qualities that helped raise him to the White House - carry potential dangers. He does not know the Federal Government or the pressures it creates. He does not really know the politicians whom he will need to help him run the country.”

Is this portrait of Carter as a political innocent simply inaccurate or is it deliberately misleading? By December 25, 1976 - two weeks before the Time article appeared - Carter had already chosen his cabinet. Three of his cabinet members – Cyrus Vance, Michael Blumenthal, and Harold Brown - were Trilateral Commissioners; and the other non-Commission members were not unsympathetic to Commission objectives and operations. In addition, Carter had appointed another fourteen Trilateral Commissioners to top government posts, including:
As of 25 December 1976, therefore, there were nineteen Trilaterals, including Carter and Mondale, holding tremendous political power. These presidential appointees represented almost one-third of the Trilateral Commission members from the United States. The odds of that happening “by chance” are beyond calculation!

Nevertheless, was there even the slightest evidence to indicate anything other than collusion? Hardly! Zbigniew Brzezinski spelled out the qualifications of a 1976 presidential winner in 1973:

“The Democratic candidate in 1976 will have to emphasize work, the family, religion and, increasingly, patriotism...The new conservatism will clearly not go back to laissez faire. It will be a philosophical conservatism. It will be a kind of conservative statism or managerism. There will be conservative values but a reliance on a great deal of co-determination between state and the corporations.”

On 23 May 1976 journalist Leslie H. Gelb wrote in the not-so-conservative New York Times, "(Brzezinski) was the first guy in the Community to pay attention to Carter, to take him seriously. He spent time with Carter, talked to him, sent him books and articles, educated him." Richard Gardner (also of Columbia University) joined into the "educational" task, and as Gelb noted, between the two of them they had Carter virtually to themselves. Gelb continued: "While the Community as a whole was looking elsewhere, to Senators Kennedy and Mondale...it paid off. Brzezinski, with Gardner, is now the leading man on Carter's foreign policy task force."

Although Richard Gardner was of considerable academic influence, it should be clear that Brzezinski was the "guiding light" of foreign policy in the Carter administration. Along with Commissioner Vance and a host of other Commissioners in the State Department, Brzezinski had more than continued the policies of befriending our enemies and alienating our friends. Since early 1977 we had witnessed a massive push to attain "normalized" relations with Communist China, Cuba, the USSR, Eastern European nations, Angola, etc.
Conversely, we had withdrawn at least some support from Nationalist China, South Africa, Zimbabwe (formerly Rhodesia), etc. It was not just a trend - it was an epidemic. Thus, if it could be said that Brzezinski had, at least in part, contributed to current U.S. foreign and domestic policy, then we should briefly analyze exactly what he was espousing.

**Needed: A More Just and Equitable World Order**

The Trilateral Commission held their annual plenary meeting in Tokyo, Japan, in January 1977. **Carter** and **Brzezinski** obviously could not attend as they were still in the process of reorganizing the White House. They did, however, address personal letters to the meeting, which were reprinted in *Trialogue*, the official magazine of the Commission:

“It gives me special pleasure to send greetings to all of you gathering for the Trilateral Commission meeting in Tokyo. I have warm memories of our meeting in Tokyo some eighteen months ago, and am sorry I cannot be with you now.

“My active service on the Commission since its inception in 1973 has been a splendid experience for me, and it provided me with excellent opportunities to come to know leaders in our three regions.

“As I emphasized in my campaign, a strong partnership among us is of the greatest importance. We share economic, political and security concerns that make it logical we should seek ever-increasing cooperation and understanding. And this cooperation is essential not only for our three regions, but in the global search for a more just and equitable world order** (emphasis added). I hope to see you on the occasion of your next meeting in Washington, and I look forward to receiving reports on your work in Tokyo.

“Jimmy Carter”

**Brzezinski’s** letter, in a similar vein, follows:

“The Trilateral Commission has meant a great deal to me over the last few years. It has been the stimulus for intellectual creativity and a source of personal satisfaction. I have formed close ties with new friends and colleagues in all three regions, ties which I value highly and which I am sure will continue.
“I remain convinced that, on the larger architectural issues of today, collaboration among our regions is of the utmost necessity. This collaboration must be dedicated to the fashioning of a more just and equitable world order (emphasis added). This will require a prolonged process, but I think we can look forward with confidence and take some pride in the contribution which the Commission is making.

“Zbigniew Brzezinski”

The key phrase in both letters was "more just and equitable world order." Did this emphasis indicate that something was wrong with our present world order, that is, with national structures? Yes, according to Brzezinski, and since the present "framework" was inadequate to handle world problems, it must be done away with and supplanted with a world government.

In September 1974 Brzezinski was asked in an interview by the Brazilian newspaper Vega. "How would you define this new world order?" Brzezinski answered:

“When I speak of the present international system I am referring to relations in specific fields, most of all among the Atlantic countries; commercial, military, mutual security relations, involving the international monetary fund, NATO etc. We need to change the international system for a global system in which new, active and creative forces recently developed - should be integrated. This system needs to include Japan. Brazil, the oil producing countries, and even the USSR, to the extent which the Soviet Union is willing to participate in a global system.”

When asked if Congress would have an expanded or diminished role in the new system, Brzezinski declared "...the reality of our times is that a modern society such as the U.S. needs a central coordinating and renovating organ which cannot be made up of six hundred people.”

Brzezinski developed background for the need for a new system in his book Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era (1969). He wrote that mankind has moved through three great stages of evolution, and was in the middle of the fourth and final stage. The first stage he described as "religious," combining a heavenly "universalism provided by the acceptance of the idea that man's destiny is essentially in God's hands" with an earthly "narrowness derived from massive ignorance, illiteracy, and a vision confined to the immediate environment."
The second stage was nationalism, stressing Christian equality before the law, which "marked another giant step in the progressive redefinition of man's nature and place in our world." The third stage was Marxism, which, said Brzezinski, "represents a further vital and creative stage in the maturing of man's universal vision." The fourth and final stage was Brzezinski's Technetronic Era, or the ideal of rational humanism on a global scale - the result of American-Communist evolutionary transformations.11

In considering our structure of governance, Brzezinski stated:

“Tension is unavoidable as man strives to assimilate the new into the framework of the old. For a time the established framework resiliently integrates the new by adapting it in a more familiar shape. But at some point the old framework becomes overloaded. The newer input can no longer be redefined into traditional forms, and eventually it asserts itself with compelling force. Today, though, the old framework of international politics - with their spheres of influence, military alliances between nation-states, the fiction of Sovereignty, doctrinal conflicts arising from nineteenth century crises - is clearly no longer compatible with reality.”12

One of the most important "frameworks" in the world, and especially to Americans, was the United States Constitution. It was this document that outlined the most prosperous nation in the history of the world. Was our sovereignty really "fiction"? Was the U.S. vision no longer compatible with reality? Brzezinski further stated:

“The approaching two-hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence could justify the call for a national constitutional convention to reexamine the nation's formal institutional framework. Either 1976 or 1989 - the two- hundredth an anniversary of the Constitution - could serve as a suitable target date culminating a national dialogue on the relevance of existing arrangements... Realism, however, forces us to recognize that the necessary political innovation will not come from direct constitutional reform, desirable as that would be. The needed change is more likely to develop incrementally and less overtly...in keeping with the American tradition of blurring distinctions between public and private institution.”13

In Brzezinski's Technetronic Era then, 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."14
Brzezinski’s philosophy clearly pointed forward to Richard Gardner’s *Hard Road to World Order* that appeared in *Foreign Affairs* in 1974, where Gardner stated,

"In short, the 'house of world order' would 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."

That former approach which had produced few successes during the 1950’s and 1960’s was being traded for a velvet sledge-hammer: It would make little noise, but would still drive the spikes of globalization deep into the hearts of many different countries around the world, including the United States. Indeed, the Trilateral Commission was the chosen vehicle that finally got the necessary traction to actually create their New World Order.

Understanding the philosophy of the Trilateral Commission was and is the only way we can reconcile the myriad of apparent contradictions in the information filtered through to us in the national press. For instance, how was it that the Marxist regime in Angola derived the great bulk of its foreign exchange from the offshore oil operations of Gulf Oil Corporation? Why did Andrew Young insist that "Communism has never been a threat to Blacks in Africa"? Why did the U.S. funnel billions in technological aid to the Soviet Union and Communist China? Why did the U.S. apparently help its enemies while chastising its friends?

A similar and perplexing question is asked by millions of Americans today: Why do we spend trillions on the “War on Terror” around the world and yet ignore the Mexican/U.S. border and the tens of thousands of illegal aliens who freely enter the U.S. each and every month?

These questions, and hundreds of others like them, cannot be explained in any other way: the U.S. Executive Branch (and related agencies) was not anti-Marxist or anti-Communist - it was and is, in fact, pro-Marxist. Those ideals which led to the heinous abuses of Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, and Mussolini were now being accepted as necessary inevitabilities by our elected and appointed leaders.

This hardly suggests the Great American Dream. It is very doubtful that Americans would agree with Brzezinski or the Trilateral Commission. It is the
American public who is paying the price, suffering the consequences, but not understanding the true nature of the situation.

This nature however, was not unknown or unknowable. Senator Barry Goldwater (R-AZ) issued a clear and precise warning in his 1979 book, With No Apologies:

“The Trilateral Commission is international and 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.”

Unfortunately, few heard and even fewer understood.

**Follow the Money, Follow the Power**

What was the *economic* nature of the driving force within the Trilateral Commission? It was the giant multinational corporations - those with Trilateral representation - which consistently benefited from Trilateral policy and actions. Polished academics such as Brzezinski, Gardner, Allison, McCracken, Henry Owen etc., served only to give "philosophical" justification to the exploitation of the world.

Don't underestimate their power or the distance they had already come by 1976. Their economic base was already established. Giants like Coca-Cola, IBM, CBS, Caterpillar Tractor, Bank of America, Chase Manhattan Bank, Deere & Company, Exxon, and others virtually dwarf whatever remains of American businesses. The market value of IBM's stock alone, for instance, was greater than the value of all the stocks on the American Stock Exchange. Chase Manhattan Bank had some fifty thousand branches or correspondent banks throughout the world. What reached our eyes and ears was highly regulated by CBS, the New York Times, Time magazine, etc.

The most important thing of all is to remember that the *political* coup de grace preceded the *economic* coup de grace. The domination of the Executive Branch of the U.S. government provided all the necessary political leverage needed to skew U.S. and global economic policies to their own benefit.
By 1977, the Trilateral Commission had notably become expert at using crises (and creating them in some instances) to manage countries toward the New World Order; yet, they found menacing backlashes from those very crises.

In the end, the biggest crisis of all was that of the American way of life. Americans never counted on such powerful and influential groups working against the Constitution and freedom, either inadvertently or purposefully, and even now, the principles that helped to build this great country are all but reduced to the sound of meaningless babblings.

**Trilateral Entrenchment: 1980-2007**


It would have been damaging enough if the Trilateral domination of the Carter administration was merely a one-time anomaly; but it was not!

Subsequent presidential elections brought George H.W. Bush (under Reagan), William Jefferson Clinton, Albert Gore and Richard Cheney (under G. W. Bush) to power.

Thus, every Administration since Carter has had top-level Trilateral Commission representation through the President or Vice-president, or both!

It is important to note that Trilateral domination has transcended political parties: they dominated both the Republican and Democrat parties with equal aplomb.

In addition, the Administration before Carter was very friendly and useful to Trilateral doctrine as well: President Gerald Ford took the reins after President Richard Nixon resigned, and then appointed Nelson Rockefeller as his Vice President. Neither Ford nor Rockefeller were members of the Trilateral Commission, but Nelson was David Rockefeller’s brother and that says enough. According to Nelson Rockefeller’s memoirs, he originally introduced then-governor Jimmy Carter to David and Brzezinski.
How has the Trilateral Commission effected their goal of creating a New World Order or a New International Economic Order? They seated their own members at the top of the institutions of global trade, global banking and foreign policy.

For instance, the World Bank is one of the most critical mechanisms in the engine of globalization. Since the founding of the Trilateral Commission in 1973, there have been only seven World Bank presidents, all of whom were appointed by the President. Of these seven, six were pulled from the ranks of the Trilateral Commission!

- Robert McNamara (1968-1981)
- Barber Conable (1986-1991)
- Paul Wolfowitz (2005-2007)
- Robert Zoellick (2007-present)

Another good evidence of domination is the position of U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), which is critically involved in negotiating the many international trade treaties and agreements that have been necessary to create the New International Economic Order. Since 1977, there have been ten USTR’s appointed by the President. Eight have been members of the Trilateral Commission!

- Mickey Kantor (1993-1997)
- Charlene Barshefsky (1997-2001)
- Rob Portman (2005-2006)
This is not to say that Clayton Yeuter and Rob Portman were not friendly to Trilateral goals, because they clearly were.

The Secretary of State cabinet position has seen its share of Trilaterals as well: **Henry Kissinger** (Nixon, Ford), **Cyrus Vance** (Carter), **Alexander Haig** (Reagan), **George Shultz** (Reagan), **Lawrence Eagleburger** (G.H.W. Bush), **Warren Christopher** (Clinton) and **Madeleine Albright** (Clinton) There were some Acting Secretaries of State that are also noteworthy: **Philip Habib** (Carter), **Michael Armacost** (G.H.W. Bush), **Arnold Kantor** (Clinton), **Richard Cooper** (Clinton).

Lastly, it should be noted that the Federal Reserve has likewise been dominated by Trilaterals: **Arthur Burns** (1970-1978), **Paul Volker** (1979-1987), **Alan Greenspan** (1987-2006). While the Federal Reserve is a privately-owned corporation, the President “chooses” the Chairman to a perpetual appointment. The current Fed Chairman, Ben Bernanke, is not a member of the Trilateral Commission, but he clearly is following the same globalist policies as his predecessors.

The point raised here is that Trilateral domination over the U.S. Executive Branch has not only continued and but has been strengthened from 1976 to the present. The pattern has been deliberate and persistent: Appoint members of the Trilateral Commission to critical positions of power so that they can carry out Trilateral policies.

The question is and has always been, do these policies originate in consensus meetings of the Trilateral Commission where two-thirds of the members are not U.S. citizens? The answer is all too obvious.

Trilateral-friendly defenders attempt to sweep criticism aside by suggesting that membership in the Trilateral Commission is incidental, and that it only demonstrates the otherwise high quality of appointees. Are we to believe that in a country of 300 million people only these 100 or so are qualified to hold such critical positions? Again, the answer is all too obvious.

**Where Does the Council on Foreign Relations Fit?**

While virtually all Trilateral Commission members from North America have also been members of the CFR, the reverse is certainly not true. It is easy to
over-criticize the CFR because most of its members seem to fill the balance of government positions not already filled by Trilaterals.

The power structure of the Council is seen in the makeup of its board of directors: No less than 44 percent (12 out of 27) are members of the Commission! If director participation reflected only the general membership of the CFR, then only 3-4 percent of the board would be Trilaterals.\textsuperscript{18}

Further, the president of the CFR is Richard N. Haass, a very prominent Trilateral member who also served as Director of Policy Planning for the U.S. Department of State from 2001-2003.

Trilateral influence can easily be seen in policy papers produced by the CFR in support of Trilateral goals.

For instance, the 2005 CFR task force report on the Future of North America was perhaps the major Trilateral policy statement on the intended creation of the North American Union. Vice-chair of the task force was Dr. Robert A. Pastor, who has emerged as the “Father of the North American Union” and has been directly involved in Trilateral operations since the 1970’s. While the CFR claimed that the task force was “independent,” careful inspection of those appointed reveal that three Trilaterals were carefully chosen to oversee the Trilateral position, one each from Mexico, Canada and the United States: Luis Rubio, Wendy K. Dobson and Carla A. Hills, respectively.\textsuperscript{19} Hills has been widely hailed as the principal architect of the North American Free Trade Agreement (\textsuperscript{1}NAFTA) that was negotiated under President George H.W. Bush in 1992.

The bottom line is that the Council on Foreign Relations, thoroughly dominated by Trilaterals, serves the interests of the Trilateral Commission, not the other way around!

\textbf{Trilateral Globalization in Europe}

The content of this paper thus far suggests ties between the Trilateral Commission and the United States. This is not intended to mean that Trilaterals are not active in other countries as well. Recalling the early years of the Commission, David Rockefeller wrote in 1998, \textit{“Back in the early Seventies, the hope for a}
more united EUROPE was already full-blown – thanks in many ways to the individual energies previously spent by so many of the Trilateral Commission’s earliest members.” [Capitals in original]²⁰

Thus, since 1973 and in parallel with their U.S. Hegemony, the European members of the Trilateral Commission were busy creating the European Union. In fact, the EU's Constitution was authored by Commission member Valéry Giscard d'Estaing in 2002-2003, when he was President of the Convention on the Future of Europe. [For more on the EU, see European Union: Dictatorship Rising? and The Globalization Strategy: America and Europe in the Crucible]

The steps that led to the creation of the European Union are unsurprisingly similar to the steps being taken to create the North American Union today. As with the EU, lies, deceit and confusion are the principal tools used to keep an unsuspecting citizenry in the dark while they forge ahead without mandate, accountability or oversight. [See The Globalization Strategy: America and Europe in the Crucible and Toward a North American Union]

Conclusion

It is clear that the Executive Branch of the U.S. was literally hijacked in 1976 by members of the Trilateral Commission, upon the election of President Jimmy Carter and Vice-President Walter Mondale. This near-absolute domination, especially in the areas of trade, banking, economics and foreign policy, has continued unchallenged and unabated to the present.

Windfall profits have accrued to interests associated with the Trilateral Commission, but the effect of their “New International Economic Order” on the U.S. has been nothing less than devastating. (See America Plundered by the Global Elite for a more detailed analysis)

The philosophical underpinnings of the Trilateral Commission are pro-Marxist and pro-socialist. They are solidly set against the concept of the nation-state and in particular, the Constitution of the United States. Thus, national sovereignty must be diminished and then abolished altogether in order to make way for the New World Order that will be governed by an unelected global elite with their self-created legal framework.

If you are having negative sentiment against Trilateral-style globalization, you are not alone. A 2007 Financial Times/Harris poll revealed that less than 20
percent of people in six industrialized countries (including the U.S.) believe that globalization is good for their country while over 50 percent are outright negative towards it.21 (See Global Backlash Against Globalization?) While citizens around the world are feeling the pain of globalization, few understand why it is happening and hence, they have no effective strategy to counter it.

The American public has never, ever conceived that such forces would align themselves so successfully against freedom and Liberty. Yet, the evidence is clear: Steerage of America has long since fallen into the hands of an actively hostile enemy that intends to remove all vestiges of the very things that made us the greatest nation in the history of mankind.
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The Bilderberg "Blackout". The press corps' noncoverage of that weekend conference in Chantilly, Va.

By Jack Shafer | Posted Monday, June 9, 2008, at 8:32 PM ET

About this time each year, the Bilderberg group convenes a weekend conference in a hotel or resort somewhere in North America or Europe in which 120 or so billionaires, bankers, politicians, industrialists, scholars, government officials, influentials from labor and education, and journalists assemble to discuss world affairs in private.

This year, the 56th Bilderberg meeting took place over the weekend at the Westfields Marriott in Chantilly, Va., seven miles from Washington Dulles International Airport. As in previous years, Bilderberg critics are berating the mainstream press for observing a "blackout" of a group they believe directs a secret, shadow government.

The critics claim that Bilderberg grooms future American presidents and future British prime ministers, pointing to Bill Clinton's attendance in 1991 and Tony Blair's in 1993. Time magazine reported in 2004 that John Edwards impressed attendees at the Bilderberg session in Italy, after which John Kerry asked him to join his presidential ticket.

According to the 1980 book Trilateralism: The Trilateral Commission and Elite Planning for World Management, President Dwight D. Eisenhower was enthusiastic about sending staffers to Bilderberg, President John F. Kennedy drew heavily from Bilderberg alumni—Dean Rusk, George W. Ball, George McGhee, Walter Rostow, Arthur Dean, and Paul
Nitze—to staff his administration, and many Carter administration officials had attended the retreat.

According to a list published by one critic, the attendees of Bilderberg 2008 include Henry Kissinger, Ben S. Bernanke, David Rockefeller, Vin Weber, Henry Kravis, Robert B. Zoellick, Donald Graham, Vernon Jordan, Charlie Rose, and their equals from Europe. Protestors staked out the elite at the hotel's entrance and recorded "surveillance" videos inside and outside the minimum-security facility before the event commenced.

About this much the Bilderberg critics are right: The mainstream media ignored Bilderberg 2008. According to Nexis, Wonkette and Raw Story noted the event and the critics' objections on the Web. A simple Web search produces Bilderberg detractors Alex Jones and Jim Tucker sounding their alarms.

And about this, too, the Bilderberg critics are right: The meeting of 120 prominent world figures probably constitutes some kind of news. Yet to be fair to the mainstream press, it's tough to report from a private gathering locked down tight by professional security.

Bilderberg organizers expect participants to keep the weekend's discussions off-the-record, stating in a press release this year that "the privacy of the meetings has no purpose other than to allow participants to speak their minds openly and freely." Bilderberg isn't the only international group that asks participants to zip their lips. The United Kingdom's Chatham House enshrined such a rule back in 1927, and similar requirements apply at some Council on Foreign Relations and Aspen Strategy Group meetings, just to name a few. Private groups meet in almost every town in the world for confidential chats. It's the way of the world. Bilderberger gab does occasionally leak, as with John Edwards' 2004 talk, but the poshes and powerful generally zip their lips.

What do you suppose would result if, say, the Washington Post had assigned a reporter to Chantilly's luminary jamboree? The Associated Press sent a reporter to cover the 1978 Bilderberger session in Princeton, N.J., but all he filed was a scene piece describing "men in gray suits and sunglasses" chasing him away from the "off limits" grounds of the Henry Chauncey Conference Center. From that dispatch (by Steve Hindy):

Kissinger casually strolled around a small manmade pond Saturday, coming within a few feet of the road leading into the complex.
He circled the pond twice, first with a gray-haired pipe-smoking man and then with a younger man. Kissinger appeared grave and attentive while the men talked of things like "range limitations."

Kissinger looked annoyed and declined comment when approached by a reporter. One of two Secret Service agents trailing the former secretary nodded sympathetically saying, "You've got to give it your best shot."


Of course, Bilderberg critics don't want to read mentions in the press. They want to see confirmation of their theories that the group operates in a sinister, behind-the-scenes fashion to exploit the powerless and throttle liberty.

How, exactly, are reporters supposed to do that when the critics rarely provide falsifiable evidence of Bilderberg malevolence? Would a shadow government, should it exist, really convene annually at a hotel to hash out the world's fate? Would it really issue a press release about its latest meeting? Would it routinely assume the security risks of inviting new blood in? (Couldn't the notorious Bilderberger Conrad Black negotiate his way out of prison by exposing the group? Or is Bilderberg so powerful that it controls the federal prison system, too?) It largely limits its attendees to North Americans and Europeans. Are the Japanese, Indians, Chinese, Brazilians, Australians, South Koreans, and Singaporean so timid that they stand aside and let the Bilderbergers have their way with the world without making a peep?

That's not to say the critics' inquiries never produce anything of value. I enjoy reading the documentary material they dig up and can only encourage them to dig deeper. Just last month, Barack Obama tapped a prominent Bilderberger, James A. Johnson, to vet possible vice presidential candidates. Johnson provided similar veep vetting for the
Democratic Party in 2004—which, as noted above, resulted in the selection of a Bilderberg attendee. The AP also reports that Johnson helped Walter Mondale pick a veep nominee in 1984.

Who is Jim Johnson? He's the former head of Fannie Mae, a power on Wall Street, and a regular Bilderberg attendee. As recently as 2006, Johnson has been the treasurer of the nonprofit American Friends of Bilderberg Inc., according to the group's Form 990 on file at Guidestar.org. According to the fractured jargon of the filing, American Friends of Bilderberg is in the business of "Organizing & sponsoring conferences which study & discuss significant problems of the Western Alliance. Collaborating on the Bilderberg meetings held in Europe & North America." The group spent $112,533 in 2006.

Still, the fact that an active Democratic supporter has performed return duty as a veep vetter stops several stations short of arriving at a shadow government. It does, however, indicate that Johnson's political influence may be underscrutinized by the press and that his career is deserving of extra study and attention. A May 24 Wall Street Journal story, "Power Broker Helps Obama Search for Running Mate," does just that. Although it makes no mention of Johnson's Bilderberg connection, it drops a gentle dig that associates Johnson's Fannie Mae service with the home-loan crisis.

Without a doubt, Bilderberg ends up stimulating speculations that it's a nefarious organization. In an earlier generation, some theorists regarded the Council on Foreign Relations as a similar shadow government for its furtive ways. But as the CFR opened up in recent decades, holding many sessions on the record, it has become as threatening as the World Economic Forum at Davos.

Maybe there's a lesson in there for the Bilderbergers. Letting the press in for a closer look at what goes on would go a long way to reduce the shouting while preserving the group's right to think out loud. Or maybe all the heavy security and skulking about is a deliberate marketing ploy by Bilderberg to differentiate its yacht cruise from the ocean voyage that is Davos.
List of Bilderberg attendees is a list of prominent persons who have attended one or more conferences organized by the Bilderberg Group. The list is currently organized by category. It is not a complete list and it includes both living and deceased people. Where known, the year(s) they attended are denoted in brackets.

**Royalty**

- Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands[1]
- Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands [2]

**Politics**

**United States**

- John Edwards[4][5]
- Gerald Ford[6]
- Lee H. Hamilton (1997[1]), former US Congressman
- Sam Nunn (1996, 1997[1]), former US Senator
- Kathleen Sebelius[12], Health and Human Services secretary
- Timothy Geithner[13], Treasury Secretary
- Lawrence Summers[14], Director of the National Economic Council
• Paul Volcker,[15] Chair of the President's Economic Recovery Advisory Board

United Kingdom

• Ed Balls (2006),[16] former Economic Secretary to the Treasury and advisor to British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and is currently Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families (2007-present)
• Peter Mandelson (1999[17]) Business Secretary (2008-present)
• Tony Blair (1993),[7] former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom[18]
• Peter Carington, 6th Baron Carrington (Steering Committee member) [19], former Foreign Secretary
• Denis Healey (founder and Steering Committee member) [19], former Chancellor of the Exchequer
• Edward Heath,(deceased) former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom[28]

Belgium

• Paul-Henri Spaak Former Prime Minister[29] (1963)

Spain

• Juan Carlos I of Spain ,King of Spain [30]

Portugal

• Jorge Braga Macedo (1991-2008),[31] former Finance Minister of Portugal, 1991 - 1993; Professor of Economics and Director of the Center for Globalization and Governance in New University of Lisbon
Finland

- **Eero Heinäluoma** (2006), former Chairman of the Finnish Social Democratic Party and he was the Minister of Finance of Finland between 2005 and 2007
- **Jyrki Katainen** (2007, 2009), chairman of Finnish National Coalition Party (Kokoomus) and the current Minister of Finance of Finland
- **Sauli Niinistö** (1997), former Minister of Finance (Finland), Speaker of Parliament
- **Matti Vanhanen** (2009) Prime Minister (Finland) chairman of Suomen Keskusta

Iceland

- **Bjarni Benediktsson**, former Prime Minister of Iceland (1963-1970) attended Bilderberg meeting in 1965 and 1970
- **Geir Haarde**, former Prime Minister of Iceland (2006-2009)
- **Geir Hallgrimsson**, former Prime Minister of Iceland (1974-1978)

Germany

- **Guido Westerwelle** (2007), Chairman of the Free Democratic Party of Germany and Leader of the Opposition in the Bundestag
- **Helmut Schmidt**, West German Chancellor

EU Commissioners

European Union Commissioners who have attended include:

- **Ritt Bjerregaard** (1991, 1995), Lord Mayor of Copenhagen and former European Commissioner for Environment, Nuclear Safety and Civil Protection
- **Frederik Bolkestein** (1996, 2003), former European Commissioner
- **Pascal Lamy** (2003)
- Peter Mandelson (1999[^42])

**UN, WTO, NATO and other International Organizations**
- George Robertson, Baron Robertson of Port Ellen[^18] (1998), former Secretary General of NATO
- Lyman Lemnitzer[^43] Former Nato Commander

**Military**

**Financial institutions**

**Major corporations**
- Jorma Ollila (1997[^1], 2005, 2008), Chairman of Royal Dutch Shell and Nokia Corporation
- Peter Sutherland (1989-1996, 1997[^1], 2005), former Chairman of BP
- Louis V. Gerstner, Jr.[^46] IBM Chairman

**University, institute and other academic**
- C. Fred Bergsten (1971, 1974, 1984, 1997[^1]), President, Peterson Institute

**Media**
Barack O’Bilderberg: Picking the President

by Andrew G. Marshall

A Background to Bilderberg

Sunday, June 8, 2008, marked the last day of this year’s annual Bilderberg meeting, which took place in Chantilly, Virginia. The American Friends of Bilderberg, an American Bilderberg front group, which organizes the American participant list for the annual Bilderberg conference, issued a rare press release this year. It stated that, "The Conference will deal mainly with a nuclear free world, cyber terrorism, Africa, Russia, finance, protectionism, US-EU relations, Afghanistan and Pakistan, Islam and Iran. Approximately 140 participants will attend."1

Bilderberg, which has been meeting annually since 1954, is a highly secretive international think tank and some say, policy-forming group made up of representatives from North America and Western Europe and was founded by Joseph Retinger, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands and Belgian Prime Minister Paul Van Zeeland. The Bilderberg Steering Committee, made up of around 30 people, (with no official list available), "decided that it would invite 100 of the most powerful people in Europe and North America every year to meet behind closed doors at a different five-star resort. The group stresses secrecy: What's said at a Bilderberg conference stays at a Bilderberg conference."2

Usually, the Bilderberg Conference is held in Europe for three years in a row, with the fourth year holding a meeting in North America. However, the previous North American conference was held in 2006 in Ottawa. So why did they break tradition to hold the conference in North America this year? Speculation abounds around a discussion of a possible attack on Iran, the American-centered global financial crisis, as well as the current US Presidential elections.
Bilderberg has long been an important forum for up-and-coming politicians of Western nations to be introduced to the global financial elite; the heads of the major multinational corporations, international banks, world financial institutions, global governing bodies, think tanks, and powerful individuals of the likes of David Rockefeller and various European monarchs, including Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands, daughter of founding member, Prince Bernhard, as well as Queen Sofia and King Juan Carlos of Spain.

According to *The Globe and Mail*, such Canadian Prime Ministers have, in the past, (often before becoming Prime Minister), attended a Bilderberg Conference as a guest, including Pierre Trudeau, Jean Chretien, Paul Martin and Stephen Harper.3 Tony Blair attended Bilderberg before becoming Prime Minister,4 as did the current British Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, who also recently called for the establishment of a "new world order."5

Interestingly, as the *Washington Post* reported, Vernon E. Jordan, a high-powered American executive, who sits on several corporate boards, including American Express, Xerox, J.C. Penney, Dow Jones, and Sara Lee, to name a few, also happens to be a very close friend of former President Bill Clinton. However, "it was Jordan who first introduced then-Gov. Clinton to world leaders at their annual Bilderberg gathering in Germany in 1991. Plenty of governors try to make that scene; only Clinton got taken seriously at that meeting, because Vernon Jordan said he was okay."6 Clinton subsequently became President.

**Barack and Bilderberg**

Recently, there has been much discussion about Barack Obama having possibly attended the recent Bilderberg conference in Virginia. This speculation arose when Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton sneaked off for a secretive meeting while in Virginia. As the *AP*
reported, "Reporters traveling with Obama sensed something might be happening between the pair when they arrived at Dulles International Airport after an event in Northern Virginia and Obama was not aboard the airplane. Asked at the time about the Illinois senator's whereabouts, [Obama spokesman Robert] Gibbs smiled and declined to comment."7

The press that had been traveling with Obama were not made aware of the secretive meeting until the plane that they assumed Obama would be present on was moving down the runway, prompting many angry questions from the press towards Obama’s spokesman, Robert Gibbs. One reported asked Gibbs, "Why were we not told about this meeting until we were on the plane, the doors were shut and the plane was about to taxi to take off?" to which he responded, "Senator Obama had a desire to do some meetings, others had a desire to meet with him tonight in a private way and that is what we are doing." This preceded another question, "Is there more than one meeting, is there more than one person with whom he is meeting?" Gibbs simply replied, "I am not going to get into all the details of the meeting." He again later repeated that, "There was a desire to do some meetings tonight, he was interested in doing them, others were interested in doing them, and to do them in a way that was private."8

On Friday, June 6, it was reported that Bilderberg tracker, Jim Tucker, "called Obama’s office today to ask if he had attended Bilderberg. A campaign spokeswoman refused to discuss the matter but would not deny that Obama had attended Bilderberg."9

**Bilderberg to Pick Obama’s Vice President**

As the *Financial Times* reported in May of this year, Barack Obama appointed James A. Johnson, the former CEO of Fannie Mae, "to head a secret committee to produce a shortlist for his vice-presidential running mate." A short list was discussed by the article, which listed, other than Hillary Clinton, "Jim Webb, the former secretary of the navy, Vietnam veteran and senator for Virginia; Tim Kaine, the governor of Virginia; John Edwards, the former vice-presidential candidate in 2004; Ted Strickland, the governor of Ohio; and Kathleen Sebelius, the governor of Kansas." Other potential nominees include "Sam Nunn, the former chairman of the Senate armed services committee; and Wesley Clark, the former head of Nato in Europe."10

James A. Johnson, the man Obama asked to pick his running mate, played the same role for John Kerry back in 2004, and he selected John Edwards. As the *New York Times* reported, "Several people pointed to the secretive and exclusive Bilderberg conference of some 120 people that this year drew the likes of Henry A. Kissinger, Melinda Gates and Richard A. Perle to Stresa, Italy, in early June, as helping [Edwards] win Mr. Kerry's heart. Mr. Edwards spoke so well in a debate on American politics with the Republican Ralph Reed that participants broke Bilderberg rules to clap before the end of the session." The *Times* further reported, "His performance at Bilderberg was important," said a friend of Mr. Kerry who was there. "He reported back directly to Kerry. There were other reports on his performance. Whether they reported directly or indirectly, I have no doubt the word got back to Mr. Kerry about how well he did."11
James A. Johnson, Vice Chairman of Perseus, a merchant banking firm, is also a director of Goldman Sachs, Forestar Real Estate Group, Inc., KB Home, Target Corporation and UnitedHealth Group Inc., is also a member of the American Friends of Bilderberg, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission and is an honorary trustee of the Brookings Institution. It is likely that Obama’s running mate will be chosen by Johnson at this years Bilderberg Conference.

Notable among this year’s Bilderberg guests are Kansas Governor, Kathleen Sebelius, who the Financial Times reported was on Johnson’s short list of nominees. In fact, Sebelius is the only person mentioned as a possible running mate in the Financial Times article that was officially listed on the Bilderberg list of attendees. Could this be a sign that she may be the chosen one? Time will tell. However, another Democratic politician present at the meeting was Tom Daschle, so perhaps he is working his way back into politics.

Don’t Forget McCain

Just because Obama’s popularity dwarfs that of McCain’s, is not reason enough to ignore the other candidate. After all, the elite never ignore both candidates, and in fact, ensure they have them both neatly packed in their back pockets. Among the guests at the Bilderberg meeting this year, included Republican Governor of South Carolina, Mark Sanford, as well as Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, which would be a smart political pick for McCain, going up against the first black presidential candidate.

McCain has also received endorsements from former Secretaries of State, Henry Kissinger, General Alexander Haig, Lawrence Eagleburger and George P. Shultz. These are not men without influence, as Henry Kissinger and George Shultz were also present at this years meeting. Also interesting to note is that George P. Shultz "associated himself with the Bush presidency early on, introducing the Texas governor to Condoleezza Rice at the Hoover Institution in 1998." Could Condi be in the process of being groomed for higher office, or is she simply at the meeting for foreign policy discussions?

Also important to note, is that McCain had a fundraiser in London held for him, which was hosted "by kind permission of Lord Rothschild OM GBE [Order of Merit and the Knight Grand Cross of the British Empire] and the Hon Nathaniel Rothschild." As the Washington Post reported, "Tickets to the invitation-only event cost $1,000 to $2,300." The Post later reported, "Aides refused to talk about the fundraiser, or to say how much money was raised, and McCain dashed through the rain away from reporters after emerging. One guest said there were about 100 people at the luncheon. If they all gave the maximum, the event would have raised about $230,000 for the campaign."
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Andrew G. Marshall contributed to breaking the Climate Change consensus in a celebrated 2006 article entitled Global Warming A Convenient Lie, in which he challenged the findings underlying Al Gore's documentary. According to Marshall, 'as soon as people start to state that “the debate is over”, beware, because the fundamental basis of all sciences is that debate is never over'. Andrew Marshall has also written on the militarization of Central Africa, national security issues and the process of integration of North America. He is also a contributor to GeopoliticalMonitor.com. He is currently a researcher at the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG) in Montreal and is studying political science and history at Simon Fraser University, British Columbia.

Google joins Bilderberg because of this information:

[This is part of the NAU. NAFTA SuperHighway]...that doesn't exist :) ---

American Rail - NAFTA Superhighway Grid System

This proposal offers dramatic improvements in highway safety and public health, as well as much reduced highway maintenance and construction costs. It will also significantly reduce energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, traffic jams, and shipping costs while providing significant short- and long-term economic stimulus. If fully implemented, it
could get as many as 83 percent of all long-haul trucks off our nation's highways by 2030, reduce carbon emissions by 39 percent and oil consumption by 15 percent. Call it the "Back on Tracks" project.


*The report is from the group calling itself—*

---

**About New America**

The New America Foundation is a nonprofit, nonpartisan public policy institute that invests in new thinkers and new ideas to address the next generation of challenges facing the United States.

New America emphasizes work that is responsive to the changing conditions and problems of our 21st Century information-age economy -- an era shaped by transforming innovation and wealth creation, but also by shortened job tenures, longer life spans, mobile capital, financial imbalances and rising inequality.

The foundation's mission is animated by the American ideal that each generation will live better than the last. That ideal is today under strain. Our education and healthcare systems are struggling with problems of quality, cost and access. The country requires creative means to address its fiscal challenges and pay for needed public, social and environmental investments. Abroad, the United States has yet to fashion sustainable foreign and defense policies that will protect its citizens and interests in a rapidly integrating world.

Too often, these challenges have proven impervious to conventional party politics and incremental proposals. With an emphasis on big ideas, impartial analysis and pragmatic solutions, New America invests in outstanding individuals whose ability to communicate to wide and influential audiences can change the country's policy discourse in critical areas, bringing promising new ideas and debates to the fore.

Launched in 1999, the foundation was guided through a period of rapid growth by founding president Ted Halstead. The Institute is now led by President and CEO Steve Coll and an outstanding Board of Directors, chaired by Eric Schmidt. New America is headquartered in Washington D.C. and also has a significant presence in California, the nation's largest laboratory of democracy.

---

**Google’s CEO & Chairman Eric Schmidt sits on “New America” board of Directors**

This “rail” system is part of the North American Community/Union to ship cheap goods into North America via China. “The Route”.
WASHINGTON – The latest meeting of the secretive, half-century-old Bilderberg Group concluded yesterday outside of Athens with a few arrests, but little news.

Demonstrators from the political left and right shouted outside the Astir Palace hotel letting some of the wealthiest and most powerful people in the world know they weren't entirely welcome.

A photographer for the London Guardian was briefly taken into custody while police insisted he delete pictures he took outside the hotel, which was closed to the public during the three-day meeting.

A police officer told the Associated Press the resort was being protected by hundreds of police, navy commandos, coast guard speedboats and two F-16 fighter planes. The officer spoke on condition of anonymity, in keeping with his department's regulations.

Attendees this year reportedly included U.S. Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner; Larry Summers, the director of the U.S. National Economic Council; Richard Holbrooke, the Obama administration's special representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan; World Bank President Robert Zoellick; European Central Bank President Jean-Claude Trichet and European Commission president Jose Manuel Barroso.

Bilderberg attendance is by invitation only. And if you want an invitation, you'd better be extremely rich or extremely powerful.

New invitees reportedly include the nouveau riche Google Chief Executive Officer Eric Schmidt. Henry Kissinger, a lynchpin of continuity with other secretive internationalist groups including the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission, is a regular attendee, as is Wall Street Journal Editor Paul Gigot.

Former British cabinet minister, Lord Denis Healey, one of the founders of the group, explained the purpose of the group to Jon Ronson of the Guardian: "Those of us in Bilderberg felt we couldn't go on forever fighting one another for nothing and killing people and rendering millions homeless. So we felt that a single community throughout the world would be a good thing."

Meanwhile, Daniel Estulin, author of "The True Story of the Bilderberg Group," said before the confab the main topic of the agenda for this meeting was the world economy. He said his sources inside the group told him the movers and shakers would be discussing two options – "either a prolonged, agonizing depression that dooms the world to decades of stagnation, decline, and poverty ... or an intense-but-shorter depression that paves the way for a new sustainable economic world order, with less sovereignty but more efficiency."
As WND has reported, The Bilderberg Group meets at luxury hotels and resorts throughout the world. Last year's conference was held at the Westfields Marriott in Chantilly, Va. WND made an effort to gain entry, but was denied. Every four years the conference is held in the U.S. or Canada. The group has an office located in Leiden, South Holland, Netherlands.

The highly secretive meeting is off limits to press, but past reports from sources that have managed to penetrate the high-security meetings have stated that the meetings emphasize a globalist agenda and dismiss national sovereignty as regressive.

The BBC declared it to be one of the most influential organizations in the world.

"It's officially described as a private gathering," BBC reported, "but with a guest list including the heads of European and American corporations, political leaders and a few intellectuals, it's one of the most influential organizations on the planet."

Attendees of the Bilderberg conference are not allowed to speak a word of what is discussed in the meeting outside of the group. The group has no website and no minutes are kept of the meetings to ensure secrecy.

Last year, however, the Bilderberg Group made a press release available listing topics of discussion and providing a general overview of the gathering.

"Approximately 140 participants will attend, of whom about two-thirds come from Europe and the balance from North America," the release stated. "About one-third is from government and politics, and two-thirds are from finance, industry, labor, education and communications. The meeting is private in order to encourage frank and open discussion."

This year's event was the 57th annual gathering of the Bilderberg Group, which began meeting in 1954. A scheduled meeting in 1976 was canceled, but if added to the tally, leads some to count this year's gathering as the 58th.
Our man at Bilderberg: Let's salt the slug in 2010

Publicity is pure poison to the world's global power elite. So we should all turn up to its next annual meeting with a few more tubs of the stuff, writes Charlie Skelton

Ten years ago, when Jon Ronson dared to report on Bilderberg, he found himself "chased by mysterious men in dark glasses through Portugal". He was scared for his safety.

"When I phoned the British embassy and asked them to explain to the powerful secret society that had set their goons on me that I was essentially a humorous journalist out of my depth, I wasn't being funny. I was being genuinely desperate," he wrote. I know exactly how he feels.

Only out of sheer desperation did I try to arrest one of the goons following me and then follow my flimsy leads up the Greek police ladder, finally catching one of the goons wet-handed in the lavatory of the department of government security. And only then did I know the extent of Bilderberg's paranoia: they had set the state police on me.

So who is the paranoid one? Me, hiding in stairwells, watching the pavement behind me in shop windows, staying in the open for safety? Or Bilderberg, with its two F-16s, circling helicopters, machine guns, navy commandos and policy of repeatedly detaining and harassing a handful of journalists? Who's the nutter? Me or Baron Mandelson? Me or Paul Volker, the head of Obama's economic advisory board? Me or the president of Coca-Cola?

It makes me want to spit, the absurdity of it: the cost, not just in Greek tax euros, but on my peace of mind, of having (conservatively) a dozen Jack Bauers assigned to tailing me. I hope the operation at least had a cool name: Operation Catastrophic Overreaction, perhaps.

So, yes, Bilderberg's paranoia is half to blame. But there is another reason why Ronson was hounded round Portugal, why I was chased round Greece, and why on Sunday the Romanian journalist Paul Dorneanu was strip-searched by goons in Vouliagmeni, held for four hours and forced to purge his camera of images (for the crime of trying to film the delegates leaving). And it is this: they can harass and detain us only because so few of us are there.

Just now, I searched for "Bilderberg" on Reuters. I did the same on AP. And this is what I turned up:
Publicity is pure salt to the giant slug of Bilderberg. So I suggest next year we turn up with a few more tubs. If the mainstream press refuses to give proper coverage to this massive annual event, then interested citizens will have to: a people's media. Find the biggest lens you can and join us for Bilderberg 2010. No idea where it's going to be, but there's usually a few days' notice.

We'll have a barbecue selling bilderburgers (with extra lies), and we will set up our own press centre near the cordon. Get some lanyards. Email me at bilderberg2010@yahoo.co.uk and we'll start prepping.

Meanwhile, petition newspapers to send a correspondent. Petition your MP to ask a question in parliament. This happened a few days ago in Holland. Citing an article by Paul Joseph Watson on prisonplanet.com, a Dutch MP asked in parliament about the involvement of the prime minister, the minister for European affairs and Queen Beatrix, asking them to make public any items that were on the agenda, and whether the ratification of the Lisbon treaty was discussed.

I've got a couple of questions I would like to ask Peter Mandelson, mainly about the freedom of the press and what he thinks about a Guardian journalist being detained, shoved and intimidated by the Greek state police on his behalf. Mandelson's office has confirmed his attendance at this year's meeting: "Yes, Lord Mandelson attended Bilberberg. He found it a valuable conference."
Oh, good. Maybe he stole a bathrobe. Peter has been a busy baron these last few days: all that beach volleyball and global strategising, then straight back to address the Google Zeitgeist conference on Monday, where he talked about "the need for regulation" of the internet. "There are worries about the impact of the internet on our society," he said. I bet he is worried; but not half as worried as I am about "the need for regulation".

But these worries are small potatoes compared with the biggest concern Bilderberg 09 has given me. My experience over the last several days in Greece has granted me a single, diamond-hard opinion. Meaning I now have two: that John McEnroe is the greatest sportsman of all time; and that we must fight, fight, fight, now – right now, this second, with every cubic inch of our souls – to stop identity cards.

I can tell you right now that the argument "If I've done nothing wrong, why would I worry about showing who I am?" is hogwash. Worse than that, it's horse hockey. It's all about the power to ask, the obligation to show, the justification of one's existence, the power of the asker over the subservience of the asked. (Did you know that most Greek police don't wear a number? This is an obligation that goes one way.)

I have learned this from the random searches, detentions, angry security goon proddings and thumped police desks without number that I've had to suffer on account of Bilderberg: I have spent the week living in a nightmare possible future and many different terrible pasts. I have had the very tiniest glimpse into a world of spot checks and unchecked security powers. And it has left me shaken. It has left me, literally, bruised.

I can tell you this from personal experience: the onus upon the individual to carry with them some external proof of their identity is transformative of his or her status as a human being. The identity card turns you from a free citizen into a suspect. It is a spanner with which to beat the individual around the head. It is the end of everything. And how much easier to put all that information inside a microchip so you don't have to carry around that pesky card all the time. How much more efficient!

Listen. I don't care if you don't love liberty. For the love of yourself: fight identity cards. Don't let them happen. STOP IDENTITY CARDS. Stop identity cards. And while you're about it: stop identity cards. And that's all I have to say, you will be delighted to know, about Bilderberg 2009. Oh, except for a giant word of thanks to everyone who has written supportive or interested comments on these blogposts (let's meet up for a proper debrief!) And one little correction: for the record, Kenneth Clarke's office has said he was "in his constituency" at
the weekend, not at the Astir Palace doing sambuca shots with the CEO of Airbus. Just in case he remembers differently when asked again.

Investigative Author, Daniel Estulin Exposes Bilderberg Group Plans

*International best-selling investigative author Daniel Estulin has received from his sources the 73-page Bilderberg Group meeting wrap-up for participants.*

that there exist big risks to a recovery still reeling from financial turmoil, making it very difficult to assess developments.

the banks themselves don’t know the answer to when (the bottom will be hit).

(Vocus/PRWEB) May 22, 2009 — International best-selling investigative author Daniel Estulin has received from his sources the 73-page Bilderberg Group meeting wrap-up for participants. In the report no one is identified by name, only as an American or European, or by a description of the speaker’s position, i.e. member of the IMF. There appears to be some disagreement about who was in attendance at this year’s secretive conclave held at a 5-star resort in Greece. According to sources in Greece and the Bilderberg Netherlands “office,” US Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner and US General David Petraeus were at this year’s gathering. Both men have denied this, according to a conversation held with a Washington, DC reporter, who stated that Mr. Geithner was attending a private function and General Petraeus was at Central Command.

Using a purported participant list, a “smear” campaign has seemingly been launched against Estulin. On a French “left-wing” website (www.bellaciao.org/fr/), and then posted in English on a populist forum in the US (http://forum.prisonplanet.com), it is claimed that Estulin was a known participant in this year’s conference. “Hardly,” said Estulin, who laughed at the prospect, saying that the Group has tried many things to keep him from reporting on its activities, but had never asked him to attend. Estulin did his
reporting this year from Spain, knowing from years of coverage that the location in Greece physically precluded any photographing of the participants. His book on the shadowy clique, “The True Story of the Bilderberg Group” broke through the barrier that the Group even existed with help from numerous photographs exposing the elite that were taken by Estulin from 600-800 meters. The book has been translated into 48 languages and sold millions of copies worldwide. Estulin’s reportage of the annual meetings has led to many correct predictions of world events, including the timing of the 2003 Iraqi War, the rise and fall of oil prices, as well as the current economic calamity and housing mess.

There have been many posts floating around the Internet claiming to be actual participant lists. Daniel has a copy of an official list, and has confirmed much of it through photo identification by staff at the hotel, a gentleman responsible for group bookings there, and the Bilderberg executive secretary in the Netherlands, who confirmed assisting Mr. Geithner with arrangements for the meeting.

A confirmed list of the US delegation is available at www.bilderbergbook.com

According to Estulin’s reading of the report, it looks as if there are serious disagreements within the group. The hardliners are for dramatic decline and a severe, short-term depression, but there are those who think that things have gone too far and that the fallout from the global economic cataclysm cannot be accurately calculated if Henry Kissinger’s model is chosen. Among them is Richard Holbrooke. What is unknown at this point: if Holbrooke’s point of view is, in fact, Obama’s.

Estulin says that the consensus dealt a blow to those in the group who were hoping for economic revival, agreeing that the recession will be deeper, and the road to recovery longer and harder, than the happy talk coming from world leaders. The terms used were ”relatively slow and protracted.” Estulin says pay attention to the press dailies: you will see quite a bit of these two terms in the weeks and months to come.

Estulin notes that some of those who attended the annual conference will give another, more moderate view, stating that ”the economy requires a period of healing and that it will take time.” While this helps create a dialectic in the press from two Bilderberg camps, both will pay heed to the idea of ”great uncertainty over the outlook.” According to Estulin, over the next several months the Bilderbergers will purposely refuse to commit to any specifics, simply pointing out “that there exist big risks to a recovery still reeling from financial turmoil, making it very difficult to assess developments.”
Estulin reports that some leading European bankers faced with the specter of their own financial mortality are extremely concerned, calling this high wire act “unsustainable,” and saying that US budget and trade deficits could result in the demise of the dollar. Recent fears about their own survival have not been quelled because, as one Bilderberg attendee pointed out, “the banks themselves don’t know the answer to when (the bottom will be hit).” According to the group’s report, however, all agreed that the level of capital needed for the American banks may be considerably higher than the US government suggested through their recent stress tests.

Estulin says that someone from the IMF pointed out that its own study on historical recessions suggests that the US is only a third of the way through this current one; therefore economies expecting to recover with resurgence in demand from the US will have a long wait. As another individual pointed out, “Equity losses in 2008 were worse than those of 1929.” This individual then added, “The next phase of the economic decline will also be worse than the ’30s, mostly because the US economy carries about $20 trillion of excess debt. Until that debt is eliminated, the idea of a healthy boom is a mirage.”

Estulin reports that according to a World Bank representative at the meeting, government officials around the world have proposed more than sixty new trade restrictions since the beginning of the financial crisis, which some attendees found distressing, as governments, in a downward spiraling economy embrace protectionist policies to try and protect employment and generate internal economic activity.

George Ball, back in 1968 at a Bilderberg conference in Canada, presented an outline of the advantages of a neo-colonial world economic order based on the concept of a world company. According to Ball, the first and most important thing that had to be eliminated was the “archaic political structure of the nation state.”

According to Estulin, for Bilderberg, the very structure of the nation state and the idea of the commonwealth represent the main obstacles to the creation of a neo-colonial world empire.

This is the first of a series of reports based upon Daniel Estulin’s readings of the 2009 Bilderberg Group wrap-up document. Subsequent reports will be available at www.bilderbergbook.com and other Internet sites.
FLASHBACK:

The CFR, Trilateral Commission, Bilderberger Connection
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Helene L. Kaplan, Dir.                           CFR
J. Bruce Llewellyn, Dir.                         CFR
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Odeh Felix Aburdene, Mng. Ptnr.,Capital Trust Boston CFR
Mitchell W. Hedstrom, VP, Citibank, NYC         CFR
Richard Leslie Huber, V. Chmn, Continental Bank Corp CFR
Jackson B. Gilbert, 2nd Chmn., Espirito Santo Bank, FLCFR
Eli Shapiro, former Chmn., Fed. Hm.Ln. Bank Boston CFR
Maynard J. Toll, Jr., Mng Dir., First Boston Corp., NYC CFR
Richard C. Holbrooke, V. Chmn., CS First Boston CFR/B
David C. Mulford, V. Chmn., CSFirst Boston, Inc., London CFR
John M. Hennessy, Pres. & CEO, CS First Boston Inc. CFR
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Morris Wolf Offit, Pres., Offit Bank, NYC CFR
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New York Stock Exchange

John J. Phelan, Jr., fmr Chmn. & CEO CFR
William H. Donaldson, Chmn. & CEO CFR
Paul A. Allaire, Dir CFR
Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., Dir. CFR
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Kenneth I. Chenault, V Chmn., Bear Sterns & Co. CFR
Denis A. Bovin, Vice Chmn., Bear Sterns & Co. CFR
Paul Hallingby, Jr., Mng. Sr. Dir. Emer, Bear Sterns & Co. CFR
James T. Hill, Gen. Ptnr, Blackstone Group CFR
David A. Stockman, Gen. Partner, Blackstone Group CFR
Thomas C. Theobald, Ptnr, Blair Capital Mgmt. CFR
Paul f. Anderson, Sr. VP, Booz, Allen, Hamilton CFR
Rudy E. Boschwitz, Dir., Chicago Mercantile CFR
Lucy Wilson Benson, Dir Dreyfus Fund CFR
Stephen J. Friedman, Exec. VP, Equitable Life CFR/TC/B
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**Goldman Sachs & Co.**  
Jon S. Coizine, Chmn, CEO                              B  
Robert J. Hurst, Gen. Partner                          CFR  
John L. Weinberg, Sr., Chmn.                           CFR  
Stephen Friedman, Co-Chmn.                             TC  
Henry H. Fowler, Ltd. Partner, former Chmn.           CFR  
E. Gerald Corrigan, former Chmn.                      CFR/TC/B  
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W. Michael Blumenthal, Sr. Advisor                    CFR  

**Lehman Bros.**  
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**FEDERAL JUDICIARY**  
Jose Alberto Cabranes, 2nd Federal Circuit, New York  CFR  
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UNITED STATES CONGRESS
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<table>
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<tbody>
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GIDEON ROSE: Hi there. Welcome, everybody. I'm Gideon Rose, managing editor of Foreign Affairs, and we're delighted to have you with us today to have a discussion with Dan Drezner, the author of an important new piece in the new issue of Foreign Affairs called "The New New World Order."

The -- if you were to think of a Venn Diagram between top political economists and prominent bloggers, there probably would be a very, very small population in that middle. But the chief in that overlap would be Dan Drezner, who is associate professor of international politics at Fletcher -- Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts. The author -- his latest book is called "All Politics is Global" coming out next month, I believe.

DANIEL W. DREZNER: Yes.

ROSE: And he has written a very interesting article for us on the new power alignments in the world and how the Bush administration is reacting to them.

So what we're going to do is, we're going -- I'm going to talk with Dan for a little bit about them, and then we'll turn it over to you. And we'll run as long as the questions keep coming.

So Dan, why don't you start by giving a brief precise of what you argue in the piece.

DREZNER: Sure. Thanks, Gideon, and thanks once again to Foreign Affairs for printing the piece.

The precise is pretty simple. If you take a look at any sort of measure of power out there, it's quite obvious that China and India are becoming much more powerful. And projections in the future, although the future can always change, but the projections are they will become, you know, among the top five states in terms of economic size or what have you within the next 15 years, 15 to 20 years.

The problem we've got is that most of the really important international institutions that were set up were set up between 1945 and 1955, and China and India were not nearly as powerful back then. This gives rise to an interesting problem, which is how do you cut in rising states to international regimes that the U.S. had set up, that privileged states that are on the decline, such as many that are potentially in the European Union.

You would not think that the Bush administration would be well suited for handling this problem, since the administration -- you know, first impressions are lasting impressions, and the impression of this administration has been it's a belligerent, unilateralist foreign policy course of action. And yet the funny thing is that if you take a look at what the U.S. has done over the past five years or so, they've taken several steps to try to cut in the Chinese and the Indians into international regimes that the U.S. had set up with the idea that if we can cut them in, they might actually in the end want what we want and support what we want.
The piece then reviews a variety of ways in which we've done this in the IMF, in the non-proliferation regime, both bilaterally and multilaterally, and on the whole gives the administration, you know, a decent grade in terms of doing this. Now certain things have handicapped it.

One is the fact that it's easy to paint this administration as unilateralist and belligerent, and as a result, there are ways in which, even if it's doing things for the right reasons, it might be accused by some states of doing things for the wrong reasons. So therefore, this creates a lot of suspicion.

The second problem which was going to be inevitable to this enterprise is that if you're trying to cut in rising powers, sort of by the nature of power you're undercutting states that are falling, and the states in this case are the members of the European Union. And while they see the handwriting on the wall as well, you know, it's not like France and Great Britain are going to be giving up their U.N. Security Council seats any time soon.

So as a result, the administration on the one hand faces a thankless task, because trying to rewrite the rules of global governance are not easy. But at the same time, I'm arguing that if they don't do it, if China and India aren't made to feel like they are responsible, you know, great power members of the existing world order, they're going to go out and create institutions of their own, and the institutions that they create might not necessarily be ones that the United States would like to see.

ROSE: So let's start back for a second with the idea that the Bush administration actually sees this new world order and thinks of it in terms of a multilateral, institutional approach -- that runs counter to most people's view of the Bush administration, so talk a little bit about that. Is the view that the conventional view of the Bush administration that's devoted to unilateralism and not caring about world order and -- or caring only about primacy if it does think of world order, is that wrong or is this occupying a place alongside it? How does this -- how does the picture you're talking about coexist with the one that other people see?

DREZNER: I would not say that that perception is wrong as much as it is incomplete. Obviously -- you know, particularly if you looked at the first term, you know, it would be hard to say that the United States, you know, did not act in a unilateral manner. And certainly the invasion of Iraq has -- you know, is the sort of apotheosis of this.

The problem is that does obscure a second component of the Bush administration's grand strategy. And they were clear about this in 2002 as well as in the 2006 reformulation, which is the U.S. sees itself at a moment in time where it actually has somewhat decent relations with the -- most of the other great powers out there, and if it can therefore form, you know, what's the great power concert to try to, you know, sort of regulate world politics, it will do so.
Part of this also is the way I think that the Bush administration -- it's an extreme version of this, but it's the way Americans view, I would argue, multilateralism as opposed to, let's say, the Europeans, which is the Europeans see multilateralism as an end in itself. It's a desirable thing to have, and the process of multilateralism smoothed out world politics, whereas I think for Americans -- and again, the Bush administration is an extreme version of this, but I think it was true of the Clinton administration as well - multilateralism is a means to an end. It's a way in which you try to achieve your policy ends, and if the multilateral institutions are seen as effective, then you will pursue that course of action. If they're not seen as effective, then you might see them pursue alternative courses of action.

So to some extent what's going on -- it's consistent with the Bush administration's view, because they want certain multilateral institutions to work. And for those multilateral institutions to work, they've got to correspond at least somewhat roughly to the distribution of power out there, which means cutting China and India in.

ROSE: Okay.

And give us an example of the institutions in particular that and -- what's the evidence for the pieces you're talking about?

DREZNER: I think one example would be the IMF, where, you know, with -- during the '90s, when the Clinton administration was dealing with the Asian financial crisis, the perception of the IMF was that it was high-handed, that it was an agent of the United States, it -- you know, the reform, the sort of structural adjustment programs they recommended along the Pacific Rim bred a lot of resentment in some quarters, whereas, you know, 10 years later, the Bush administration actively supported a move to give China greater -- a greater quota, a greater sort of representation within the IMF, and is going to push for I think further reforms to try to give large -- you know, what you would consider advanced developing countries like China and India greater weight in terms of within that organization.

I think another example of this -- and this also gets to some of the trickiness in trying to do this -- is the nonproliferation regime, where the United States signed a bilateral -- the civilian nuclear cooperation deal with India, which was, I think, just sort of a reflection of the facts of life, which is India was never going to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear member. By engaging in this, the administration is basically acknowledging that fact but saying, you know, we can still cooperate.

ROSE: China and India strike me as somewhat different, primarily because of the political context. India, as you note, is being groomed as a sort of regional pillar and democratic ally and liberalizing their economy and developing a global trade partnership, as well as being a nice stable, liberal democracy. And so can you imagine that fitting in with the United States and Europe in the sort-of advanced industrial democracy camp.
But China, rising even faster, and taking part in the global economy, still is not a player in the democratic -- in the political sphere, and might even be, because of that –

DREZNER: A negative player, yeah.

ROSE: A negative player, exactly.

So how will that differ? Are these -- how does the administration -- and as you say, one of the reasons for bringing India on and grooming it for this partnership is as a possible counterweight to China, and so forth. So how does that play out? I mean you talk about them as the two, you know, new Asian powers. But one would seem to be able to be fit into the existing civilizational alliance, in some sense, or the democratic political community of democracies, and so forth, and the other would not. How is that going to play out?

DREZNER: I would say a couple of things. First of all, on India I would highly recommend another article in this issue of Foreign Affairs that Ashutosh Varshney wrote, which would be worth looking at in terms of India's domestic situation.

But with regard to India and China, it's worth noting that the institutions that I'm talking about bringing these states on to don't have democratic foundations in the sense of they're primarily dealing with either issues of global security or global economics. And on those two issues there's a lot more that China and India agree on than disagree. There's no question that you're not going to see Chinese membership in NATO or any sort of similar sort of democratic club. And I think, you know, down the road that's going to play a role in terms of U.S. foreign policy. And there's no question that the U.S., in part, is trying to bring India in as a counterweight to China, and all three countries know this.

But at the same time, the U.S. can't ignore China. You know, its economic weight is becoming too big now. And that's partly what's going on. The administration is trying to get out in front of this, but they're also reacting to what's happening in the real world. China is simply too big to ignore now. So on issues where there is going to be some commonality of interest, where there is going to be an interest in maintaining global stability, yeah, the Chinese can be counted on to act in a responsible manner. And indeed, you know, some of the studies I cited in the article -- Ian Johnson at Harvard and Robert Lawrence -- have noticed that when China joins both security and economic institutions, they wind up becoming sort of status quo powers, states that wind up articulating policies that are very consistent with what the United States wants.

ROSE: Back in the -- you know, during the middle part of the century, in the third quarter of the 20th century, you had the development of institutions like the Trilateral Commission, which formally enshrined a sort of America, Europe and Japan, this tripartite condominium, in certain respects, relationship.
Do you expect to see not just India and China brought into universal institutions, but do you expect to see any sort of institutions directly and specifically engaging them, as individual countries, in a way that we brought Japan into something like the Trilateral Commission?

DREZNER: Well, I mean, the Trilateral Commission's a nongovernmental body, which -- it raises an interesting question, which is whether you're going to see --

ROSE: Reflecting the sort of elite views of this kind of notion that Japan was now a partner.

DREZNER: Yeah. I mean, I think you're seeing it already. I mean, you saw it in the Davos forum this year, where the theme was, you know, developing countries and the sort of diffusion of power, where I think India, you know, had a, you know, large representation at the Davos Economic Forum.

So yeah, I think you're going to see moves at the elite level, and that would actually make a fair amount of sense.

ROSE: And things like the Strategic Economic Dialogue and so forth and --

DREZNER: And bilaterally, I mean, the U.S. has launched ambitious dialogues with both China and India.

The interesting question in the future, I think, is going to be whether there's continued political support for doing that at -- let's say after 2008, after the 2008 election. My suspicion is, regardless of who's elected president, eventually they're going to come to the same conclusion, but there might be some stumbling around in the first six months.

ROSE: Okay. Go forward. Where do you see this all trending in the next 10 to 20 years?

DREZNER: In the next 10 to 20 years, it's going to be interesting. I think the fundamental question is going to be whether, you know, the sort of shift that the Bush administration has started and presumably will be continued by whoever wins in 2008 is going to be successful both in bringing China and India into these institutions and also, you know, roughly speaking, getting them to want the same things that we want.

I mean, the big $64,000 question is China's regime and, as you said, whether or not China's regime maintains the current outlook -- the current regime type that it's got or whether there's going to be some instability.

That said, I think the biggest problem you're going to have is trying to get countries on the wane -- namely, the European Union -- to agree to arrangements that give these countries greater -- you know, give these rising states greater power.
And then the next question's going to be, are there any other countries out there besides China and India? You know, is Brazil going to demand a piece of the pie? Is South Africa? To what extent are you going to see -- I think the really fundamentally interesting question is, are you going to have cleavages based on development, where you've got China, India -- and you see this already in the WTO, where China, India and Brazil do hold sort of similar policy positions. But in the future, that might not necessarily be the case as some countries acquire more middle-income status. ROSE: One country that doesn't figure in analysis in any of the various camps is Russia. DREZNER: Yes. That's true, because I didn't talk about energy. You know, I mean, beyond that, the fact is -- is that, you know, in the long term, as you say, 15, 20, 30 years from now, you know, the line is, "Demography is destiny," and in that case, Russia doesn't look terribly good. Its demographic future is not a terribly promising one. It's the same reason I didn't mention Japan, either. Both of those countries demographically are not moving in a direction that indicates long-term economic growth. ROSE: Got it.

Okay. Thank you very much, Dan. And at this point, why don't we turn it over to our questioners and fire away.

OPERATOR: If you'd like to ask a question, please press the star key, followed by the 1 key, on your touch-tone phone now. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received. If at any time you'd like to remove yourself from the questioning queue, press star-2.

(Pause.)

ROSE: Okay. Well, while we're waiting for some more questions to be generated, Dan, are there any other thoughts that you have and that you've been led from this or -- in the writing of it, did you come across new ways of thinking about it that you hadn't expected?

DREZNER: Well, as I said, the whole enterprise is interesting, because I'm basically -- I'll be interested about the reaction it gets. Because making the argument that the Bush administration is pursuing a very subtle form of multilateralism is not the common perception of what the -- how the administration behaves. So that's been interesting, just trying to make that argument for others.

And then the other -- I think the more interesting question in the future is going to be, to what extent does -- to what extent is the administration doing this because it's consciously doing it, as opposed to sort of seeing the handwriting on the wall? And I think that's going to affect what happens in 2008, as well, which is even if you have, let's say, a Democratic party candidate who, you know, has adopted, let's say, a tough protectionist line on China or India -- what they wind up doing once they actually take power.
ROSE: Do you see different attitudes in different sectors or bureaucracies of the U.S. government?

DREZNER: Yes. There's not question about that. I mean, part of it -- you know, part of what's going on and why this has sort of been more and more salient feature of the second term rather than the first term is, you know, the neocons are on the wane.

Neoconservatives were not necessarily big enthusiasts of cutting deals with China on a whole variety of topics, and it's not like they're big fans of multilateral institutions to begin with.

So there's no question that as you had Condi Rice, you know, go from NSC to State, and as you have Henry Paulson take over as Treasury Secretary, certainly you've got some heavyweights in the administration that actually have an interest in pursuing this policy, whereas in the first term, you know, maybe you had Colin Powell. But even Powell was so marginalized -- and so unwilling to travel, I might add -- that he didn't have enough of a profile to be able to do anything.

ROSE: And what do you see in terms of the implications of this for the institutions themselves? Are you going to see, because of the kinds of areas of cooperation or because of the memberships that you're talking about and the functional differentiation or, you know, specialization in terms of the issues they deal with -- are certain global or multilateral institutions going to become more important and others less important over time because they can adapt more or less easily or are needed more or less to deal with the new power structures?

DREZNER: I mean, I don't doubt that's the case. You know, the institutions that are somewhat more nimble in terms of adjusting and bringing in -- I mean, there's a paradox here, which is that the institutions that are more nimble, that are better able to bring in rising powers, might be less well-respected. I mean, part of the reason -- you know, one of the questions is, what's in it for China and India and for rising powers to get membership into these organizations, to get more influence, if they're being asked to change their views somewhat? And the answer is that they get respect; they get recognition. And that's not a small thing if you're a rising power. One of the things you want as a rising power is the recognition by others that you are, you know, on the rise and should be granted respect there.

I think, you know, as I said in the article, it's clear that the economic institutions are the ones that are making the adjustment quickest. I think the institution that in the future that's going to be the really interesting one to see how it reacts to this is NATO, because NATO obviously can't include these organizations. It's got a more regional focus. But NATO has been the linchpin through which, you know, the United States and Europe have managed to cooperate. And what's going to be interesting down the road is to what extent NATO is still considered a relevant player.
I think in the economic realm, the parallel would be the OECD, which is a club of advanced industrialized states. And it's going to be a long time before either India or China are considered advanced enough to join. And until now, the OECD was considered not only the rich man's club, but also the club of states that basically ran the economic sphere of the world. And I'm not sure that's going to be the case anymore.

ROSE: Interesting. So with the rise of China and India as extraordinarily powerful and liberalizing lesser-developed states or developing states, you will break the link between economic power and development in some sense that you've had.

DREZNER: Right. Well, I mean, it's because China and India are so large -- and this is actually the thing I touched on in the book that's coming out, which is what's fascinating about China and India -- and this is really going to be a first -- that China and India in terms of their overall economic size in terms of GDP are going to get to the U.S. level or, you know, get to great-power status long before their per capita incomes reach anything approximating middle-income status. And that's the fundamentally interesting thing. They're going to have states that, you know, in terms of aggregate economic size are as powerful or approaching the U.S. size, and yet their preferences are going to be dramatically different because they're just still going to be fundamentally poor countries.

ROSE: That's very interesting, especially because when you think about it in historical terms, they won't be economically undeveloped in historic -- compared to where previous great powers were when they became great powers, but in the contemporary context, they will.

DREZNER: (Inaudible word) -- terms, yeah. I mean they won't be as rich. And look, I mean, one area where this is clearly going to come up is going to be in global warming, which is the extent to which China and India are going to be asked to adopt measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I mean, even if the U.S. -- if the U.S. ever changes its position, the position is going to be, "Well, China and India need to change too." And their response is going to be, "Well, why did the U.S. and the other advanced states get a free pass for the previous century?" And it's going to be an interesting debate.

ROSE: Let me ask one last question if we don't have any from the floor, which is, people have talked about this often in terms of U.S. power and U.S. hegemony, and there's been a sense, as you say in the piece, that power is a zero-sum game, so that India and China's rise are coming at the expense of Europe's position and so forth. But one interesting question is, will that come at the expense of the U.S. position? Or will the U.S. be able, by tweaking the membership of the club in various of these institutions, be able to sort of not so much divide and conquer as, by manipulating its role as the chief arbiter of who gets in and who has what kind of thing and who gets its favor and its alliance, will the U.S. role necessarily diminish and U.S. power necessarily fall back towards the middle as these new ones rise?
DREZNER: I mean, that's a possibility, there's no question about that. I mean, you know, it's easy to point to the decline of Europe, but this might potentially lead to at least some relative decline in the United States.

I'm a little more optimistic about the U.S., just because first of all, the demographic profile of the United States is much healthier than Europe in terms of sort of, you know, birth rates and the extent to which you've got an active labor force supporting a retiring -- supporting pensioners. That's one thing. And the second reason is that our fundamental advantage is that our labor markets are much more flexible and also we're more receptive to immigration.

So as a result, I mean, the U.S. might -- you know, it's not going to ever grow again at 10 percent a year, you know, the growth rates that you see in India and China. That said, because it's starting from a larger base, it doesn't necessarily have to, and because of its technological lead. It's going to be a longer -- it's going to be a couple decades, I think, before you need to talk about whether or not the U.S. is going to actually be eclipsed by any of these countries.

And the other fact is -- and this is important -- is that although China and India are rising, you know, there are a lot of reasons why they might -- both states might encounter serious amounts of political instability along the way, whereas the U.S. political system, even in the polarizing era we are now, is considered much more stable.

ROSE: So it's less the rise of multilateralism or the decline of the U.S. as it is the U.S. changing its dance partners or increasing the size of its harem.

DREZNER: Yeah, I would say it's more expanding the option -- expanding its dance partner options. You know, as I said in the piece, it's not that -- the United States needs the European Union, needs the EU members because on a whole variety of issues we actually agree more with Europe than we agree with other countries. But there are other issues, particularly on economic growth, where we're much more simpatico with China and India than we are with the European Union. So this -- if this is done well, if this is done adroitly, the U.S. can sort of pick and choose who its great power allies will be given the issue at hand.

QUESTIONER: So Robin being joined by Bat Girl.

DREZNER: Yeah, there you go.

ROSE: And on that note, do we have anymore questions from the floor?


QUESTIONER: Hi, Dr. Drezner?

DREZNER: Yes.
QUESTIONER: First of all, I want to say that I think the piece is excellent, and I really appreciate this conversation. I want to ask a couple of questions about this calculus or potential calculus. Let me just start with a simple one and add a couple to it.

If -- I'm interested if you took the sort of current line-up of players and said, all right, everybody on this side of the line is for the concept that some sort of reform or restructuring of these current institutions needs to take place to recognize that the world order in 2006 is different from the one in 1946. And all those who are either, you know, against that or reluctant to do that stand on the other side.

I'm interested -- it's sort of like shirts and skins. I'm interested to know, you know, in addition to us and obviously China and India and presumably Brazil, et cetera, who else is on the side that favors the reform and reorganization in the manner that you talk about? And who are the powers that are against it?

A related question is, I was struck by something you said near the end of your article when you said developing countries on the periphery of the global economy can be expected to back Europe in resisting U.S.-led reform efforts, and that struck me as slightly counterintuitive. And I wonder if you could just say a little bit more about that and explain that.

And then, I guess, the third question that it leads to for me is: If you were sitting down with the national security team of the next administration, whichever -- wherever that comes from, and you were laying this out, what do you think some of the strategic steps that you'd be recommending to them might look like to move in the direction of this reform and reorganization?

DREZNER: Okay. Very good questions. I think I can answer your first two in one swoop, which is who -- you know, who is on what side, the shirts and skins.

I mean, to some extent I would argue it corresponds just down to brute interest; which countries are growing at very, very high rates and which countries are not? You know, the U.S. and China and India, and to a lesser extent Brazil and South Africa and South Korea -- you know, countries that are foreseen as -- perceived as being on the rise, particularly economically, would fall under that one category.

And then, on the other hand, you've got countries in the developing world that are not growing by nearly as fast a rate, namely in Africa and Latin America. These countries also have relatively long standing colonial ties or ex-colonial ties with members of the European Union. So it's not shocking that you'd see, you know, a similar kind of alliance between those two groups, which is why I argued that -- when I said countries on periphery, I was primarily referring to Africa on this. Those states have very low growth rates on the whole, you know, with the exception of South Africa and Botswana.
And as a result, you know, in a world where, let's say, the IMF judges things based on economic size, they don't have a lot of influence to begin with. The last thing they want to see is things corresponding to economic growth even more, where they lose out even relatively speaking to China and India.

In terms of sitting down with the '08 group, you know, with whoever comes in '08, what my advice would be -- I would probably give two pieces of advice.

The first would be if you're going to engage in U.N. -- the first is to engage in U.N. Security Council reform, which is namely cut India in and potentially Brazil, and keep it at those two. I'm not necessarily sure you want to do any more, which of course is going to make it fantastically difficult.

But I -- the Security Council seriously worries me in the future, where it's this situation where Britain and France both have vetoes and yet India doesn't. That strikes me as increasingly it's going to look more and more anachronistic. And for the U.N. to retain any kind of influence, I think you're going to need to see the buy-in of large developing countries.

The other thing I think is going to be to have some more flexibility in terms of potentially the U.S. creating new organizations as a -- you know, because new organizations -- you know, you don't have to deal bureaucratic inertia and you don't have to deal with the past. There might be some issues such as, let's say, the environment or trade where it might be appropriate to create new, more flexible groupings and clubs that actually bring in rising powers as well as our existing allies.

OPERATOR: All right. Once again, if you'd like to ask a question, you can press the star key followed by the one key on your touch-tone phone now.

There are currently no more questions.

ROSE: Okay. Well, this -- we all have busy schedules, and Dan, I want to thank you for your time and recommend his piece and the rest of the issue to all of you, and we'll see you -- or speak to you at our next call sometime down the road.

Thank you very much for participating.

DREZNER: Thank you.
Asia and the World Roundtable Series

Director: Evan A. Feigenbaum, Senior Fellow for East, Central, and South Asia

The Asia and the World Roundtable Series examines the global implications of the rise of Asian power. For a thousand years, Asia was the engine of the global economy, a locus of science and innovation, a center of ideas and intellectual ferment, and the nexus of global power. After a long hiatus, Asia's major powers have now reemerged on the global stage, but their interaction with one another, and with the United States, on important issues and challenges is unsettled and evolving. Speakers and participants analyze the reemergence of China and India as global players, the changing role of Japan on the international stage, and efforts to reshape the international architecture to accommodate the rise of China and India, in particular. Sessions also consider the ways in which greater involvement in the world, not just their immediate neighborhood, is changing the strategic, economic, and political calculations of major countries in East, Central, and South Asia. Meetings look at the tensions, opportunities, and constraints that will determine whether and how the United States can forge partnerships with major Asian powers on issues of global scope. Other sessions may examine timely issues that arise in Central Asia, such as connections to the international oil and gas market, international institutions, and the global economy.

[undated article below]

The reader should bear in mind that, although this article explains the "U.S./British Connection", England has been under economic and political control of the Rothschild money trust for centuries.

Without that understanding, the subject of the US/British connection serves to create confusion as to WHO or WHAT is behind those individuals, groups, societies, etc. which, - while not well known to the general population - are somewhat more visible.

A clue is given in the statement: "The money to found the CFR came in part from J.P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Bernard Baruch, Otto Kahn, Jacob Schiff and Paul Warburg".
An Introduction to the "Little Sister" of The Royal Institute of International Affairs: The U.S. Council on Foreign Relations

By Eric Samuelson, J.D.
janeric@concentric.net

"Since its founding... the CFR has been the preeminent intermediary between the world of high finance, big oil, corporate elitism, and the U.S. government. Its members slide smoothly into cabinet-level jobs in Republican and Democratic administrations. The policies promulgated in its quarterly journal, Foreign Affairs, become U.S. government policy." -- Jonathan Vankin (1)

"As a teenager, I heard John Kennedy's summons to citizenship. And then, as a student, I heard that call clarified by a professor I had named Carroll Quigley." -- Democratic Presidential Nominee Bill Clinton

When Bill Clinton delivered his acceptance speech at the Democratic convention, on July 16, 1992, Carroll Quigley's name was not exactly a household word. Quigley, Dean of The School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, had graduated magna cum from Harvard. He made Ripley's "Believe It or Not" for being Harvard's youngest person to receive a Ph.D. After teaching at Harvard and Princeton, he went to Georgetown where for 28 consecutive years alumni selected him as their most influential professor.

Clinton, Quigley's student, went on to become a Rhodes Scholar, a CFR member, a Trilateral Commission member and a Bilderberger participant. He joined the Council on Foreign Relations in 1989, attended a Bilderberg meeting in 1991 and was a current member of the Trilateral Commission at the time of his nomination. Clinton, before the American public, openly acknowledged his Georgetown mentor and clued his followers from the convention podium. He then went on in November to defeat former CFR/Trilateralist/Skull and Bones member President George H.W. Bush.
The shadowy political and even "foreign" beginnings of the Council on Foreign Relations have long been intentionally obscured. For more than three decades the CFR received no notice by authors, the general public or serious researchers. When mentioned, it is almost always in articles detailing how many of the appointees of a given administration, as usual, have a "CFR connection". (1)

Santa Barbara sociologist G. William Domhoff wrote in 1978 that the CFR had been the subject of only two "academic studies." This, he said, provided "an impressive commentary in itself on how little social scientists know about policy-making in the United States." (5) A lack of academic commentary has also been paralleled by little coverage in the media or press. It was not until some 37 years after the creation of the CFR that a mainstream magazine article was published in Harper's by Joseph Kraft in July 1958 entitled: "School for Statesmen." (6)

A major clue was given by Georgetown University Professor Carroll Quigley in an interview. Quigley, in his best Boston accent, dismissed the Radical-Right interpretation as 'garbage'. But he then added: "To be perfectly blunt, you could find yourself in trouble dealing with this subject." He explained that his career as a lecturer in the government institution circuit was all but ruined because of the twenty or so pages he had written about the existence of Round Table Groups. As we will see, the CFR was, indeed, a British Round Table creation. This is one of the most important hidden secrets of the NYC-based CFR.

The story of the British connection to the Council on Foreign Relations may be traced back to George Peabody, J.P. Morgan, Andrew Carnegie, Nicholas M. Butler and Col. Edward House -- all who may be described a British loyalists. A Secret Society was established by Cecil Rhodes in connection with Rothschild, Morgan, Carnegie, and Rockefeller. A small highly secret group called the Round Table directed operations. (7)

The story begins at least when George Peabody moved to London and took up English residence in 1837 -- the same year Queen Victoria ascended the throne. He joined with other merchant bankers who traded in dry goods in "high finance." This consisted of exclusive service to "governments, large companies and rich individuals." (8) Soon after his arrival in London, Peabody was summoned by Baron Nathan Mayer Rothschild. Rothschild offered to pay all his entertainment bills. Hence, the famous Peabody July 4th dinners were bought and paid for by funds from the Rothschilds. (9) In 1837, Peabody was warned, in advance, by his British friends of their decision "to withdraw credits from the worldwide markets and thereby depress commercial values; so he was fully liquid and ready to pounce on the American properties rendered bargains by the British move." (10) In the crash of 1837 Peabody made a fortune.
purchasing depressed property in America.\(^{(11)}\) In 1854 the American Ambassador to London, James Buchanan, stormed out of the room when George Peabody toasted Queen Victoria before President Pierce.\(^{(12)}\) Peabody "was the founder of the Morgan financial empire."\(^{(13)}\) In 1859 Junius Morgan assumed control of George Peabody and Company. He traded Union bonds. The Civil War was "a bonanza for German-Jewish bankers on Wall Street, who raised loans from the numerous Union sympathizers in Germany."\(^{(14)}\) Peabody's American agent was the Boston firm of Beebe, Morgan and Company -- headed by Junius Morgan.\(^{(15)}\) When J. Pierpont Morgan was in Vienna, his father wrote that Alexander Duncan had an opening in Duncan, Sherman & Company -- a bank affiliated with George Peabody in London. Pierpont "soon was acting as George Peabody & Company's American representative."\(^{(16)}\)

Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919), in 1872, was paid a $150,000 commission for placing $6 million of bonds of a Pennsylvania branch road in Europe. He made another $75,000 on a second trip. While in England in 1873, on one of his frequent trips to Great Britain, he met Henry Bessemer and saw the Bessemer process of making steel. He then organized Carnegie, McCandless & Company with a capital of $700,000 and built a new steel plant named the Edgar Thompson Steel Works (to flatter the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad to get generous rebates).\(^{(17)}\)

In the original edition of Andrew Carnegie's 1893 book, *Triumphant Democracy*, he stated: "Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams but it will never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked for and undesired separation of the Mother from her child is not to bleed forever. Let men say what they will, therefore I say, that surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the United States, the British American Union."\(^{(18)}\) In 1948 a bio of Carnegie ended: "There is bound to be universal peace, he believed, through the final interlocking of the national interests throughout the world. At first a coalition of America and England -- a union of the English-speaking race. Then a United States of Europe. And finally a unification of the entire human race."\(^{(19)}\) Carnegie was a vice president and generous financial supporter of the Anti-Imperialist League from its formation in 1898 until his death. His profits went from almost $3.5 million in 1887 to $40 million in 1900.\(^{(20)}\) He consolidated his holdings into Carnegie Steel Co. in 1899. On December 12, 1900 an informal parliament of "all the biggest men of New York" was held as a dinner party to the president of the Carnegie Steel Company -- "Smiling Charlie" Schwab. After an all night session, some weeks later, Morgan sent Schwab to Carnegie: "Go and find his price." The resulting price of $492,000,000, dubbed a "stupendous ransom," was paid to Carnegie with $300,000,000 in bonds and preferred stock.\(^{(21)}\) Carnegie's assets were actually worth only $80 million but Morgan merged other corporations to create U.S. Steel Company controlling 65% of U.S. steelmaking capacity.\(^{(22)}\) At the
end of his steel career, in 1901, he turned over his Carnegie Steel to J.P. Morgan who merged it with three other steel giants (the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company, the Illinois Steel Company and Colorado Fuel and Iron) to form the U.S. Steel Corporation -- the first billion dollar corporation in America. (23)

Andrew Carnegie financed three temples of peace: Central America Court of Justice, the Pan American Union and the Palace of Peace at the Hague (which cost $1.5 million to construct in 1903). (24) He was also a member of the Philippine Independence Committee (1904) and a vice president of the Filipino Progress Association (1905-1907). In 1905 Carnegie gave $10 million to provide pensions for retired college professors. Those who gathered at Carnegie's mansion on November 15, 1905, included Charles W. Eliot (Harvard), Woodrow Wilson (Princeton), Arthur Hadley (Yale) and David Star Jordan (Stanford). (25)

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was set up in 1910. The initial direction of the fund was given by Carnegie to Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler (1862-1947). 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. (26) Butler was President of Columbia University (1901-1945), helped establish the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and served as its President (1925-1945). Norman Dodd, research director for the Reece Committee, was invited to examine the warehoused records of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The minutes, inspected by a Dodd researcher, revealed that in 1910 the Carnegie trustees asked: "Is there any way known to man more effective than war, to so alter the life of an entire people?" The trustees ultimately decided that war was the most effective way to change people. A year later the minutes showed that the trustees asked: "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." The trustees also sent a confidential message to President Wilson insisting that the war not end too quickly. Dodd also found that all high appointments in the State Department took place only after they had been cleared by the Council of Learned Societies (established by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace). (27) The Church Peace Union was established at a meeting at the home of Andrew Carnegie in 1914 with an endowment of over $2 million. (28) Andrew Carnegie, J.P. Morgan and Otto Kahn backed the 1915 Anglo-French loan. (29) The 1915 loans were said by Morgan to be made for "trade" purposes. (30)

The League of Free Nations was created in early 1918 (in 1920 it became the Foreign Policy Association). (31) The Foreign Policy Association "grew out of a meeting of nineteen writers, editors, educators, and such with a view to selling
Wilsonian policies and the League of Nations to the public." (32) The Foreign Policy Association, however, soon began to play "second fiddle" to the CFR.

In June 1918, a "more discrete" club of New York "financial and international lawyers" was formed headed by Elihu Root (an Andrew Carnegie lawyer). (33) The 108 members of the original Council on Foreign Relations were described by Whitney Shepardson as "high-ranking officers of banking, manufacturing, trading and finance companies, together with many lawyers." (34) International Bankers provided the money: "In Britain the organization was (initially) called the Institute for International Affairs (IIA) while in New York it operated as the Council for Foreign Relations (CFR). The finances for the group came from wealthy international bankers..." (35) The CFR was founded "by East Coast bankers, lawyers and academicians..." (36) By April 1919, however, the CFR "went dormant." (37)

A Texan named House was a key individual before and during the Wilson administration. He helped establish the income tax, the Federal Reserve System, coined the phrase "league of nations," drafted the covenant for the League of Nations and presided over the creation of the Council on Foreign Relations (C.F.R.).

Col. Edward M. House (the title came from a Texas Governor) inherited a fortune estimated at around $1.5 million. He was born in Houston, Texas -- the son of a wealthy planter and banker. (38) Originally the House ("Huis") family was Dutch. House's family had lived in England for 300 years before his father came to Texas. (39) Thomas William House came to Texas to fight under Sam Houston and was an American agent for London Banking interests "said by some to the House of Rothschild..." (40) Edward House attended school in England for several years as a young boy: "Much of his youth and adult life was spent in the British Isles, which he regularly visited." (41) The elder House said he wanted to raise his sons to "know and serve England." (42) House surrounded himself with prominent members of the Fabian Society. (43) Between 1892 and 1902 he elected four Texas Governors. (44)

In the winter of 1911-1912, House wrote Philip Dru: Administrator. House said he was working for "Socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx..." The book was a fictional plan for the conquest of America by gaining control of both the Republican and Democratic parties and using them to create a socialist world government. Central portions of the plan included a graduated federal income tax and a central bank. (45) The book also outlined an inheritance tax and suggested taking functions away from the states. (46) It suggested a conspiracy "insinuated into the primaries, in order that no candidate might be nominated whose views were not in accord with theirs." (47) House passed the book to his father-in-law in New York City -- Dr. Sidney E. Mezes. Mezes, who read and
approved the book, was Director of the College of the City of New York and
former President of the University of Texas. House then sent the book to future
Wilson cabinet member David F. Houston. Houston declared the work
economically sound but said the fiction in it was so thin that he advised it be
rewritten as a serious work. (48)

After his November 1912 election, Woodrow Wilson, on vacation in Bermuda,
read Philip Dru. (49) Arthur Howden Smith wrote: "In nine months the Wilson
administration completely reorganized the financial structure in accordance with
the conceptions outlined in 'Philip Dru.'" (50) From 1912-1914, Wilson's
legislative program "was largely the program of House's book..." (51) The New
York Times in January 1913 found the authorship of Philip Dru to still be a
puzzle. (52) In 1915 House was still trying to conceal his connection as author of
the book. (53) Among those who read the novel was Franklin Delano Roosevelt -
- then Assistant Secretary of the Navy -- whose mother was then and always a
close friend of Colonel House. (54) It was published by B.W. Huebsch -- "a
favorite publisher of the Left and for many years a valued collaborator of
American Fabian Socialist groups." (55) In 1917 a bookseller wrote regarding the
House book: "As time goes on the interest in it becomes more intense, due to
the fact that so many of the ideas expressed...have become laws of this
Republic, and so many of his ideas have been discussed as becoming laws." He
ended with the question: "Is Colonel E.M. House of Texas the author? If not,
who is?" Seymour admitted: "Colonel House was, in truth, the author; to his
other occupations he added that of novelist." (56) Both Franklin K. Lane and W.
J. Bryan commented on the influence of Philip Dru on Wilson. (57) In 1918,
Franklin K. Lane, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of the Interior, stated in a
private letter: "All that book has said should be, comes about...The President
comes to Philip Dru, in the end." (58) House's book has been said to have
outlined the next 40-50 years in code (DRU is also said to be the code for David
Rex Universe). (59)

Charles Seymour called Col. House "the unseen guardian angel of the (Federal
Reserve) bill." (60) The banker J. Horace Harding held a dinner at which House
"convinced the financial overlords that the Democratic donkey, with Wilson in
the saddle, would not kick over the traces....The Schiffs, the Warburgs, the
Kuhns, the Rockefellers, the Morgans put their faith in House..." (61) On
November 17, 1913, Paul Warburg requested an interview, with House, to
include Jacob Schiff and Cleveland Dodge. Dodge was grateful for a
"substantial subscription for the Y.M.C.A. fund." Warburg did most of the
talking. Schiff favored only four regional reserve banks. (62) Schiff said House
was the Moses and they would be the Aarons: "He asked if I knew my Bible
well enough for this to be clear to be. I told him I did." (63) Schiff then wrote to
House on December 23, 1913: "I want to say a word of appreciation to you for
the silent, but no doubt effective work you have done in the interest of currency
legislation..." (64) After getting the Federal Reserve through, House then turned
House "had powerful connections with international bankers in New York. He was influential...with great financial institutions represented by such people as Paul and Felix Warburg, Otto H. Kahn, Louis Marburg, Henry Morgenthau, Jacob and Mortimer Schiff and Herbert Lehman. House had equally powerful connections with bankers and politicians of Europe." (66) Jacob Schiff died on September 25, 1920. Of all the other living bankers named by Smoot, all, without an exception, were later founding members of the CFR in 1921. (67) The original 270-secret crowd that created the Federal Reserve System "were all in the original (CFR) membership." They included Jacob Schiff, Averell Harriman, Frank Vanderlip, Nelson Aldrich, Bernard Baruch, J.P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller. (68)

Associates of J.P. Morgan and Company created an American parallel group to the Milner Group before the first World War. (69) The RIIA was an above-ground group: "During the Versailles Treaty talks after the war, Round Table members Lionel Curtis, Balfour, Milner, and others formed an above-ground group called the Royal Institute of International Affairs for the purpose of coordinating Anglo-American cooperative efforts. They decided also to form an American branch, but gave it a different name in order to secure its antecedents. Thus was born the Council on Foreign Relations, originally staffed by J.P. Morgan men and financed by Morgan money." (70) The two groups were established to prevent the American people from reacting with patriotic fury if it was discovered that the CFR was in fact a subsidiary of the British Round Table. (71) The man most responsible for creating subgroups of the Round Table was Lionel Curtis. He established local chapters of the Round Table called the Royal Institute of International Affairs: "In the United States, the Round Table 'front group' was named the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)." (72)

A savvy observer has described the CFR's British front-role: "The interlock problem is conspicuous for another reason, one which has never been addressed by Congress. It seems that certain huge Yankee foundations, namely Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie, have been conscious instruments of covert U.S. foreign policy, with directors and officers who can only be described as agents of U.S. intelligence. According to Quigley, the roots for this can be traced to the establishment of an American branch of the British Royal Institute in 1921, which itself had grown out of the Rhodes Trust. The American branch, called the Council on Foreign Relations, was a largely a front for J. P. Morgan and Company." (73)

The Council on Foreign Relations Handbook of 1936 stated: "On May 30, 1919, several leading members of the delegations to the Paris Peace Conference met at the Hotel Majestic in Paris to discuss setting up an international group which would advise their respective governments on international affairs. The U.S. was represented by Gen. Tasker H. Bliss (Chief of Staff, U.S. Army), Col.
Edward M. House, Whitney H. Shepardson, Dr. James T. Shotwell, and Prof. Archibald Coolidge. Great Britain was unofficially represented by Lord Robert Cecil, Lionel Curtis, Lord Eustace Percy, and Harold Temperley." The May 30th meeting was held at the billet of the British delegation and proposed an Anglo-American Institute of International Affairs -- one branch in London and one in New York. The New York and London locations were appropriate since "nearly all of them were bankers and lawyers." (74)

The British moved quickly to establish their branch. The establishment of the American branch was much slower. When the American delegates got home their fellow citizens were "absorbed in isolationism and prohibition, thoroughly inhospitable to the ideas of the League of Nations." (77)

So far no complete list of the fifty dinner guests has been located. It has been stated, however: "The twenty-one Americans, who, together with (their 29) British counterparts, founded in Paris The Institute of International Affairs, were a diverse group that included Col. Edward M. House, Herbert Hoover, Gen. Tasker Bliss, Christian Herter, and such scholars as Charles Seymour, later President of Yale, Professors Archibald Cary Coolidge of Harvard and James T. Shotwell of Columbia." (78) There were two camps. One was headed by the U.S. official negotiators Tasker H. Bliss and Edward House along with advisors Herbert Hoover and Thomas W. Lamont -- along with their aides. The other side was composed of the twelve scholars that had served the American delegation in an advisory capacity. (79) Most of the scholars were from Harvard, Yale and Columbia. (80)

The returning Inquiry scholars lacked the funds to create the envisioned American Institute of International Affairs but offered diplomatic experience, expertise and high-level contacts: "The men of law and banking, by contrast, could tap untold resources of finance...This was the synergy that produced the modern Council..." (81) **The money to found the CFR came in part from J.P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Bernard Baruch, Otto Kahn, Jacob Schiff and Paul Warburg.** (82)

Another source suggests that the original CFR itself had fund-raising problems: "They took the name of an organization already in existence. The original Council on Foreign Relations had been formed in New York in July, 1918, but in little more than a year had become inactive owing to an inability to raise the necessary funds. It was with 66 members of this original crowd that the peacemongers from Paris merged to form the organization we know today." (83)

J.P. Morgan's personal attorney, John W. Davis (and later Republican presidential candidate), was the founding President of the CFR. Paul Carvath,
the first Vice-President of the CFR, also represented the J.P. Morgan interests. The council's first chairman was Morgan partner Russell Leffingwell. Morgan also had the loyalty of many professors due to his large academic endowments. Paul Cravath was also the founder of the famous law firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore.

In summary, the Federal Reserve System, the League of Nations and the Council on Foreign Relations had both common origins and creators. Last, but not least, the CFR was of British -- not U.S. origin.

ENDNOTES:
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67. Paul Warburg, Henry Morgenthau and Jacob Schiff were also all 33rd degree
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71. Larry Abraham, *Call it Conspiracy* 93 (1985).

NOTE CFR PUBLICATIONS:

http://www.cfr.org/project/286/study_group_on_new_world_order.html

- **Study Group on New World Order**
  - **Director:** Michael Mandelbaum, Christian Herter Professor, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, The Johns Hopkins University
  - July 1, 2000 - June 30, 2004
  - The activities carried out under this study group during previous years have supported the development of the project director’s recently published book, *The Ideas that Conquered the World: Peace, Democracy, and Free Markets in the Twenty-first Century*. Throughout the Fall, the project director will promote his by holding Council meetings in New York, Washington, and across the country. Following this book
promotion, the project director will begin research on a new book, building on the first, related to America’s role in the world.

- **The Ideas That Conquered the World**

  **Author:** Michael Mandelbaum, Christian Herter Professor, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, The Johns Hopkins University

- At the dawn of the twenty-first century, three ideas dominate the world: peace as the preferred basis for relations between countries, democracy as the optimal way to organize political life, and free markets as the indispensable vehicle for the creation of wealth. While not practiced everywhere, these ideas have—for the first time in history—no serious rivals as methods for organizing the world’s politics, economics, and international relations.

[undated article below]

This excerpt from Carroll Quigley's Tragedy and Hope was transcribed after we read and formatted for posting the article from the New York Times on 12-03-01, titled **Calls for a New Push Into Iraq Gain Power in Washington**. The Globalists become ever more emboldened as they lay their puppet minions and their plans in the faces of elected officials, both federal and state and no effort is made to reign in the "outsiders" - as that article labels them.

Thus, we are once again reminded of the Protocols, better known as the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. Whoever its author - having been first published in London in 1906 - we must notice a projected outcome and method that is clearly visible today. The description and mission of the 'outsider group', as described in the article mentioned above is articulated clearly in Protocol No.9

"It is from us that the all-engulfing terror proceeds.

We have in our service persons of all opinions, of all doctrines... demagogues, socialists, communists, and utopian dreamers of every kind.
We have harnessed them all to the task; each one of them on his own account is boring away at the last remnants of authority, is striving to overthrow all established form of order.

*By these acts all States are in torture; they exhort to tranquility, are ready to sacrifice everything for peace: but we will not give them peace until they openly acknowledge our international Super-Government, and with submissiveness."

We notice with Carroll Quigley, either a subtle deceptiveness or naivete' when describing some of the named minions of the International Priesthood. He died soon after the publication of Tragedy and Hope. Read and take heed. -- Jackie - 2-11-01

**TRAGEDY AND HOPE**

by: Carroll Quigley

Excerpted from pp. 950 - 955 - detailing the establishment of the "New York branch of the ROYAL INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS" . . . the:

**COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international Anglophile network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Group has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, of 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, but 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 wished to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known.
The Round Table Groups have already been mentioned in this book several times, notably in connection with the formation of the British Commonwealth in chapter 4 and in the discussion of appeasement in chapter 12 ("the Cliveden Set").

At the risk of some repetition, the story will be summarized here, because the 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.

The Round Table Groups were semi-secret discussion and lobbying groups organized by Lionel Curtis, Philip H. Kerr (Lord Lothian), and (Sir) William S. Marris in 1908-1911. 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, (1840-1912), and the money for the organizational work came originally from the Rhodes Trust.

By 1915 Round Table groups existed in seven countries, including England, South Africa, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, and a rather loosely organized group in the United States (George Louis Beer, Walter Lippman, Frank Avdelotte, Whitney Shepardson, Thomas W. Lamont, Jerome D. Greene, Erwin D. Canham of the Christian Science Monitor, and others).

The attitudes of the various groups were coordinated by frequent visits and discussions and by a well-informed and totally anonymous quarterly magazine, The Round Table, whose first issue, largely written by Philip Kerr, appeared in November 1910.

The leaders of this group were: Milner, until his death in 1915, followed by Curtis (1872-1955), Robert H. (Lord) Brand -- brother-in-law of Lady Astor -- until his death in 1963, and now Adam D. Marris, son of Sir William and Brand's successor as managing director of Lazard Brothers bank. The original intention had been to have collegial leadership, but Milner was too secretive and headstrong to share the role.

He did so only in the period 1913-1919 when he held regular meetings with some of his closest friends to coordinate their activities as a pressure group in the struggle with Wilhelmine Germany. This they called their "Ginger Group".
After Milner's death in 1925, the leadership was largely shared by the survivors of Milner's 'Kindergarten', that is, the group of young Oxford men whom he used as civil servants in his reconstruction of South Africa in 1901-1910.

Brand was the last survivor of the "Kindergarten", since his death, the greatly reduced activities of the organization have been exercised largely through the Editorial Committee of *The Round Table* magazine under Adam Marris.

Money for the widely ramified activities of this organization came originally from the associates and followers of Cecil Rhodes, chiefly from the Rhodes Trust itself, and from wealthy associates such as the Beit brothers, from Sir Abe Bailey, and (after 1915) from the Astor family.

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.

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.

Milner himself in 1901 had refused a fabulous offer, worth up to 100,000 a year, to become one of the three partners of the Morgan Bank in London, in succession to the younger J.P. Morgan who moved from London to join his father in New York (eventually the vacancy went to E.C. Grenfell, so that the London affiliate of Morgan became known as Morgan, Grenfell, and Company).

Instead, Milner became director of a number of public banks, chiefly the London Joint Stock Bank, corporate precursor of the Midland Bank. He became one of the greatest political and financial powers in England, with his disciples strategically placed throughout England in significant places, such as the editorship of *The Times*, the editorship of *The Observer*, the managing directorship of Lazard Brothers, various administrative posts, and even Cabinet positions.

Ramifications were established in politics, high finance, Oxford and London universities, periodicals, the civil service, and tax exempt foundations.
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.

The American organizers were dominated by the large number of Morgan "experts", including Lamont and Beer, who had gone to the Paris Peace Conference and there became close friends with the similar group of English "experts" which had been recruited by the Milner group.

In fact, the original plans for the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations were drawn up at Paris.

The Council of the RIIA (which, by Curtis's energy came to be housed in Chatham House, across St. James's Square from the Astors, and was soon known by the name of the headquarters) and the board of the Council on Foreign Relations have carried ever since the marks of their origin.

Until 1960 the council at Chatham House was dominated by the dwindling group of Milner's associates, while the paid staff members were largely the agents of Lionel Curtis. The Round Table for years (until 1960) was edited from the back door of Chatham House grounds in Ormond Yard, and its telephone came through the Chatham House switchboard.

The New York branch was dominated by the associates of the Morgan Bank. For example, in 1928 the Council on Foreign relations had John W. Davis as president, Paul Cravath as vice-president, and a council of thirteen others, which included Owen D. Young, russell C. Leffingwell, Norman Davis, Allen Dulles, George W. Wickersham, Frank L. Polk, Whitney Shepardson, Isaiah Bowman, Stephen P. Duggan, and Otto Kahn.

Throughout its history, the council has been associated with the American Round Tablers, such as Beer, Lippmann, Shepardson, and Jerome Greene.
The academic figures have been those linked to Morgan, such as James T. Shotwell, Charles Seymour, Joseph P. Chamberlain, Philip Jessup, Isaiah Bowman and, more recently, Philip Moseley, Grayson L. Kirk, and Henry W. Wriston.

The Wall Street contracts with these were created originally from Morgan's influence in handling large academic endowments. In the case of the largest of these endowments, that at Harvard, the influence was usually exercised indirectly through "State Street", Boston, which, for much of the twentieth century, came through the Boston banker Thomas Nelson Perkins.

Closely allied with this Morgan influence were a small group of Wall Street law firms, whose chief figures were Elihu Root, John W. Davis, Paul D. Cravath, Russell Leffingwell, the Dulles brothers and, more recently, Arthur H. Dean, Philip D. Reed, and John J. McCloy. Other nonlegal agents of Morgan included men like Owen D. Young and Norman H. Davis.

On this basis, which was originally financial and goes back to George Peabody, 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.

Some rather incidental examples of the operations of this structure are very revealing, just because they are incidental. For example, it set up in Princeton a reasonable copy of the Round Table Group's chief Oxford headquarters, All Souls College.

This copy, called the Institute for Advanced Study, and best known, perhaps, as the refuge of Einstein, Oppenheimer, John von Neumann, and George F. Kennan, was organized by Abraham Flexner of the Carnegie Foundation and Rockefeller's General Education Board after he had experienced the delights of All Souls while serving as Rhodes Memorial Lecturer at Oxford. The plans were largely drawn by Tom Jones, one of the Round Table's most active intrigues and foundation administrators.

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

In fact, the editor of the Christian Science Monitor was the chief American correspondent (anonymously) of The Round Table, and Lord Lothian, the original editor of The Round Table and later secretary of the Rhodes Trust (1925-1939) and ambassador to Washington, was a frequent writer in the Monitor.

It might be mentioned that the existence of this Wall Street Anglo-American axis is quite obvious once it is pointed out.

It is reflected in the fact that such Wall Street luminaries as John W. Davis, Lewis Douglas, Jock Whitney, and Douglas Dillon were appointed to be American ambassadors in London.

This double international network in which the Round Table groups formed the semi-secret or secret nuclei of the Institutes of International Affairs was extended into a third network in 1935, organized by the same people for the same motives.

Once again the mastermind was Lionel Curtis, and the earlier Round Table Groups and Institutes of International Affairs were used as nuclei for the new network.

However, this new organization for Pacific affairs was extended to ten countries, while the Round Table Groups existed only in seven. The new additions, ultimately China, Japan, France, the Netherlands, and Soviet Russia, had Pacific councils set up from scratch.

In Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, Pacific councils, interlocked and dominated by the Institutes of International Affairs, were set up.

In England, Chatham House served as the English center for both nets, while in the United States the two were parallel creations (not subordinate) of the Wall Street allies of the Morgan Bank. The financing came from the same international banking groups and their subsidiary commercial and industrial firms.
In England, Chatham House was financed for both networks by the contributions of Sir Abe Bailey, the Astor family, and additional funds largely acquired by the persuasive powers of Lionel Curtis. The financial difficulties of the IPR Councils in the British Dominions in the depression of 1929-1935 resulted in a very revealing effort to save money, when the local Institute of International Affairs absorbed the local Pacific Council, both of which were, in a way, expensive and needless fronts for the local Round Table groups.

The chief aims of this elaborate, semi-secret organization were largely commendable: to coordinate the international activities and outlooks of all the English-speaking world into one (which would largely, it is true, be that of the London group); to work to maintain the peace; to help backward, colonial, and underdeveloped areas to advance toward stability, law and order, and prosperity along lines somewhat similar to those taught at Oxford and the University of London (especially the School of Economics and the Schools of African and Oriental Studies).

These organizations and their financial backers were in no sense reactionary or Fascistic persons, as Communist propaganda would like to depict them. Quite the contrary.

They were gracious and cultured gentlemen of somewhat limited social experience who were much concerned with the freedom of expression of minorities and the rule of law for all, who constantly thought in terms of Anglo-American solidarity, of political partition and federation, and who were convinced that they could gracefully civilize the Boers of South Africa, the Irish, the Arabs, and the Hindus, and who are largely responsible for the partitions of Ireland, Palestine, and India, as well as the federations of South Africa, Central Africa, and the West Indies.

Their desire to win over the opposition by cooperation worked with Smuts but failed with Hertzog, worked with Gandhi but failed with Menon, worked with Stresemann but failed with Hitler, and has shown little chance of working with any Soviet leader. If their failures now loom larger than their successes, this should not be allowed to conceal the high motives with which they attempted both.

It was this group of people, whose wealth and influence so exceeded their experience and understanding, who provided much of the frame-work of influence which the Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers took over in the United States in the 1930's.
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**, and, once the anger and suspicions of the American people were aroused, as they were by 1950, it was a fairly simple matter to get rid of the Red sympathizers.

Before this could be done, however, a congressional committee, following backward to their source the threads which led from admitted Communists like Whittaker Chamber, through Alger Hiss, and the Carnegie Endowment to Thomas Lamont and the Morgan Bank, fell into the whole complicated network of the interlocking tax-exempt foundations.

The Eighty-third Congress in July 1953 set up a Special Committee to investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations with Representative B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee, as chairman. 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 worth while, in terms of votes or campaign contributions.

An interesting report showing the Left-wing associations of the interlocking nexus of tax-exempt foundations was issued in 1954 rather quietly. Four years later, the Reece committee's general counsel, Rene A. Wormser wrote a shocked, but not shocking, book on the subject called *Foundations: Their Power and Influence*.

One of the most interesting members of this Anglo-American power structure was Jerome D. Greene (1874-1959). Born in Japan of missionary parents, Greene graduated from Harvard's college and law school by 1899 and became secretary to Harvard's president and corporation in 1901-1910. This gave him contacts with Wall Street which made him general manager of the Rockefeller Institute (1910-1012), assistant to John d. Rockefeller in philanthropic work for two years, then trustee to the Rockefeller Institute, to the Rockefeller foundation, and to the Rockefeller General Education Board until 1939.

For fifteen years (1917-1932) he was with the Boston investment banking firm of Lee, Higginson, and Company, most of the period as its chief officer, as well as with its London branch. As executive secretary of the American section of the Allied Maritime Transport Council, stationed in London in 1918, he lived in Toynbee Hall, the world's first settlement house, which has been founded by Alfred Milner and his friends in 1984.
This brought him in contact with the Round Table Group in England, a contact which was strengthened in 1919 when he was secretary to the Reparations Commission at the Paris Peace Conference. Accordingly, on his return to the United States he was one of the early figures in the establishment of the Council on Foreign Relations, which served as the New York branch of Lionel Curtis's Institute of International Affairs.

As an investment banker, Greene is chiefly remembered for his sales of millions of dollars of the fraudulent securities of the Swedish match king, Ivar Kreuger. That Greene offered these to the American investing public in good faith is evident from the fact that he put a substantial part of his own fortune in the same investments. As a consequence, Kreuger's suicide in Paris in April 1932 left Greene with little money and no job. He wrote to Lionel Curtis, asking for help, and was given, for two years, a professorship of international relations at Aberystwyth, Wales.

- End Excerpt -

See also:

Excerpts from pp 324 - 327 discussing the "powers of financial capitalism"


The Council on Foreign Relations and The New World Order

By William Blase
of The Courier

For those who may be confused by the controversies surrounding the "New World Order", a One-World-Government, and American concern over giving the UN more power; those unaware of the issues involved; and those wishing more background, I offer the following.
Originally presented for an Honors Class, "Dilemmas of War and Peace," at New Mexico State University, the paper was ridiculed and characterized by Dr. Yosef Lapid, (an acknowledged and locally quoted "expert" on Terrorism and Middle Eastern affairs) as "paranoid... possibly a symptom of mental illness." You may judge for yourself.

Citing source data is the "scientific method," but does not seem to apply to "Conspiracy Theories." A thousand sources may be quoted, yet will not convince the "skeptics," the "realists." It seems to me the "symptoms of mental illness" are on their side, if they refuse to look at evidence ("There are none so blind as those who WILL not see"); or perhaps something more sinister is at work, such as a knowledge of the truth, that does not want YOU to know.

To be paranoid means to believe in delusions of danger and persecution. If the danger is real, and the evidence credible, then it cannot be delusional. To ignore the evidence, and hope that it CANNOT be true, is more an evidence of mental illness.

The issue involves much more than a difference of philosophy, or political viewpoint. Growing up in the midst of the "Cold War," our generation were taught that those who attempted to abolish our national sovereignty and overthrow our Constitutional government were committing acts of treason. Please judge for yourself if the group discussed is guilty of such.

If one group is effectively in control of national governments and multinational corporations; promotes world government through control of media, foundation grants, and education; and controls and guides the issues of the day; then they control most options available. The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), and the financial powers behind it, have done all these things, and promote the "New World Order", as they have for over seventy years.

The CFR is the promotional arm of the Ruling Elite in the United States of America. Most influential politicians, academics and media personalities are members, and it uses its influence to infiltrate the New World Order into American life. Its' "experts" write scholarly pieces to be used in decision making, the academics expound on the wisdom of a united world, and the media members disseminate the message.

To understand how the most influential people in America came to be members of an organization working purposefully for the overthrow of the Constitution and American sovereignty, we have to go back at least to the early 1900's, though the story begins much earlier (depending on your viewpoint and beliefs).
That a ruling power elite does indeed control the U.S. government behind the scenes has been attested to by many Americans in a position to know. Felix Frankfurter, Justice of the Supreme Court (1939-1962), said: "The real rulers in Washington are invisible and exercise power from behind the scenes." In a letter to an associate dated November 21, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt wrote, "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." February 23, 1954,

Senator William Jenner warned in a speech: "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."

Baron M.A. Rothschild wrote, "Give me control over a nation's currency and I care not who makes its laws."

All that is needed to effectively control a government is to have control over the nation's money: a central bank with a monopoly over the supply of money and credit. This had been done in Western Europe, with the creation of privately owned central banks such as the Bank of England.

Georgetown professor Dr. Carroll Quigley (Bill Clinton's mentor while at Georgetown) wrote about the goals of the investment bankers who control central banks: "... 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... 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 Bank of the United States (1816-36), an early attempt at an American central bank, was abolished by President Andrew Jackson, who believed that it threatened the nation. He wrote: "The bold effort the present bank had made to control the government, the distress it had wantonly produced...are but premonitions of the fate that awaits the American people should they be deluded into a perpetuation of this institution or the establishment of another like it."

Thomas Jefferson wrote: "The Central Bank is an institution of the most deadly hostility existing against the principles and form of our Constitution...if the American people allow private banks to control the issuance of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will
grow up around them will deprive the people of all their property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered."

Does that not describe the situation in America today?

The U.S. managed to do without a central bank until early in this century, when, according to Congressman Charles Lindbergh, Sr., "The Money Trust caused the 1907 panic, and thereby forced Congress to create a National Monetary Commission." Headed by Senator Nelson Aldrich, father-in-law of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the Commission recommended creation of a central bank.

Though unconstitutional, as only "The Congress shall have Power...To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof..." (Article I, Section 8, U.S. Constitution) the Federal Reserve Act was passed in December 1913; ostensibly to stabilize the economy and prevent further panics, but as Lindberg warned Congress: "This act establishes the most gigantic trust on earth...the invisible government by the money power, proven to exist by the Money Trust investigation, will be legalized." The Great Depression and numerous recessions later, it is obvious the Federal Reserve produces inflation and federal debt whenever it desires, but not stability.

Congressman Louis McFadden, House Committee on Banking and Currency Chairman (1920-31), stated: "When the Federal Reserve Act was passed, the people of these United States did not perceive that a world banking system was being set up here. A super-state controlled by international bankers and industrialists...acting together to enslave the world...Every effort has been made by the Fed to conceal its powers but the truth is--the Fed has usurped the government."

Although called "Federal," the Federal Reserve system is privately owned by member banks, makes its own policies, and is not subject to oversight by Congress or the President. As the overseer and supplier of reserves, the Fed gave banks access to public funds, which enhanced their lending capacity.

Peter Kershaw, in "Economic Solutions" lists the ten major shareholders of the Federal Reserve Bank System as: Rothschild: London and Berlin; Lazard Bros: Paris; Israel Seiff: Italy; Kuhn-Loeb Company: Germany; Warburg: Hamburg and Amsterdam; Lehman Bros: New York; Goldman and Sachs: New York; Rockefeller: New York. (That most, if not all of these families just happen to be Jewish, you may judge the significance of yourself). The balance of stock is owned by major commercial member banks.
According to Davvy [Devvy -Ed.] Kidd, "Why A Bankrupt America?" The Federal Reserve pays the Bureau of Engraving & 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 our land, labor, and assets... collected by their agents, the IRS. By authorizing the Fed to regulate and create money (and thus inflation), Congress gave private banks power to create profits at will.

As Lindberg put it: "The new law will create inflation whenever the trusts want inflation...they can unload the stocks on the people at high prices during the excitement and then bring on a panic and buy them back at low prices...the day of reckoning is only a few years removed." That day came in 1929, with the Stock Market crash and Great Depression.

One of the most important powers given to the Fed was the right to buy and sell government securities, and provide loans to member banks so they might also purchase them. This provided another built-in mechanism for profit to the banks, if government debt was increased. All that was needed was a method to pay off the debt. This was accomplished through the passage of the income tax in 1913.

A national income tax was declared unconstitutional in 1895 by the Supreme Court, so a constitutional amendment was proposed in Congress by none other than ...Senator Nelson Aldrich. As presented to the American people it seemed reasonable enough: income tax on only one percent of income under $20,000, with the assurance that it would never increase.

Since it was graduated, the tax would "soak the rich", ...but the rich had other plans, already devising a method of protecting wealth. As described by Gary Allen in his 1976 book "The Rockefeller File," "By the time the (16th) Amendment had been approved by the states, the Rockefeller Foundation was in full operation...about the same time that Judge Kenesaw Landis was ordering the breakup of the Standard Oil monopoly...John D...not only avoided taxes by creating four great tax-exempt foundations; he used them as repositories for his 'divested' interests...made his assets non-taxable so that they might be passed down through generations without...estate and gift taxes...Each year the Rockefellers can dump up to half their incomes into their pet foundations and deduct the "donations" from their income tax."

Exchanging ownership for control of wealth, foundations are also a handy means for promoting interests that benefit the wealthy. Millions of foundation dollars have been "donated" to causes such as promoting the use of drugs, while
degrading preventive medicine. Since many drugs are made from coal tar derivatives, both oil companies and drug manufacturing concerns (many Rockefeller owned or controlled) are the main beneficiaries.

With the means to loan enormous sums to the government (the Federal Reserve), a method to repay the debt (income tax), and an escape from taxation for the wealthy, (foundations), all that remained was an excuse to borrow money. By some happy "coincidence," in 1914 World War I began, and after American participation national debt rose from $1 billion to $25 billion.

Woodrow Wilson was elected President in 1913, beating incumbent William Howard Taft, who had vowed to veto legislation establishing a central bank. To divide the Republican vote and elect the relatively unknown Wilson, J.P. Morgan and Co. poured money into the candidacy of Teddy Roosevelt and his Progressive Party.

According to an eyewitness, Wilson was brought to Democratic Party headquarters in 1912 by Bernard Baruch, a wealthy banker. He received an "indoctrination course" from those he met, and in return agreed, if elected: to support the projected Federal Reserve and the income tax, and "listen" to advice in case of war in Europe and on the composition of his cabinet.

Wilson's top advisor during his two terms was a man named Colonel Edward M. House. House's biographer, Charles Seymour, called him the "unseen guardian angel" of the Federal Reserve Act, helping to guide it through Congress. Another biographer wrote that House believed: "...the Constitution, product of eighteenth-century minds...was thoroughly outdated; that the country would be better off if the Constitution could be scrapped and rewritten..." House wrote a book entitled "Philip Dru: Administrator," published anonymously in 1912. The hero, Philip Dru, rules America and introduces radical changes, such as a graduated income tax, a central bank, and a "league of nations."

World War I produced both a large national debt, and huge profits for those who had backed Wilson. Baruch was appointed head of the War Industries Board, where he exercised dictatorial power over the national economy. He and the Rockefellers were reported to have earned over $200 million during the war. Wilson backer Cleveland Dodge sold munitions to the allies, while J.P. Morgan loaned them hundreds of millions, with the protection of U.S. entry into the war.

While profit was certainly a motive, the war was also useful to justify the notion of world government. William Hoar reveals in "Architechs of Conspiracy" that during the 1950s, government investigators examining the records of the
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a long-time promoter of globalism, found that several years before the outbreak of World War I, the Carnegie trustees were planning to involve the U.S. in a general war, to set the stage for world government.

The main obstacle was that Americans did not want any involvement in European wars. Some kind of incident, such as the explosion of the battleship Main, which provoked the Spanish-American war, would have to be provided as provocation. This occurred when the Lusitania, carrying 128 Americans on board, was sunk by a German submarine, and anti-German sentiment was aroused. When war was declared, U.S. propaganda portrayed all Germans as Huns and fanged serpents, and all Americans opposing the war as traitors.

What was not revealed at the time, however, was that the Lusitania was transporting war munitions to England, making it a legitimate target for the Germans. Even so, they had taken out large ads in the New York papers, asking that Americans not take passage on the ship.

The evidence seems to point to a deliberate plan to have the ship sunk by the Germans. Colin Simpson, author of "The Lusitania," wrote that Winston Churchill, head of the British Admiralty during the war, had ordered a report to predict the political impact if a passenger ship carrying Americans was sunk. German naval codes had been broken by the British, who knew approximately where all U-boats near the British Isles were located.

According to Simpson, Commander Joseph Kenworthy, of British Naval Intelligence, stated: "The Lusitania was deliberately sent at considerably reduced speed into an area where a U-boat was known to be waiting...escorts withdrawn." Thus, even though Wilson had been reelected in 1916 with the slogan "He kept us out of war," America soon found itself fighting a European war. Actually, Colonel House had already negotiated a secret agreement with England, committing the U.S. to the conflict. It seems the American public had little say in the matter.

With the end of the war and the Versailles Treaty, which required severe war reparations from Germany, the way was paved for a leader in Germany such as Hitler. Wilson brought to the Paris Peace Conference his famous "fourteen points," with point fourteen being a proposal for a "general association of nations," which was to be the first step towards the goal of One World Government-the League of Nations.
Wilson's official biographer, Ray Stannard Baker, revealed that the League was not Wilson's idea. "...not a single idea--in the Covenant of the League was original with the President." Colonel House was the author of the Covenant, and Wilson had merely rewritten it to conform to his own phraseology.

The League of Nations was established, but it, and the plan for world government eventually failed because the U.S. Senate would not ratify the Versailles Treaty.

Pat Robertson, in "The New World Order," states that Colonel House, along with other internationalists, realized that America would not join any scheme for world government without a change in public opinion.

After a series of meetings, it was decided that an "Institute of International Affairs", with two branches, in the United States and England, would be formed.

The British branch became known as the Royal Institute of International Affairs, with leadership provided by members of the Round Table. Begun in the late 1800's by Cecil Rhodes, the Round Table aimed to federate the English speaking peoples of the world, and bring it under their rule.

The Council on Foreign Relations was incorporated as the American branch in New York on July 29, 1921. Founding members included Colonel House, and "...such potentates of international banking as J.P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Paul Warberg, Otto Kahn, and Jacob Schiff...the same clique which had engineered the establishment of the Federal Reserve System," according to Gary Allen in the October 1972 issue of "AMERICAN OPINION."

The founding president of the CFR was John W. Davis, J.P. Morgan's personal attorney, while the vice-president was Paul Cravath, also representing the Morgan interests. Professor Carroll Quigley characterized the CFR as "...a front group for J.P. Morgan and Company in association with the very small American Round Table Group." Over time Morgan influence was lost to the Rockefellers, who found that one world government fit their philosophy of business well. As John D. Rockefeller, Sr. had said: "Competition is a sin," and global monopoly fit their needs as they grew internationally.

Antony Sutton, a research fellow for the Hoover Institution for War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, wrote of this philosophy: "While monopoly control of industries was once the objective of J.P. Morgan and J.D.
Rockefeller, by the late nineteenth century the inner sanctums of Wall Street understood the most efficient way to gain an unchallenged monopoly was to 'go political' and make society go to work for the monopolists--under the name of the public good and the public interest."

Frederick C. Howe revealed the strategy of using government in a 1906 book, "Confessions of a Monopolist": "These are the rules of big business...Get a monopoly; let society work for you; and remember that the best of all business is politics..."

As corporations went international, national monopolies could no longer protect their interests. What was needed was a one world system of government controlled from behind the scenes. This had been the plan since the time of Colonel House, and to implement it, it was necessary to weaken the U.S. politically and economically.

During the 1920's, America enjoyed a decade of prosperity, fueled by the easy availability of credit. Between 1923 and 1929 the Federal Reserve expanded the money supply by sixty-two percent. When the stock market crashed, many small investors were ruined, but not "insiders." In March of 1929 Paul Warburg issued a tip the Crash was coming, and the largest investors got out of the market, according to Allen and Abraham in "None Dare Call it Conspiracy."

With their fortunes intact, they were able to buy companies for a fraction of their worth. Shares that had sold for a dollar might now cost a nickel, and the buying power, and wealth, of the rich increased enormously.

Louis McFadden, Chairman of the House Banking Committee declared: "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."

Curtis Dall, son-in-law of FDR and a syndicate manager for Lehman Brothers, an investment firm, was on the N.Y. Stock Exchange floor the day of the crash. In "FDR: My Exploited Father-In-Law," he states: "...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 Market."

The Crash paved the way for the man Wall Street had groomed for the presidency, FDR. Portrayed as a "man of the little people", the reality was that
Roosevelt's family had been involved in New York banking since the eighteenth century.

Frederic Delano, FDR's uncle, served on the original Federal Reserve Board. FDR attended Groton and Harvard, and in the 1920's worked on Wall Street, sitting on the board of directors of eleven different corporations.

Dall wrote of his father-in-law: "...Most of his thoughts, his political 'ammunition,'...were carefully manufactured for him in advance by the CFR-One World Money group. Brilliantly... he exploded that prepared 'ammunition' in the middle of an unsuspecting target, the American people--and thus paid off and retained his internationalist political support."

Taking America off the gold standard in 1934, FDR opened the way to unrestrained money supply expansion, decades of inflation--and credit revenues for banks. Raising gold prices from $20 an ounce to $35, FDR and Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr. (son of a founding CFR member), gave international bankers huge profits.

FDR's most remembered program, the New Deal, could only be financed through heavy borrowing. In effect, those who had caused the Depression loaned America the money to recover from it. Then, through the National Recovery Administration, proposed by Bernard Baruch in 1930, they were put in charge of regulating the economy. FDR appointed Baruch disciple Hugh Johnson to run the NRA, assisted by CFR member Gerard Swope. With broad powers to regulate wages, prices, and working conditions, it was, as Herbert Hoover wrote in his memoirs: "...pure fascism;...merely a remaking of Mussolini's 'corporate state'..." The Supreme Court eventually ruled the NRA unconstitutional.

During the FDR years, the Council on Foreign Relations captured the political life of the U.S. Besides Treasury Secretary Morgenthau, other CFR members included Secretary of State Edward Stettinus, War Secretary Henry Stimson, and Assistant Secretary of State Sumner Welles.

Since 1934 almost every United States Secretary of State has been a CFR member; and ALL Secretaries of War or Defense, from Henry L. Stimson through Richard Cheney.

The CIA has been under CFR control almost continuously since its creation, starting with Allen Dulles, founding member of the CFR and brother of
Secretary of State under President Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles. Allen Dulles had been at the Paris Peace Conference, joined the CFR in 1926, and later became its president.

John Foster Dulles had been one of Woodrow Wilson's young proteges at the Paris Peace Conference. A founding member of the CFR...he was an in-law of the Rockefellers, Chairman of the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Board Chairman of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

In 1940 FDR defeated internationalist Wendell Willkie, who wrote a book entitled "One World," and later became a CFR member. Congressman Usher Burdick protested at the time on the floor of the House that Willkie was being financed by J.P. Morgan and the New York utility bankers. Polls showed few Republicans favored him, yet the media portrayed him as THE Republican candidate.

Since that time nearly ALL presidential candidates have been CFR members. President Truman, who was not a member, was advised by a group of "wise men," all six of whom were CFR members, according to Gary Allen. In 1952 and 1956, CFR Adlai Stevenson challenged CFR Eisenhower.

In 1960, CFR Kennedy (who was probably killed because he had the courage NOT to go along with all their plans) CFR Nixon. In 1964 the GOP stunned the Establishment by nominating its candidate over Nelson Rockefeller.


CFR candidates for president include George McGovern, Walter Mondale, Edmund Muskie, John Anderson, and Lloyd Bentsen. In 1976 we had Jimmy Carter, who is a member of the Trilateral Commission, created by David Rockefeller and CFR member Zbigniew Brezinski with the goal of economic linkage between Japan, Europe, and the United States, and: "...managing the world economy...a smooth and peaceful evolution of the global system." We have also had (though his name strangely disappears from the membership list in 1979) CFR director (1977-79) George Bush, and last but not least, CFR member Bill Clinton.

They have all promoted the "New World Order," controlled by the United Nations. The problem is that "...the present United Nations organization is
actually the creation of the CFR and is housed on land in Manhattan donated to it by the family of current CFR chairman David Rockefeller," as Pat Robertson describes it.

The original concept for the UN was the outcome of the Informal Agenda Group, formed in 1943 by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. All except Hull were CFR members, and Isaiah Bowman, a founding member of the CFR, originated the idea.

The American delegation to the San Francisco meeting that drafted the charter of the United Nations in 1949 included CFR members Nelson Rockefeller, John Foster Dulles, John McCloy, and CFR members who were communist agents--Harry Dexter White, Owen Lattimore, and the Secretary-General of the conference, Alger Hiss. In all, the Council sent forty-seven of its members in the United States delegation, effectively controlling the outcome.

Since that time the CFR and its friends in the mass media (largely controlled by CFR members such as Katherine Graham of the "Washington Post" and Henry Luce of" Time, Life"), foundations, and political groups have lobbied consistently to grant the United Nations more authority and power. Bush and the Gulf War were but one of the latest calls for a "New World Order."

Admiral Chester Ward, a member of the CFR for over a decade, became one of its harshest critics, revealing its inner workings in a 1975 book, "Kissinger ON THE COUCH." In it he states "The most powerful cliques in these elitist groups have one objective in common: they want to bring about the surrender of the sovereignty and national independence of the United States."

Most members are one-world-government ideologists whose long-term goals were officially summed up in September 1961 State Department Document 7277, adopted by the Nixon Administration: "...elimination of all armed forces and armaments except those needed to maintain internal order within states and to furnish the United Nations with peace forces...by the time it (UN global government) would be so strong no nation could challenge it."

Within the CFR there exists a "much smaller group but more powerful...made up of Wall Street international bankers and their key agents. Primarily, they want the world banking monopoly from whatever power ends up in control of the global government ...This CFR faction is headed by the Rockefeller brothers," according to Ward.
What must be remembered is that this is not some lunatic-fringe group...these are members of one of the most powerful private organizations in the world: the people who determine and control American economic, social, political, and military policy. Members' influence and control extends to "leaders in academia, public service, business, and the media," according to the CFR 1993 "Annual Report."

Their founding they describe as: "American Participants in the Paris Peace Conference decided that it was time for more private Americans to become familiar with the increasing responsibilities and obligations of the United States...there was a need for an organization able to provide for the continuous study of U.S. foreign policy for the BENEFIT OF ITS MEMBERS (emphasis mine) and a wider audience of interested Americans."

They sponsor hundreds of programs, where members "exchange views with American and foreign officials and policy experts... discuss foreign policy issues...consider international issues of concern to the business community" (Corporate business), and "...affiliated groups of community leaders throughout the United states...meet with decision makers."

The CFR states that it is "host to many views, advocate of none," and it "has no affiliation with the U.S. government." No, no affiliation at all, if you don't count: "A Council member was elected president of the United States...Dozens of other Council colleagues were called to serve in cabinet and sub-cabinet positions," as they describe it in "Foreign Affairs," along with many members of Congress, the Supreme Court, the Joint Chiefs, the Federal Reserve, and many other Federal bureaucrats.

They are not AFFILIATED with government, they ARE the government, in effect.

One re-occurring view was stated in the 50th anniversary issue of "Foreign Affairs," the official publication of the CFR. In an article by Kingman Brewster, Jr. entitled "Reflections on Our National Purpose." Our purpose should be, according to him, 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."
Today we have the spectacle of Spc. 4 Michael New, a U.S. soldier in Germany who refuses to wear the uniform of the UN, facing an "administrative discharge." He states rightly that he swore an oath to defend the U.S. Constitution, not the United Nations. Many other Americans have taken that same oath, such as myself, and believe it is our sworn duty still to defend the Constitution, since an oath sworn before God must be fulfilled. (Why else do we swear to tell the truth in our courts, or when taking public office?) Is it a crime these days to actually BELIEVE in God and the oath that was taken?

Meanwhile, others who attempt to destroy the Constitution and our sovereignty are given honors and position...At least they are not hypocrites...only supremely arrogant.

"In short, 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 assault..." in the opinion of Richard N. Gardner, former deputy assistant Secretary of State in "Foreign Affairs," April 1974.

James Warburg, son of CFR founder Paul Warburg, and a member of FDR's "brain trust," testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 17, 1950, "We shall have world government whether or not you like it--by conquest or consent."

Is this an AMERICAN speaking, or a dangerous lunatic? Who is this "We" who threatens to CONQUER us?

They are a group that actually has the power to do it, and is doing it every day, bit by bit.

CFR Members in the mass media, education, and entertainment push their propaganda of "humanism" and world brotherhood. We should all live in peace under a world government, and forget about such selfish things as nationalities and patriotism. We can solve our own problems. We don't need God [God does not exist -Ed.], or morals, or values: it's all relative, anyway, right?...Because if we actually had some moral character and values, we might be able to discern that these people are actually EVIL.

The Bible says that the LOVE of money is the root of all evil (1 Tim. 6:10). These people are evil because they love money and power, and greed drives
them to do anything to achieve their goals. They have lost all morality and conscience, and believe such concepts, as well as our Constitution, "outdated".

THAT is insanity--to have more wealth than can be spent, and still it is never enough. They have to control governments, start wars, conspire to rule the world; lest [lest -Ed.] the "common people" wake up to how they have gained their wealth, take it away from them, and demand that they pay the price for their crimes.

That is why they constantly pit us one against the other, with "Diversity," Affirmative Action, and other programs,...black against white, men against women, rural against urban, ranchers against environmentalists, and on and on...lest [lest -Ed.] we look in their direction.

We The People are held to a much higher standard. If we threaten the President or a public official, we are charged with a crime...yet the One-World-Gang can threaten the Constitution and the liberties of We The People, the sovereign rulers of this nation, and nothing is said or done.

Perhaps they do not fear what Man can do to them... they believe they have arranged everything, and their power and wealth will prevail in this world. However, those among them who have sworn an oath before God to uphold and defend the Constitution: the President, members of Congress, and the military; may find one day that they do indeed have something to fear.

Colonel House, the fallen angel, still has relatives controlling the CFR. Karen Elliot House is Chairman of the Membership Committee, and a member of the Nominating Committee, along with Jeane Kirkpatrick. David Rockefeller is now "Honorary Chairman of the Board", after serving as Chairman 1970-1985; and "Director Emeritus," after serving as a Director 1949-1985. Peter G. Peterson is Chairman, Admiral B. R. Inman is Vice Chairman, while Thomas Foley and Jeane Kirkpatrick are Directors serving on the Executive Committee.

These "private citizens" have access to government officials and policy makers as often as they wish, yet the results of their meetings can only be given to other government officials, corporate officers, or law partners. Participants are forbidden to transmit an attributed statement to any public medium, such as newspapers or TV, where there is "risk that it will promptly be widely circulated or published," as the "Annual Report" puts it.
Should not OUR public officials be forbidden to meet in secret with private
groups? Public officials should only be allowed to discuss public business and
policy in a public forum. The Public...remember US?

There is much more to say about this group and their plans for America. Gary
Allen, in "The Rockefeller File," states that they are behind the many regional
government plans, which would abolish city, county, and state lines, leaving us
at the mercy of federal bureaucrats; and behind the push for "land use" controls.
They want "federal control of everything. Since they intend to control the
federal government..."

There are also the many allegations of involvement in gun running, drug
smuggling, prostitution and sex slaves; and the many mysterious assassinations
and "suicides" of witnesses and others who get too close to the truth...but that is
another story.
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Rockefeller Associates

By Richard Sanders, Editor, Press for Conversion!
The Rockefellers were heavy financial backers of the American Liberty League.

John Davison Rockefeller (1839-1937), the world’s first billionaire, was America’s most generous philanthropist, fascist financier and Nazi collaborator. Although Rockefeller’s wealth was based largely on a near global control of oil refining, he also had large interests in other monopolies. As Anthony Sutton notes, Rockefeller “controlled the copper trust, the smelters trust and the gigantic tobacco trust, in addition to having influence in some Morgan properties such as the U.S. Steel Corporation as well as in hundreds of smaller industrial trusts, public service operations, railroads and banking institutions. National City Bank was the largest of the banks influenced by Standard Oil-Rockefeller, but financial control extended to the U.S. Trust Co. and Hanover National Bank [and] major life insurance companies – Equitable Life and Mutual of New York” (Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution, 1981).

His incredible rags-to-riches success story owes much to what he learned from his father’s attitudes towards business and respect for the public good. Descended from hardworking German immigrants, his father William Avery Rockefeller was a travelling, snake oil salesman. “Big Bill” excelled as a quack doctor, or pitch man, conning the sick and desperate into buying expensive remedies that were either useless or downright dangerous. “He would be gone for months and come back with a great roll of money…. He would go to small towns and put up handbills advertising himself as ‘The Celebrated Dr. Levingston.’ He advertised to cure anything, but made a specialty of cancer and kidney troubles” (MacDonald, “Double Life,” New York World, February 2, 1908). But these were not “Doc’s” only crimes. He was indicted for rape, but was not arrested or tried. He fled the area with family and escaped neighbours who accused him of horse thieving, burglary, arson and counterfeiting. He had two wives, simultaneously, and was a bigamist for 34
years. He met his second wife in Norwich, Ontario, where he sold lumber in 1853, calling himself William Levingston.

William’s example provided ample life lessons to his sons about the business values of duplicity, deceit, and a blatant disregard for public health. John dropped out of high school in 1855 to take a business course. He worked as a bookkeeper and then teamed up with a friend to start a grain commission business. In 1863, the Civil War propelled him into the oil business. That year, he – like J.P. Morgan and other rising stars – paid $300 to avoid conscription. It was a small price for them, but unattainable for the thousands who would die. At first, he sold whiskey at inflated rates to Federal soldiers. Then, he invested his profits in oil refineries. The South had been supplying turpentine to the North for camphene-fueled lights. When the war cut off the North’s access to this fuel, kerosene from Pennsylvania oil quickly took over as the lamp fuel of choice and stimulated his oil business.

In 1865, Rockefeller bought out his partners in the kerosene business for $72,500. In 1870, he and a few others, organized The Standard Oil Company, with capital of $1 million. He built his company by buying out competitors, price cutting and controlling secondary businesses related to pipelines, trains, oil terminals and barrel making. By 1880, his monopoly controlled the refining of 95% of America’s oil. In 1885, 70% of Standard Oil’s sales were overseas, largely to northern Europe and Russia. All of its properties were merged into the Standard Oil Trust with an initial capitalization of $70 million, and by 1900 Rockefeller controlled about two-thirds of the entire world’s oil supply. He was also a director of the U.S. Steel Corp when it formed in 1901.

In the 1880s, an oil boom was brewing in Tsarist Russia, around the Caspian Sea town of Baku. Robert Nobel, the son of Alfred Nobel (originator of Sweden’s peace prize and the inventor of dynamite), was soon competing with the Parisian Rothschilds for control of Central Asia oil treasure. Their exports threatened Rockefeller’s near global oil monopoly, especially when Marcus Samuel, future founder of Shell Oil, developed tankers to carry the Rothchild’s oil to Europe and Asia. In 1903, Rockefeller made a deal with the Tsarist government to lease and then buy the Baku oil fields. Besides selling vast quantities of American oil to pre-Soviet Russia, Rockefeller also had millions invested there. Thereafter, seeing an inevitable revolution looming on the horizon, Rockefeller also invested in anti-Tzarist forces to protect this branch of his empire. The Soviets did expropriate the Caspian oil fields from the Nobels and Rothschilds. Rockefeller’s National City Bank also lost assets, thanks to the revolution. Its lawyer, Joseph Proskauer, fought a legal battle to get Rockefeller’s money back. In 1926, Walter Teagle, the president of Standard Oil of New Jersey, successfully negotiated oil concessions in the Soviet Union.
By that time though, Standard Oil’s near global monopoly had been broken up. In 1911, the U.S. Supreme Court decided it was violating anti-trust laws and dissolved it into about three dozen companies. Many of these are now household names like Chevron (Standard Oil California), Amoco (Standard Oil Indiana), Mobil (Standard Oil New Jersey) and Exxon, previously called Esso (Standard Oil New Jersey).

When the U.S. was debating whether to join WWI, a group of so-called “War Hawks,” calling themselves the National Security League, knew that this war would be a major boon to profits. This League of bankers and industrialists, including Rockefeller, J.P. Morgan, Coleman du Pont and H.H. Rodgers of Standard Oil, promoted increases in arms production and universal military training. By 1917, they had helped build war hysteria to a fever pitch. But not all Americans were on their side. The Woman’s Peace Party, many suffragists and others, strongly opposed America’s entry into WWI. However, the League was successful and the War Hawks’ profits skyrocketed.

Soon after WWI and the Russian revolution, many among America’s wealthy elite felt threatened by rising radicalism, particularly among unions. In April 1919, letter bombs, destined for John D. Rockefeller, J.P. Morgan and others, were supposedly discovered in the U.S. postal system. The media quickly stirred up a massive Red Scare by blaming unions, communists, anarchists and foreign agitators. John Spivak says: “Trade unions were openly disbelieving and denounced with anger the so-called discoveries as a deliberate frame-up to provide excuses for more raids against organized labour” (A Man in His Time, 1967). This incident and others were used as pretexts for the Palmer Raids, during which the government rounded up more than ten thousand activists across the country.
Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, while the persecution of leftists continued, corporate leaders on the extreme right, continued their criminal rampages in pursuit of profit. Although Rockefeller’s many links to Nazism are too numerous to list here, a few examples are worth noting. In the 1920s, Exxon entered into partnerships with Germany’s top chemical cartel members, BASF and I.G. Farben. The Bank for International Settlements, which helped fund the Nazis before and during WWII, was created in 1930 by the world’s central banks, including the Federal Reserve Bank of NY. Its creation was inspired by the Nazi government and its bankers. Its first president was Gates McGarrah, a Rockefeller banker formerly of Chase National Bank and the “Fed.”

In 1932, Chevron struck oil in Bahrain and was soon operating in Saudi Arabia. In 1933, when Hitler seized power, Standard Oil New Jersey supplied Germany with the patents it required for tetraethyl lead aviation fuel. In 1936, the company Schroder, Rockefeller Investment Bankers, included board directors linked to the Gestapo and several European, Nazi-linked banks. It’s lawyers were John Foster Dulles and Allan Dulles, leading Wall Street fascists who drummed up American investments in Germany and elsewhere. The Dulles law firm represented I.G. Farben and Fritz Thyssen. Thyssen was Hitler’s biggest German financier. The Dulles brothers later became Secretary of State and CIA Director, respectively.

In 1937, John D. Rockefeller died, but his legacy of using oil money to grease the wheels of fascism continued. That year, as the Spanish Civil War raged, Texas Co. (later called Texaco) fueled Franco’s fascists. (In 1936, Texas Co. and Standard Oil California formed California Texas Oil (later Caltex) to combine Texas Co’s marketing network in the Middle East with Standard’s operations there.) Texas Co. also continued shipping oil to Germany during WWII. In 1938, Brown Brothers, Harriman, the Wall Street investment firm (with senior partners Prescott Bush and George Herbert Walker) was involved in funding the supply of leaded gas for the Nazi Luftwaffe. Chevron and Texas Co. created Aramco in 1939, to pump Saudi oil for the Nazi war machine. In 1940, Texaco provided an office, in their Chrysler Building, for a Nazi intelligence officer, Dr. Gerhardt Westrick. Executives of Standard Oil’s German subsidiary were “Prominent figures of Himmler’s Circle of Friends of the Gestapo – its chief financiers – and close friends and colleagues of the Baron von Schroder” a leading Gesatpo officer and financier (Charles Higham, Trading with the Enemy). Just before WWII, the Rockefeller’s Chase Bank collaborated with the Nazi’s Schroder Bank to raise $25 million for Germany’s war economy. They also supplied the German government with names and background information on 10,000 fascist sympathizers in America. Throughout WWII, Rockefeller’s Chase Bank stayed open in Nazi-occupied Paris, providing services for Germany’s embassy and its businesses.
In 1943, Roosevelt’s government took control of Rockefeller’s Aramco. It also seized assets of the Union Banking Corp., which Harriman, Bush and Walker had built up by collaborating with Nazi companies that used slave labour. This money was later returned and it launched the Bushes in oil and politics.

In 1953, after an elected upstart named Dr. Mohammed Mossadegh nationalized Iran’s oil business, a UK/U.S.-backed coup returned the Shah to power. CIA Director Allan Dulles and his brother, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, were instrumental in this coup. Previously, Iran’s oil had been controlled by the Anglo-Persian Oil Co. (i.e., British Petroleum, BP) but after the U.S. role in this coup, U.S. companies got a 40% share and the top beneficiary was Standard Oil of New Jersey.

The next year, the Dulles boys were at it again orchestrating a coup in Guatemala. This one ushered in decades of fascist military governments that killed hundreds of thousands of innocents. But, it brought great profits for Rockefeller’s United Fruit Co., in which the Dulles were invested. Allen had also been on its Board of Trustees.

John D. Rockefeller would be happy to see the re-merging of his great monopoly. In 1988, Standard Oil merged with British Petroleum. Since then, other mergers have reunited many of his original oil companies. Exxon and Mobil reunited in 1999, to become the world’s top oil business. They made profits of $17.7 billion the next year. BP, merging with Amoco and Standard Oil Ohio, was number two that year and made profits of $12 billion.

J.D. Rockefeller’s philanthropy has been much lauded. Even as a student, he reportedly gave donations to his Baptist church and to foreign Sunday schools. By 1900, he offered to buy a whole church for Baptist preacher Thomas Dixon, a former, southern politician who was then flogging his white supremacist gospel in New York. But from the pulpit, Dixon’s fiery tirades against “creeping negroidism” didn’t reach enough people, so he took up writing respectable, romantic novels about the KKK. He churned out two dozen books. The Clansman, his race-baiting best seller, extolled the Klan’s role in redeeming the South. In 1915, it was made into a movie, called The Birth of a Nation. Endorsed by President Wilson, the film helped revive this dreaded terrorist organization.

Rockefeller’s great generosity was aimed largely at medical education, perhaps because of his father’s career and its peculiar contributions to medicine. J.D. Rockefeller, being a high school dropout, was not well-suited to his new role as godfather of the country’s centres for higher learning. His philanthropy was permeated with extremely racist views. In 1901, the Rockefeller Institute
for Medical Research was created. In 1902, the General Education Board (GEB) began four decades of tremendously controversial influence over American schools and universities.

That same year, J.D. Rockefeller and Averell Harriman, a business partner of Prescott Bush and George Herbert Walker in Brown Brothers Harriman, gave $11 million to create the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory. Built on Manhattan property owned by the Dulles brothers, it spawned America’s groundbreaking “eugenics” research and the world’s first “racial hygiene” laws. By 1907, Rockefeller funding was heavily influencing America’s medical institutions. The Rockefeller Institute created the first genetics lab in 1909. The following year, the Eugenics Research Association and the Eugenics Records Office were founded near Cold Spring Harbor, New York, on land donated by the widow of Averell Harriman. In 1911, John Foster Dulles summed up eugenics, saying that by eliminating “the weakest members of the population” a purer race could be created.

In 1928, Germany’s Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Eugenics, Anthropology and Human Heredity was created. Run by Ernst Rudin, Hitler’s foremost “racial hygienist,” the institute’s main financing came from Rockefeller. Ironically, by 1936 an early psychiatrist at that institute, the half Jewish Dr. Franz Kallmann, had fled Nazism to America. According to Anton Chaitkin, Kallmann’s experiments on 1,000 schizophrenics, published by the Freemasons, was used in 1939 to justify the Nazi’s mass murder of “mental patients and various ‘defective’ people.” Meanwhile, other Nazi doctors conducted incredibly cruel and vicious experiments on live, captive human subjects. Their body parts “were delivered to [Josef] Mengele, [Otmar] Verschuer and the other Rockefeller-linked contingent at the Wilhelm Institute.”
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Rockefeller: Internet is “Number One National Hazard”

Kurt Nimmo
Infowars
March 23, 2009

According to the great-grandson of John D. Rockefeller, nephew of banker David Rockefeller, and former Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman Jay Rockefeller the internet represents a serious threat to national security. Rockefeller is not alone in this assessment. His belief that the internet is the “number one national hazard” to national security is shared by the former Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell and Obama’s current director Admiral Dennis C. Blair.

“It really almost makes you ask the question would it have been better if we had never invented the internet,” Rockefeller mused during the confirmation hearing of Gary Locke (see video), Obama’s choice for Commerce Secretary. He then cites a dubious figure of three million cyber “attacks” launched against the Department of Defense every day. “Everybody is attacked, anybody can do it. People say, well it’s China and Russia, but there could be some kid in Latvia doing the same thing.”

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ct9xzXUQLuY

Jay Rockefeller’s comments reveal an astounding degree of ignorance – or if not ignorance, outright propaganda. Since the September 11, 2001, attacks the government has cranked up the fear quotient in regard to cyber attacks and so-called cyber terrorism, a virtually non-existent threat except in the minds security experts and politicians. In the years since the attacks, not one real instance of real cyberterrorism has been recorded.

“Cyberattacks on critical components of the national infrastructure are not uncommon, but they have not been conducted by terrorists and have not sought to inflict the kind of damage that would qualify as cyberterrorism,” writes Gabriel Weimann, author of Terror on the Internet. “Nuclear weapons and other sensitive military systems, as well as the computer systems of the CIA and FBI, are ‘air-gapped,’ making them inaccessible to outside hackers. Systems in the private sector tend to be less well protected, but they are far from defenseless, and nightmarish tales of their vulnerability tend to be largely apocryphal.”

“Psychological, political, and economic forces have combined to promote the fear of cyberterrorism,” Weimann continues. “From a psychological perspective, two of the
greatest fears of modern time are combined in the term ‘cyberterrorism.’ The fear of random, violent victimization blends well with the distrust and outright fear of computer technology.”

“The sky is not falling, and cyber-weapons seem to be of limited value in attacking national power or intimidating citizens,” notes James Lewis of the Center for Strategic and International Studies. Such a threat is overblown, Lewis explains. He notes that “a brief review suggests that while many computer networks remain very vulnerable to attack, few critical infrastructures are equally vulnerable.” In other words, Rockefeller’s example of a kid in Latvia with a laptop posing a serious “hazard” to national security is little more than sensationalistic propaganda.

So-called cyber terrorists are far less of a threat than government. China and Australia have recently imposed draconian censorship on internet freedom. Brazil, Denmark, Canada, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Israel, the United Kingdom, the United States, and many other countries also impose nominal censorship on internet freedom. Urgent calls to restrict the medium in various ways through legislation and government action have increased over the last few years (for more detail, see Internet Censorship: A Comparative Study).

However, the real threat to internet freedom is currently posed by IT and ISP corporations, not the government.

As Alex Jones explained last June, large corporate ISPs are now in the process of imposing bandwidth caps and routing traffic over their networks and blocking certain targeted websites. For instance, in 2005 AOL Time-Warner was caught blocking access to all of Jones’ flagship websites across the entire United States. Other instances of outright censorship include the UK ISP Tiscali blocking subscribers from reaching material on the 7/7 London bombings and Google’s continued and habitual censorship of 9/11 material and Alex Jones’ films on the ever-popular YouTube. There are many other instances as well. (See Censoring the Internet: A Collection of Essential Links on Infowars.)

Jay Rockefeller’s warning about virtually non-existent and largely absurd cyberterrorism reveals increasing government nervousness and apprehension about the medium as a whole, especially as the internet grows by leaps and bounds as an alternative news and activism medium. On numerous occasions over the last few years alternative websites have posted articles exposing government crime, articles the corporate media has largely ignored. During the Bush years, the internet served as a vital resource for information on everything from torture and the destruction of civil liberties to the invasions and
occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan, information the corporate media was often unable or unwilling to carry.

For instance, earlier this month Infowars broke a story concerning the Missouri Information Analysis Center and its effort to profile Libertarians and Ron Paul supporters as terrorists. The story was subsequently picked up by the corporate media (although Alex Jones and Infowars did not receive attribution).

As more corporate media outlets fail — as evinced by several high profile newspapers going out of business recently — and more people flock to the internet to get their news and information, the government will increasingly employ fear tactics designed to portray the medium as a refuge for terrorists, pedophiles, and other miscreants.

It appears the Obama administration is attempting to micromanage this effort. Last week CNet “obtained a summary of a proposal from Senators Jay Rockefeller (D-W.V.) and Olympia Snowe (R-Maine) that would create an Office of the National Cybersecurity Advisor, part of the Executive Office of the President. That office would receive the power to disconnect, if it believes they’re at risk of a cyberattack, ‘critical’ computer networks from the Internet.” As well, the effort would put the White House National Cybersecurity Advisor in charge of coordinating cyber efforts within the intelligence community and within civilian agencies.
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Introduction

Dear Reader:
The super rich in America enjoy power and prerogatives un-imaginable to most of us. Who can conceive of owning a private empire that includes 100 homes, 2,500 servants, untold thousands of luxuries, and untold millions of dollars? America has a royal family of finance that has known such riches for generations. It is, of course, the Rockefellers.

But if the Rockefellers were content with their wealth, if their riches had satisfied their desires, this book would not have been written. And I would not be urging you to read it. Money alone is not enough to quench the thirst and lusts of the super-rich. Instead, many of them use their vast wealth, and the influence such riches give them, to achieve even more power. Power of a magnitude never dreamed of by the tyrants and despot of earlier ages. Power on a world wide scale. Power over people, not just products.

The Rockefeller File is not fiction. It is a compact, powerful and frightening presentation of what may be the most important story of our lifetime, the drive of the Rockefellers and their allies to create a one-world government, combining super-capitalism and Communism under the same tent, all under their control.

For more than one hundred years, since the days when John D. Rockefeller Sr. used every devious strategy he could devise to create a gigantic oil monopoly, enough books have been written about the Rockefellers to fill a library. I have read many of them. 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.

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, always vital-in the pages that follow. Gary Allen has done a masterful job of combining the hundreds of scattered facts and hidden clues of the Rockefeller puzzle until one unmistakable pattern emerges.

The picture that is revealed when *The Rockefeller File* is finally opened may shock you. In this book, you will learn 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.
I urge you to read The Rockefeller File and to encourage your friends to do the same.

November 1975
LAWRENCE P. Mc DONALD
Member of Congress

Dedication: to : Floyd Paxton - Freedom never had a truer champion - I never had a better friend.

http://www.mega.nu:8080/ampp/gary_allen_rocker/
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WE SPECIALISE IN SUPPRESSED INFORMATION

Excerpted from the book *Murder by Injection* by Eustace Mullins, chapter 10:

by Eustace Mullins

Many American conservatives believe as a matter of faith that the Rockefellers and the Council on Foreign Relations exercise absolute control over the government and the people of United States. This thesis can be accepted as a working formula if one remains conscious of the larger issues. Two writers for whom the present writer has great respect, Dr. Emanuel Josephson and Morris Bealle, insisted on focusing on the Rockefellers and excluding all other aspects of the World Order. This severely limited the effect of their otherwise ground breaking work on the Medical Monopoly.
This writer advanced a contrary view in "The World Order," fixing upon the Rothschild monetary power, which reached a point of world control by 1885, and its London policy group, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, as the policy makers for what has essentially been since 1900, re-established colonial government in the United States. The colonial, or occupation, government, functions primarily through the Council on Foreign Relations, but only as the subsidiary of RIIA and through the Rockefeller Foundation which controls government functions, the educational establishments, the media, the religions and the state legislatures.

It is true that the American colonials have "free elections," in which they have the absolute right to vote for one of two opposing candidates, both of whom have been handpicked and financed by the Rockefeller syndicate. This touching evidence of "democracy" serves to convince most Americana that we are indeed a free people. We even have a cracked Liberty Bell in Philadelphia to prove it. American youth have been free since 1900 to be marched off to die in Hegelian wars in which both combatants received their instructions from the World Order. We are free to invest in a stock market in which the daily quantity, price and value of the monetary unit is manipulated and controlled by a Federal Reserve System which is answerable only to the Bank of England. It has maintained its vaunted "independence" from our government's control, but this is the only independence it has ever had.

The realization that we do indeed live under the dictates of the "Rockefeller Syndicate" can well be the starting point of the long road back of a genuine struggle for American independence. In exposing "the Rockefellers" as agents of a foreign power, which is not merely a foreign power, but a genuine world government, we must realize that this is not merely a group dedicated to making money, but a group which is committed to maintaining the power of a colonial form of government over the American people. Thus the ancient calumny of John D. Rockefeller as a man obsessed by greed (a category in which he has plenty of company) obscures the act that from the day the Rothschilds began to finance his march towards a total oil monopoly in the United States from their coffers at the National City Bank of Cleveland, Rockefeller was never an independent power, nor does any department of the Rockefeller Syndicate operate as an independent power. We know that the Cosa Nostra, or Mafia, with which the Syndicate is closely allied, has somewhat autonomous power in the regions which have been assigned to that particular "family" by the national directors, but this always implies that that family remains under total control and answerable for everything which occurs in its territory.

Similarly, the Rockefeller Syndicate operates under clearly defined spheres of influence. The "charitable" organizations, the business companies, and the policy groups, always meld into a working operation, nor can any department of the Syndicate strike out on its own or formulate an independent policy, no matter what may be its justification.

The Rockefeller Syndicate operates under the control of the world financial structure, which means that on any given day, all of its assets could be rendered close to worthless by adroit financial manipulation. This is the final control, which ensures that no one can quit the organization. Not only would he be stripped of all assets, but he would be under contract for immediate assassination. Our Department of Justice is well aware that the
only "terrorists" operating in the United States are the agents of the World Order, but they prudently avoid any mention of this fact.

The world financial structure, far from being an unknown or hidden organization, is actually well known and well defined. It consists of the major Swiss Banks; the survivors of the old Venetian-Genoese banking axis; the Big Five of the world grain trade; the British combine, centered in the Bank of England and its chartered merchant banks, functioning through the Rothschilds and the Oppenheimer's and having absolute control over their Canadian colony through the Royal Bank of Canada and the Bank of Montreal, their Canadian lieutenants being the Bronfmans, Belzbergs, and other financial operators; and the colonial banking structure in the United States, controlled by the Bank of England through the Federal Reserve System; the Boston Brahmin families who made their fortunes in the opium trade, including the Delanos and others and the Rockefeller Syndicate, consisting of the Kissinger network headquartered in the Rockefeller Bank, Chase Manhattan Bank, American Express, the present form of the old Rothschild representatives in the United States, which includes Kuhn, Loeb Company and Lehman Brothers.

It is notable that the Rockefeller Syndicate is far down on the list of the world's financial structure. Why then is it of such importance? Although it is not the crucial factor in financial decision in the Western Hemisphere, it is the actual working control mechanism of the American colony. The Rockefeller family themselves, like the Morgans, Schiff's and Warburgs, have faded into insignificance, but the mechanism created in their name roars along at full power, still maintaining all of the functions for which it was organized. Since he set up the Trilateral Commission, David Rockefeller has functioned as a sort of international courier for the World Order, principally concerned with delivering working instructions to the Communist bloc, either directly, in New York or by traveling to the area. Laurance Rockefeller is active in the operation of the Medical Monopoly, but his principal interests are in operating various vacation spas in tropical areas. They are the two survivors of the "Fortunate Five," the five sons of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and Abby Aldrich. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. died in an institution in Tucson, Arizona and was hastily cremated. John D. Rockefeller III died in a mysterious accident on a New York Parkway near his home. Nelson Rockefeller, named after his grandfather, died in the arms of a TV journalist; it was later revealed that he had also been in the arms of another TV journalist at the same time; the death was hushed up for many hours. It is generally believed that he ran afoul of his Colombian drug connection, the disagreement hardly being trivial; it involved several billion dollars in drug profits which had not been properly apportioned. Winthrop Rockefeller died an alcoholic in the arms of his black boy friend. He had been interviewed on television by Harry Reasoner to explain his hasty move from New York to Arkansas. Winthrop leered that his black boy friend, an Army sergeant who apparently taught him the mysteries of drill, refused to live in New York. To celebrate this alliance, Winthrop Rockefeller gave magnificently to Negro causes, including the Urban League building on East 48th Street in New York. A plaque on the second floor notes that it was his gift; it might well have stated "From Hadrian to his Antinous".
We do not wish to imply that the Rockefellers no longer have influence, but that the major policy dictates of the Rockefeller Syndicate are handed down by other capos, of whom they continue to be a visible force. Through the person of David Rockefeller, the family is sometimes called ``the first family of the Soviet Union.'' Only he and Dr. Armand Hammer, the moving force behind USTEC, have permanent permission to land their private planes at the Moscow Airport. Others would suffer the fate of KAL 007.

Both the Rockefeller family fortune and the considerable portion set aside in the foundations of the Rockefeller Syndicate are effectively insulated against any type of government control. *Fortune* magazine noted August 4, 1986, that John D. Rockefeller, Jr. had created trusts in 1934 which now amounted to some $2.3 billion; another $200 million had been set aside for the Abby Rockefeller branch. The five sons had trusts which in 1986 amount to $2.1 billion. These trusts had originally amounted to only $50 million each, showing the increase in their assets as well as inflation during the ensuing half century. *Fortune* estimated the 1986 total Rockefeller wealth as $3.5 billion, of which $900 million was in securities and real estate. They owned 45% of the Time Life Building; Nelson Rockefeller's International Basic Economy Corporation had been sold to a British company in 1980. For years, the Rockefeller family had deliberately kept the rents low in its major holding, the Rockefeller Center, a $1.6 billion investment yielding an annual return of 1%. This was a convenient maneuver, for tax purposes. Rockefeller Center recently went public issuing stock which was sold to public buyers. The Rockefellers are rumored to be liquidating their investments in the New York area, and reinvesting in the West, particularly in the area around Phoenix, Arizona. It is possible that they know something we don't.

However much of the Rockefeller wealth may be attributed to old John D.'s rapacity and ruthlessness, its origins are indubitably based in his initial financing from the National City Bank of Cleveland, which was identified in Congressional reports as one of the three Rothschild banks in the United States and by his later acceptance of the guidance of Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, who had been born in the Rothschild house in Frankfort and was now the principal Rothschild representative (but unknown as such to the public) in the United States.

With the seed money from the National City Bank of Cleveland, old John D. Rockefeller soon laid claim to the title of ``the most ruthless American''. It is more than likely that it was this quality which persuaded the Rothschilds to back him. Rockefeller realized early in the game that the oil refinery business, which could offer great profits in a short time, also was at the mercy of uncontrolled competition. His solution was a simple one - crush all competition. The famous Rockefeller dedication to total monopoly was simply a business decision. Rockefeller embarked on a campaign of coercing all competing oil refineries out of business. He attacked on a number of fronts, which is also a lesson to all would be entrepreneurs. First, he would send a minion, not known to be working for Rockefeller, with an offer to buy the competing refinery for a low price, but offering cash. If the offer was refused, the competitor would then come under attack from a competing refinery which greatly undercut his price. He might also suffer a sudden strike at his refinery, which would force him to shut down. Control of labor through unions has always been a basic Rockefeller technique. Like the Soviet Union, they seldom have
labor trouble. If these techniques failed, Rockefeller would then be saddened by a reluctant decision to use violence; beating the rival workers as they went to and from their jobs, or burning or blowing up the competing refinery.

These techniques convinced the Rothschilds that they had found their man. They sent their personal representative, Jacob Schiff, to Cleveland to help Rockefeller plan further expansion. At this time, the Rothschilds controlled 95% of all railroad mileage in the United States, through the J.P. Morgan Company and Kuhn Loeb & Company according to official Department of Commerce figures for the year 1895. J.P. Morgan mentions in his *Who's Who* listing that he controlled 50,000 miles of U.S. railways. Schiff worked out an elaborate rebate deal for Rockefeller, through a dummy corporation, South Improvement Company. These rebates ensured that no other oil company could survive in competition with the Rockefeller firm. The scheme was later exposed, but by that time Rockefeller had achieved a virtual monopoly of the oil business in the United States. The daughter of one of his victims, Ida Tarbell, whose father was ruined by Rockefeller's criminal operations, wrote the first major expose of the Standard Oil Trust. She was promptly denounced as a "muckraker" by the poseur, Theodore Roosevelt, who claimed to be a "trust buster". In fact, he ensured the dominance of the Standard Oil Trust and other giant trusts.

During the next half century, John D. Rockefeller was routinely caricatured by socialist propagandists as the epitome of the ruthless capitalist. At the same time, he was the principal financier of the world Communist movement, through a firm called American International Company. Despite the fact that the House of Rothschild had already achieved world control, the sound and fury was directed exclusively against its two principal, representatives, John D. Rockefeller and J.P. Morgan. One of the few revelations of the actual state of affairs appeared in *Truth* magazine, December 16, 1912, which pointed out that "Mr. Schiff is head of the great private banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, which represents the Rothschild interests on this side of the Atlantic. He is described as a financial strategist and has been for years the financial minister of the great impersonal power known as Standard Oil." Note that this editor did not even mention the name of Rockefeller.

Because of these concealed factors, it was a relatively simple matter for the American public to accept the "fact" that the Rockefellers were the preeminent power in this country. This myth was actually clothed in the apparel of power, the Rockefeller Oil Trust becoming the "military-industrial complex" which assumed political control of the nation; the Rockefeller Medical Monopoly attained control of the health care of the nation, and the Rockefeller Foundation, a web of affiliated tax exempt creations, effectively controlled the religious and educational life of the nation. The myth succeeded in its goal of camouflaging the hidden rulers, the Rothschilds.

After the present writer had been exposing this charade for some twenty-five years, a new myth began to be noised about in American conservative circles, effectively propagated by active double agents. This myth found a host of eager believers, because it heralded a growing crack in the monolithic power which had been oppressing all the peoples of the world. This new "revelation" was that a struggle to the death for world power had developed between the Rockefellers and the Rothschilds. According to this startling
development, one faction or the other, depending on which agent you were listening to, had gained control of the Soviet Union and would use its power as the basis for achieving the overthrow of the other faction. The sudden death of several members of the Rockefeller family was cited as "proof" that such a struggle was taking place, although no Rothschild is known to have succumbed during this "war". This ignored the general understanding that Nelson Rockefeller had been "eliminated" as the result of losing deposit slips for several billion dollars of drugs from the Colombian cartel, or that the other Rockefeller deaths showed no trace of a "Rothschild connection".

Having maintained extensive files on this situation for several decades, the present writer could not believe anyone could be so misinformed as to think that "the Rockefellers" were now trying to seize power from the Rothschilds, at a time when the influence of members of the Rockefeller family was already in great decline, their family finances being handled by J. Richardson Dilworth, their legal affairs being handled by John J. McCloy, and other faithful retainers; none of these retainers would have been willing to engage in a genuine power struggle, as they were faceless managers who lived only for their weekly paycheck. They had no ambitions of their own. Nevertheless, many hopeful Americans grasped the will-o-the-wisp notion that the Rockefellers were now "good Americans" who were willing to risk all to overthrow the Rothschilds. Amazingly enough, this pernicious story persisted for almost a decade before being relegated to the curiosities of history.

Like J.P. Morgan, who had begun his commercial career by selling the U.S. Army some defective guns, the famous fall carbine affair, John D. Rockefeller also was a war profiteer during the Civil War; he sold unstamped Harkness liquor to Federal troops at a high profit, gaining the initial capital to embark on his drive for monopoly. His interest in the oil business was a natural one; his father, William Rockefeller had been "in oil" for years. William Rockefeller had become an oil entrepreneur after salt wells at Tarentum, near Pittsburgh, were discovered in 1842 to be flowing with oil. The owners of the wells, Samuel L. Kier, began to bottle the oil and sell it for medicinal purposes. One of his earliest wholesalers was William Rockefeller. The "medicine" was originally labeled "Kier's Magic Oil". Rockefeller printed his own labels, using "Rock Oil" or "Seneca Oil," Seneca being the name of a well known Indian tribe. Rockefeller achieved his greatest notoriety and his greatest profits by advertising himself as "William Rockefeller, the Celebrated Cancer Specialist". It is understandable that his grandsons would become the controlling power behind the scenes of the world's most famous cancer treatment center and would direct government funds and charitable contributions to those areas which only benefit the Medical Monopoly. William Rockefeller spared no claim in his flamboyant career. He guaranteed "All Cases of Cancer Cured Unless They Are Too Far Gone." Such were the healing powers that he attributed to his magic cancer cure that he was able to retail it for $25 a bottle, a sum then equivalent to two months' wages. The "cure" consisted of a few well known diuretics, which had been diluted by water. This carnival medicine show Barker could hardly have envisioned that his descendants would control the greatest and the most profitable Medical Monopoly in recorded history.

As an itinerant "carnie," a traveling carnival peddler, William Rockefeller had chosen a career which interfered with developing a stable family life. His son John rarely saw
him, a circumstance which has inspired some psychological analysts a conjecture that the absence of a father figure or parental love may have contributed to John D. Rockefeller's subsequent development as a money mad tyrant who plotted to maim, poison and kill millions of his fellow American during almost century of his monopolistic operations and whose influence, reaching up from the grave, remains the most dire and malignant presence in American life. This may have been a contributing factor - however, it is also possible that he was totally evil. It is hardly arguable that he is probably the most Satanic figure in American history.

It has long been a truism that you can find a horse thief or two in any prominent American family. In the Rockefeller family it was more than a truism. William seems to have faithfully followed the precepts of the Will of Canaan throughout his career, "love robbery, love lechery." He fled from a number of indictments for horse stealing, finally disappearing altogether as William Rockefeller and re-emerging as Dr. William Levingston of Philadelphia, a name which he retained for the rest of his life. An investigative reporter at Joseph Pulitzer's New York World received a tip that was followed up. The World then disclosed that William Avery Rockefeller had died May 11, 1906 in Freeport, Illinois, where he was interred in an unmarked grave as Dr. William Levingston.

William Rockefeller's vocation as a medicine man greatly facilitated his preferred profession of horse thief. As one who planned to be in the next county by morning, it was a simple matter to tie a handsome stallion to the back of his wagon and head for the open road. It also played a large part in his vocation as a woman-chaser; he was described as being "woman-mad". He not only concluded several bigamous marriages, but he seems to have had uncontrolled passions. On June 28, 1849, he was indicted for raping a hired girl in Cayuga, New York; he later was found to be residing in Oswego, New York and was forced once again to decamp for parts unknown. He had no difficulty in financing his woman-chasing interests from the sale of his miraculous cancer cure and from another product, his "Wonder Working Liniment," which he offered at only two dollars a bottle. It consisted of crude petroleum from which the lighter oils had been boiled away, leaving a heavy solution of paraffin, lube oil and tar, which comprised the "liniment." William Rockefeller's original miracle oil survived until quite recently as a concoction called Nujol, consisting principally of petroleum and peddled as a laxative. It was well known that Nujol was merely an advertising sobriquet meaning "new oil," as opposed, apparently, to "old oil". Sold as an antidote to constipation, it robbed the body of fat-soluble vitamins, it being a well-established medical fact that mineral oil coated the intestine and prevented the absorption of many needed vitamins and other nutritional needs. Its makers added carotene as a sop to the health-conscious, but it was hardly worth the bother. Nujol was manufactured by a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey, called Stanco, whose only other product, manufactured on the same premises, was the famous insecticide, Flit.

Nujol was hawked from the Senate Office Building in Washington for years during a more liberal interpretation of "conflict of interest." In this case, it was hardly a conflict of interest, because the august peddler, Senator Royal S. Copeland, never had any interests other than serving the Rockefellers. He was a physician whom Rockefeller had
appointed as head of the New York State Department of Health and later financed his campaign for the Senate. Copeland's frank display of commercialism amazed even the most blasé Washington reporters. He devoted his Senate career to a daily program advertising Nujol. A microphone was set up in his Senate office each morning, the first order of business being the Nujol program, for which he was paid $75,000 a year, an enormous salary in the 1930s and more than the salary of the President of the United States. Senator Copeland's exploits earned him a number of nicknames on Capitol Hill. He was often called the Senator from the American Medical Association, because of his enthusiastic backing for any program launched by the AMA and Morris Fishbein. More realistically, he was usually referred to as ``the Senator from Standard Oil''. He could be counted on to promote any legislation devised for the greater profit of the Rockefeller monopoly. During congressional debate on the Food and Drug Act in 1938, he came under criticism from Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan, who charged that Senator Copeland, a physician who handled the bill on the Senate floor, frankly acknowledged during the debate that soap was exempted from the law, because the soap manufacturers, who were the nation's largest advertisers, would otherwise join with other big industries to fight the bill. Congresswoman Sullivan complained the ```Soap was officially declared in the law not to be a cosmetic . .. The hair dye manufacturers were given license to market known dangerous products, just so long as they placed a special warning on the label - but what woman in a beauty parlor ever sees the label on the bulk container in which hair dye is shipped ?"

Just as the elder Rockefeller had spent his life in the pursuit of his personal obsession, omen, so his son John was equally obsessed, being money-mad instead of women-mad, totally committed to the pursuit of ever-increasing wealth and power. However, the principal accomplishments of the Rockefeller drive for power, the rebate scheme for monopoly, the chartering of the foundations to gain power over American citizens, the creation of the central bank, the Federal Reserve System, the backing of the World Communist revolution and the creation of the Medical Monopoly, all came from the Rothschilds or from their European employees. We cannot find in the records of John D. Rockefeller that he originated any one of these programs. The concept of the tax exempt charitable foundation originated with the Rothschild minion, George Peabody, in 1865. The Peabody Educational Foundation later became the Rockefeller Foundation. It is unlikely that even the diabolical mind of John D. Rockefeller could have conceived of this devious twist. A social historian has described the major development of the late nineteenth century, when charitable foundations and world Communism became important movements, as one of the more interesting facets of history, perhaps equivalent to the discovery of the wheel. This new discovery was the concept developed by the rats, who after all have rather highly developed intelligences, that they could trap people by baiting traps with little bits of cheese. The history of mankind since then has been the rats catching humans in their traps. Socialism - indeed any government program - is simply the rat baiting the trap with a smidgen of cheese and catching himself a human.

Congressman Wright Putman, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, noted from the floor of Congress that the establishment of the Rockefeller Foundation effectively insulated Standard Oil from competition. The controlling stock had been removed from market manipulation or possible buy-outs by competitors. It also relieved
Standard Oil from most taxation, which then placed a tremendous added burden on individual American taxpayers. Although a Rockefeller relative by marriage, Senator Nelson Aldrich, Republican majority leader in the Senate, had pushed the General Education Board charter through Congress, the Rockefeller Foundation charter proved to be more difficult. Widespread criticism of Rockefeller's monopolistic practices was heard, and his effort to insulate his profits from taxation or takeover was seen for what it was. The charter was finally pushed through in 1913 (the significant Masonic numeral 13 - 1913 was also the year the progressive income tax and of the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act). Senator Robert F. Wagner of New York, another senator from Standard Oil (there were quite a few), ramrodded the Congressional approval of the charter. The charter was then signed by John D. Rockefeller, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Henry Pratt Judson, president of the Rockefeller established University of Chicago, Simon Flexner, director of the Rockefeller Institute, Starr Jameson, described in Who's Who as “personal counsel to John D. Rockefeller in his benevolences,” and Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard University.

The Rockefeller Oil Monopoly is now 125 years old, yet in 1911, the Supreme Court, bowing to public outrage, had ruled that it had to be broken up. The resulting companies proved to be no problem for the Rockefeller interests. The family retained a two per cent holding in each of the “new” companies, while the Rockefeller foundations took a three per cent stock holding in each company. This gave them a five per cent stock interest in each company; a one per cent holding in a corporation is usually sufficient to maintain working control.

The involvement of the Rockefellers in promoting the world Communist Revolution also developed from their business interests. There was never any commitment to the Marxist ideology; like anything else, it was there to be used. At the turn of the century Standard Oil was competing fiercely with Royal Dutch Shell for control of the lucrative European market. Congressional testimony revealed that Rockefeller had sent large sums to Lenin and Trotsky to instigate the Communist Revolution of 1905. His banker, Jacob Schiff, had previously financed the Japanese in their war against Russia and had sent a personal emissary, George Kennan to Russia to spend some twenty years in promoting revolutionary activity against the Czar. When the Czar abdicated, Trotsky was placed on a ship with three hundred Communist revolutionaries from the Lower East Side of New York. Rockefeller obtained a special passport for Trotsky from Woodrow Wilson and sent Lincoln Steffens with him to make sure he was returned safely to Russia. For traveling expenses, Rockefeller placed a purse containing $10,000 in Trotsky's pocket.

On April 13, 1917, when the ship stopped in Halifax, Canadian Secret Service officers immediately arrested Trotsky and interned him in Nova Scotia. The case became an international cause celebre, as leading government officials from several nations frantically demanded Trotsky's release. The Secret Service had been tipped off that Trotsky was on his way to take Russia out of the war, freeing more German armies to attack Canadian troops on the Western Front. Prime Minister Lloyd George hurriedly cabled orders from London to the Canadian Secret Service to free Trotsky at once--they ignored him. Trotsky was finally freed by the intervention of one of Rockefeller's most faithful stooges, Canadian Minister Mackenzie King, who had long been a “labor
specialist" for the Rockefellers. King personally obtained Trotsky's release and sent him on his way as the emissary of the Rockefellers, commissioned to win the Bolshevik Revolution. Thus Dr. Armand Hammer, who loudly proclaims his influence in Russia as the friend of Lenin, has an insignificant claim compared to the role of the Rockefellers in backing world Communism. Although Communism, like other isms, had originated with Marx's association with the House of Rothschild, it enlisted the reverent support of John D. Rockefeller because he saw Communism for what it is, the ultimate monopoly, not only controlling the government, the monetary system and all property, but also a monopoly which, like the corporations it emulates, is self-perpetuating and eternal. It was the logical progression from his Standard Oil monopoly.

An important step on the road to world monopoly was the most far-reaching corporation invented by the Rothschilds. This was the international drug and chemical cartel, I.G. Farben. Called "a state within a state," it was created in 1925 as Interessen Gemeinschaft Farbenindustrie Aktien gesellschaft, usually known as I.G. Farben, which simply meant "The Cartel". It had originated in 1904, when the six major chemical companies in Germany began negotiations to form the ultimate cartel, merging Badische Anilin, Bayer, Agfa, Hoechst, Weiler-ter-Meer, and Greisheim-Electron. The guiding spirit, as well as the financing, came from the Rothschilds, who were represented by their German banker, Max Warburg, of M.M. Warburg Company, Hamburg. He later headed the German Secret Service during World War I and was personal financial adviser to the Kaiser. When the Kaiser was overthrown, after losing the war, Max Warburg was not exiled with him to Holland, instead he became the financial adviser to the new government. Monarchs may come and go, but the real power remains with the bankers. While representing Germany at the Paris Peace Conference, Max Warburg spent pleasant hours renewing family ties with his brother, Paul Warburg, who, after drafting the Federal Reserve Act at Jekyl Island, had headed the U.S. banking system during the war. He was in Paris as Woodrow Wilson's financial advisor.

I.G. Farben soon had a net worth of six billion marks, controlling some five hundred firms. Its first president was Professor Carl Bosch. During the period of the Weimar Republic, I.G. officials, seeing the handwriting on the wall, began a close association with Adolf Hitler, supplying much needed funds and political influence. The success of the I.G. Farben cartel had aroused the interest of other industrialists. Henry Ford was favorably impressed and set up a German branch of Ford Motor Company. Forty percent of the stock was purchased by I.G. Farben. I.G. Farben then established an American subsidiary, called American I.G., in cooperation with Standard Oil of New Jersey. Its directors included Walter Teagle, president of Standard Oil, Paul Warburg of Kuhn Loeb & Company and Edsel Ford, representing the Ford interests. John Foster Dulles, for the law firm, Sullivan and Cromwell, became the attorney for I.G., frequently traveling between New York and Berlin on cartel business. His law partner, Arthur Dean, is now director of the $40 million Teagle Foundation which was set up before Teagle's death. Like other fortunes it had become part of the network. Like John Foster Dulles, Arthur Dean has been a director of American Banknote for many years; this is the firm which supplies the paper for our dollar bills. Dean also has been an active behind the scenes government negotiator, serving as arms negotiator at disarmament conferences. Dean was also a director of Rockefeller's American Ag & Chem Company.
He was a director of American Solvay, American Metal and other firms. As attorney for the wealthy Hochschild family, who owned Climax Molybdenum and American Metal, Dean became director of their family foundation, the Hochschild Foundation. Dean is director emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Asia Foundation, International House, Carnegie Foundation, and the Sloan Kettering Cancer Center.

In 1930, Standard Oil announced that it had purchased an alcohol monopoly in Germany, a deal which had been set up by I.G. Farben. After Hitler came to power, John D. Rockefeller assigned his personal press agent, Ivy Lee, to Hitler to serve as a full-time adviser on the rearment of Germany, a necessary step for setting up World War II. Standard Oil then built large refineries in Germany for the Nazis and continued to supply them with oil during World War II. In the 1930s Standard Oil was receiving in payment from Germany large shipments of musical instruments and ships which had been built in German yards.

The dreaded Gestapo, the Nazi police force, was actually built from the worldwide intelligence network which I.G. Farben had maintained since its inception. Herman Schmitz, who had succeeded Carl Bosch as head of I.G., has been personal advisor to chancellor Brüning; when Hitler took over, Schmitz then became his most trusted secret counselor. So well concealed was the association that the press had orders never to photograph them together. Schmitz was named an honourary member of the Reichstag, while his assistant, Carl Krauch, became Göring's principal advisor in carrying out the Nazis' Four Year Plan. A business associate, Richard Krebs, later testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee, "The I.G. Farbenindustrie, I know from personal experience, was already, in 1934, completely in the hands of the Gestapo." This was a misstatement; the I.G. Farben had merely allied itself with the Gestapo.

In 1924 Krupp Industries was in serious financial difficulty; the firm was saved by a $10 million cash loan from Hallgarten & Company and Goldman Sachs, two of Wall Street's best known firms. The planned re-armament of Germany was able to proceed only after Dillon Read floated $100 million of German bonds on Wall Street for that purpose. It was hardly surprising that at the conclusion of the Second World War, General William Draper was appointed Economic Czar of Germany, being named head of the Economic Division of the Allied Military Government. He was a partner of Dillon Read.

In 1939 Frank Howard, a vice-president of Standard Oil visited Germany. He later testified, "We did our best to work out complete plans for a modus vivendi which would operate throughout the term of the war, whether we came in or not." At this time American I.G. had on its board of directors Charles Mitchell, president of the National City Bank, the Rockefeller bank, Carl Bosch, Paul Warburg, Herman Schmitz and Schmitz' nephew, Max Ilgner.

Although his name is hardly known, Frank Howard was for many years a key figure in Standard Oil operations as director of its research and its international agreements. He also was chairman of the research committee at Sloan Kettering Institute during the 1930s; his appointee at Sloan Kettering, Dusty Rhoads, headed the experimentation in the development of chemotherapy. During the Second World War Rhoads headed the Chemical Warfare Service in Washington at U.S. Army Headquarters. It was Frank
Howard who had persuaded both Alfred Sloan and Charles Kettering of General Motors in 1939 to give their fortunes to the Cancer Center, which then took on their names. A member of the wealthy Atherton family, Frank Howard (1891-1964) had married a second time, his second wife being a leading member of the British aristocracy, the Duchess of Leeds. The first Duke of Leeds was titled in 1694, Sir Thomas Osborne, who was one of the key conspirators in the overthrow of King James II and the seizure of the throne of England by William III in 1688. Osborne had made peace with Holland during the reign of King Charles II, and singlehandedly promoted the marriage of Mary, daughter of the Duke of York, to William of Orange in 1677. The Dictionary of National Biography notes that Osborne "for five years managed the House of Commons by corruption and enriched himself." He was impeached by King Charles II for treasonous negotiations with King Louis XIV and imprisoned in the Tower of London from 1678 to 1684. After his release, he again became active in the conspiracy to bring in William of Orange as King of England and secured the crucial province of York for him. William then created him Duke of Leeds. The placing of William on the throne of England made it possible for the conspirators to implement the crucial step in their plans, setting up the Bank of England in 1694. This enabled the Amsterdam bankers to gain control of the wealth of the British Empire. Osborne's biography also notes that he was later accused of Jacobite intrigues and was impeached for receiving a large bribe to procure the charter for the East India Company in 1695, but "the proceedings were not concluded". It was further noted that he "left a large fortune".

The 11th Duke of Leeds was Minister to Washington from 1931 to 1935, Minister to the Holy See from 1936 to 1947, that is, throughout the Second World War. One branch of the family married into the Delano family, becoming relatives of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. A cousin, Viscount Chandos, was a prominent British official, serving in the War Cabinet under Churchill from 1942 to 1945, later becoming a director of the Rothschild firm, Alliance Assurance, and Imperial Chemical Industries.

Frank Howard was the key official in maintaining relations between Standard Oil and I.G. Farben. He led in the development of synthetic rubber, which was crucial to Germany in the Second World War; he later wrote a book, "Buna Rubber". He also was the consultant to the drug firm, Rohm and Haas, representing the Rockefeller connection with that firm. In his later years, he resided in Paris, but continued to maintain his office at 30 Rockefeller Center, New York.

Walter Teagle, the president of Standard Oil, owned 500,000 shares of American I.G., these shares later becoming the basis of the Teagle Foundation. Herman Metz, who was also a director of American I.G., was president of H.A. Metz Company, New York, a drug firm wholly owned by I.G. Farben of Germany. Francis Garvan, who had served as Alien Property Custodian during the First World War, knew many secrets of I.G. Farben's operations. He was prosecuted in 1929 to force him to remain silent. The action was brought by the Department of Justice through Attorney General Merton Lewis, the former counsel for Bosch Company. John Krim, former counsel for the German Embassy in the United States, testified that Senator John King had been on the payroll of the Hamburg American Line for three years at a salary of fifteen thousand dollars a year; he appointed Otto Kahn as treasurer of his election fund. Homer Cummings, who had
been Attorney General for six years, then became counsel for General Aniline and Film at a salary of $100,000 a year. During the Second World War, GAF was supposedly owned by a Swiss firm; it came under considerable suspicion as an "enemy" concern and was finally taken over by the United States government. John Foster Dulles had been director of GAF from 1927 to 1934; he was also a director of International Nickel, which was part of the network of I.G. Farben firms. Dulles was related to the Rockefeller family through the Avery connection. He was attorney for the organization of a new investment firm, set up by Avery Rockefeller, in 1936 which was called Schröder-Rockefeller Company. It combined operations of the Schröder Bank, Hitler's personal bank and the Rockefeller interests. Baron Kurt von Schröder was one of Hitler's closest confidantes, and a leading officer of the SS. He was head of the Keppler Associates, which funneled money to the SS for leading German Corporations. Keppler was the official in charge of Industrial Fats during Göring's Four Year Plan, which was launched in 1936. American I.G. changed its name to General Aniline and Film during the Second World War, but it was still wholly owned by I.G. Chemie of Switzerland, a subsidiary of I.G. Farben of Germany. It was headed by Gadow, brother-in-law of Herman Schmitz. I.G. Farben's international agreements directly affected the U.S. war effort, because they set limits on U.S. supplies of magnesium, synthetic rubber and, crucial medical supplies. The director of I.G. Farben's dyestuffs division, Baron George von Schnitzler, was related to the powerful von Rath family, the J.H. Stein Bankhaus which held Hitler's account and the von Mallinckrodt family, the founders of the drug firm in the United States. Like other I.G. officials, he had become an enthusiastic supporter of the Hitler regime. I.G. Farben gave four and a half million reichsmarks to the Nazi Party in 1933; by 1945, I.G. had given the Party 40 million reichsmarks, a sum which equaled all contributions by I.G. to all other recipients during that period. One scholar of the Nazi era, Anthony Sutton, has focussed heavily on German supporters of Hitler, while ignoring the crucial role played by the Bank of England and its Governor, Sir Montague Norman, in financing the Nazi regime. Sutton's position on this problem may have been influenced by the fact that he is British. In view of the outspoken statements from Adolf Hitler about Jewish influence in Germany, it would be difficult to explain the role of I.G. Farben in the Nazi era. Peter Hayes' definitive study of I.G. Farben shows that in 1933 it had ten Jews on its governing boards. We have previously pointed out that I.G., from its inception was a Rothschild concern, formulated by the House of Rothschild and implemented through its agents, Max Warburg in Germany and Standard Oil in=20

Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands joined the SS during the early 1930s. He then joined the board of an I.G. subsidiary, Farben Bilder, from which he took the name of his postwar supersecret policy making group, the Bilderbergers. Farben executives played an important role in organizing the Circle of Friends for Heinrich Himmler, although it was initially known as Keppler's Circle of Friends, Keppler being the chairman of an I.G. subsidiary. His nephew, Fritz J. Kranefuss, was the personal assistant to Heinrich Himmler. Of the forty members of the Circle of Friends, which provided ample funds for Himmler, eight were executives of I.G. Farben or of its subsidiaries.

Despite the incredible devastation of most German cities from World War II air bombings, the I.G. Farben building in Frankfort, one of the largest buildings there, miraculously survived intact. A large Rockefeller mansion in Frankfort also was left
untouched by the war, despite the saturation bombing. Frankfort was the birthplace of
the Rothschild family. It was hardly coincidental that the postwar government of
Germany, Allied Military Government, should set up its offices in the magnificent I.G.
Farben building. This government was headed by General Lucius Clay, who later
became a partner of Lehman Brothers bankers in New York. The Political Division was
headed by Robert Murphy, who would preside at the Nuremberg Trials, where he was
successful in glossing over the implication of I.G. Farben officials and Baron Kurt von
Schröder. Schröder was held a short time in a detention camp and then set free to return
to his banking business. The Economic Division was headed by Lewis Douglas, son of
the founder of Memorial Cancer Center in New York, president of Mutual Life and
director of General Motors. Douglas was slated to become U.S. High Commissioner for
Germany, but he agreed to step aside in favor of his brother-in-law, John J. McCloy. By
an interesting circumstance, Douglas, McCloy and Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of
Germany had all married sisters, the daughters of John Zinsser, a partner of J.P. Morgan
Company.

As the world's pre-eminent cartel, I.G. Farben and the drug companies which it controlled
in the United States through the Rockefeller interests were responsible for many
inexplicable developments in the production and distribution of drugs. From 1908 to
1936 I.G. held back its discovery of sulfanilamide, which would become a potent weapon
in the medical arsenal. In 1920, I.G. had signed working agreements with the important
drug firms of Switzerland, Sandoz and Ciba-Geigy. In 1926, I.G. merged with Dynamit-
Nobel, the German branch of the dynamite firm, while an English firm took over the
English division. I.G. officials then began to negotiate with Standard Oil officials about
the prospective manufacture of synthetic coal, which would present a serious threat to
Standard Oil's monopoly. A compromise was reached with the establishment of
American I.G., in which both firms would play an active role and share in the profits.

Charles Higham's book, "Trading with the Enemy," offers ample documentation of the
Rockefeller activities during the Second World War. While Hitler's bombers were
dropping tons of explosives on London, they were paying royalties on every gallon of
gasoline they burned to Standard Oil, under existing patent agreements. After World
War II, when Queen Elizabeth visited the United States, she stayed in only one private
home during her visit, the Kentucky estate of William Irish, of Standard Oil. Nelson
Rockefeller moved to Washington after our involvement in World War II, where
Roosevelt named him Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Apparently his principal
task was to coordinate the refueling of German ships in South America from Standard Oil
tanks. He also used this office to obtain important South American concessions for his
private firm, International Basic Economy Corporation, including a corner on the
Colombian coffee market. He promptly upped the price, a move which enabled him to
buy seven billion dollars worth of real estate in South America and also gave rise to the
stereotype of the "Yanqui imperialismo". The attack on Vice President Nixon's
automobile when he visited South America was explained by American officials as a
direct result of the depredations of the Rockefellers, which caused widespread agitation
against Americans in Latin America.
After World War II, twenty-four German executives were prosecuted by the victors, all of them connected with I.G. Farben, including eleven officers of I.G. Eight were acquitted, including Max Ilgner, nephew of Herman Schmitz. Schmitz received the most severe sentence, eight years. Ilgner actually received three years, but the time was credited against his time in jail waiting for trial, and he was immediately released. The Judge was C.G. Shake and the prosecuting attorney was Al Minskoff.

The survival of I.G. Farben was headlined by the Wall Street Journal on May 3, 1988 - GERMANY BEATS WORLD IN CHEMICAL SALES. Reporter Thomas F. O'Boyle listed the world's top five chemical companies in 1987 as 1. BASF $25.8 billion dollars. 2. Bayer $23.6 billion dollars. 3. Hoechst $23.5 billion dollars. 4. ICI $20 billion dollars. 5. DuPont $17 billion dollars in chemical sales only.

The first three companies are the firms resulting from the "dismantling" of I.G. Farben from 1945 to 1952 by the Allied Military Government, in a process suspiciously similar to the "dismantling" of the Standard Oil empire by court edict in 1911. The total sales computed in dollars of the three spin-offs of I.G. Farben, some $72 billion, dwarfs its nearest rivals, ICI and DuPont, who together amount to about half of the Farben empire's dollar sales in 1987. Hoechst bought Celanese corp. in 1987 for $2.72 billion.

O'Boyle notes that "The Big Three (Farben spin-offs) still behave like a cartel. Each dominates specific areas; head to head competition is limited. Critics suspect collusion. At the least, there's a cosiness that doesn't exist in the U.S. chemical industry."

After the war, Americans were told they must support an "altruistic" plan to rebuild devastated Europe, to be called the Marshall Plan, after Chief of Staff George Marshall, who had been labeled on the floor of the Senate by Senator Joseph McCarthy as "a living lie". The Marshall Plan proved to be merely another Rockefeller Plan to loot the American taxpayer. On December 13, 1948, Col. Robert McCormick, editor of the Chicago Tribune, personally denounced Esso's looting of the Marshall Plan in a signed editorial. The Marshall Plan had been rushed through Congress by a powerful and vocal group, headed by Winthrop Aldrich, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank and Nelson Rockefeller's brother-in-law, ably seconded by Nelson Rockefeller and William Clayton, the head of Anderson, Clayton Company. The Marshall Plan proved to be but one of a number of lucrative postwar swindles, which included the Bretton Woods Agreement, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation and others.

After World War II, the Rockefellers used their war profits to buy a large share of Union Miniere du Haut Katanga, an African copper lode owned by Belgian interest, including the Societe Generale, a Jesuit controlled bank. Soon after their investment, the Rockefellers launched a bold attempt to seize total control of the mines through sponsoring a local revolution, using as their agent the Grangesberg operation. This enterprise had originally been developed by Sir Ernest Cassel, financial advisor to King Edward VII - Cassel's daughter later married Lord Mountbatten, a member of the British royal family, who was also related to the Rothschilds. Grangesberg was now headed by Bo Hammarskjold, whose brother, Dag Hammarskjold was then Secretary General of the United Nations - Bo Hammarskjold became a casualty of the Rockefeller revolution when his plane was shot down during hostilities in the Congo. Various stories have since
circulated about who killed him and why he was killed. The Rockefeller intervention in the Congo was carried out by their able lieutenants, Dean Rusk and George Ball of the State Department and by Fowler Hamilton.

In the United States, the Rockefeller interests continue to play the major political role. Old John D. Rockefeller's treasurer at Standard Oil, Charles Pratt, bequeathed his New York mansion to the Council on Foreign Relations as its world headquarters. His grandson, George Pratt Shultz, is now Secretary of State. The Rockefellers also wielded a crucial role through their financing of the Trotskyite Communist group in the United States, the League for Industrial Democracy, whose directors include such staunch "anti-communists" as Jeane Kirkpatrick and Sidney Hook. The Rockefellers were also active on the "right-wing" front through their sponsorship of the John Birch Society. To enable Robert Welch, a 32nd degree Mason, to devote all of his time to the John Birch Society, Nelson Rockefeller purchased his family firm, the Welch Candy Company, from him at a handsome price. Welch chose the principal officers of the John Birch Society from his acquaintances at the Council On Foreign Relations. For years afterwards, American patriots were puzzled by the consistent inability of the John Birch Society to move forward on any of its well-advertised "anti-Communist" goals. The fact that the society had been set up at the behest of the backers of the world Communist revolution may have played some role in this development. Other patriots wondered why most American conservative writers, including the present writer, were steadily blacklisted by the John Birch Society for some thirty years. Despite thousands of requests from would be book buyers, the John Birch Society refused to review or list any of my books. After several decades of futility, the Society was totally discredited by its own record. In a desperate effort to restore its image, William Buckley, the CIA propagandist, launched a "fierce" attack against the John Birch Society in the pages of his magazine, the National Review. This free publicity campaign also did little to revive the moribund organization.

The Rockefeller monopoly influence has had its effect on some of New York's largest and wealthiest churches. Trinity Church on Wall Street, whose financial resources had been directed by none other than J.P. Morgan, owns some forty commercial properties in Manhattan and has a stock portfolio of $50 million, which, due to informed investment, actually yields a return of $25 million a year! Only $2.6 million of this income is spent for charitable work. The rector, why receives a salary of $100,000 a year, lives on the fashionable Upper East Side. Trinity's mausoleum sells its spaces at fees starting at $1250 and rising to $20,000 . St. Bartholomew, on Fifth Avenue, has an annual budget of $3.2 million a year of which only $100,000 is spent on charity. Its rector resides in a thirteen room apartment on Park Avenue.

In medicine, the Rockefeller influence remains entrenched in its Medical Monopoly. We have mentioned its control of the cancer industry through the Sloan Kettering Cancer Center. We have listed the directors of the major drug firms, each with its director from Chase Manhattan Bank, the Standard Oil Company or other Rockefeller firms. The American College of Surgeons maintains a monopolistic control of hospitals through the powerful Hospital Survey Committee, with members Winthrop Aldrich and David McAlpine Pyle representing the Rockefeller control.
A medical fraternity known as the "rich man's club," the New York Academy of Medicine, was offered grants for a new building by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation, its subsidiary group. This "seed money" was then used to finance a public campaign which brought in funds to erect a new building. For Director of the new facility, the Rockefellers chose Dr. Lindsly Williams, son-in-law of the managing partner of Kidder, Peabody, a firm strongly affiliated with the J.P. Morgan interests (the J.P. Morgan Company had originally been called the Peabody Company). Williams was married to Grace Kidder Ford. Although Dr. Williams was widely known to be an incompetent physician, his family connections were impeccable. He became a factor in Franklin D. Roosevelt's election campaign when he publicly certified that Roosevelt, a cripple in a wheelchair who suffered from a number of oppressive ailments, was both physically and mentally fit to be the President of United States. Dr. Williams' opinion, published in an article in the widely circulated Collier's Magazine, allayed public doubts about Roosevelt's condition. As a result, Williams was to be offered a newly created post in Roosevelt's cabinet, Secretary of Health. However, it was another thirty years before Health became a cabinet post, due to the politicking of Oscar Ewing.

The Rockefellers had greatly extended their business interests in the impoverished Southern states by establishing the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission. It was headed by Dr. Wickliffe Rose, a longtime Rockefeller henchman whose name appears on the original charter of the Rockefeller Foundation. Despite its philanthropic goals, the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission required financial contributions from each of the eleven Southern states in which it operated, resulting in the creation of State Departments of Health in those states and opening up important new spheres of influence for their Drug Trust. In Tennessee, the Rockefeller representative was a Dr. Olin West, who moved on to Chicago to become the power behind the scenes at the American Medical Association for forty years, as secretary and general manager.

The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research finally dropped the "Medical Research" part of its title; its president, Dr. Detlev Bronk, resided in a $600,000 mansion furnished by this charitable operation. Rockefeller's general Education Board has spent more than $100 million to gain control of the nation's medical schools and turn our physicians to physicians of the allopathic school, dedicated to surgery and the heavy use of drugs. The Board, which had developed from the original Peabody Foundation, also spent some $66 million for Negro education.

One of the most far-reaching consequences of the General Education Board's political philosophy was achieved with a mere six million dollar grant to Columbia University in 1917, to set up the "progressive" Lincoln School. From this school descended the national network of progressive educators and social scientists, whose pernicious influence closely paralleled the goals of the Communist Party, another favorite recipient of the Rockefeller millions. From its outset, the Lincoln School was described frankly as a revolutionary school for the primary and secondary schools of the entire United States. It immediately discarded all theories of education which were based on formal and well-established disciplines, that is, the McGuffey Reader type of education which worked by teaching such subjects as Latin and algebra, thus teaching children to think logically
about problems. Rockefeller biographer Jules Abel hails the Lincoln School as "a beacon light in progressive education ".

Rockefeller Institute financial fellowships produced many prominent workers in our atomic programs, such as J. Robert Oppenheimer, who was later removed from government laboratories as a suspected Soviet agent. Although most of his friends and associates were known Soviet agents, this was called "guilt by association." The Rockefeller Foundation created a number of spin-off groups, which now plague the nation with a host of ills, one of them being the Social Science Research Council, which single-handedly spawned the nationwide "poverty industry," a business which expends some $130 billion a year of taxpayer funds while grossing some $6 billion income for its practitioners. The money, which would amply feed and house all of the nation's "poor," is dissipated through a vast administrative network which awards generous concessions to a host of parasitic "consultants".

Despite years of research, the present writer has been able to merely scratch the surface of the Rockefeller influences listed here. For instance, the huge Burroughs Wellcome drug firm is wholly owned by the "charitable" Wellcome Trust. This trust is directed by Lord Oliver Franks, a key member of the London Connection which maintains the United States as a British Colony. Franks was Ambassador to the United States from 1948 to 1952. He is now a director of the Rockefeller Foundation, as its principal representative in England. He also is a director of the Schröder Bank, which handled Hitler's personal bank account, director of the Rhodes Trust in charge of approving Rhodes scholarships, visiting professor at the University of Chicago and chairman of Lloyd's Bank, one of England's Big Five.

Other Rockefeller Foundation spin-offs include the influential Washington think-tank, the Brookings Institution, the National Bureau of Economic Research, whose findings play a critical role in manipulating the stock market; the Public Administration Clearing House, which indoctrinates the nation's municipal employees; the Council of State Governments, which controls the nation's state legislatures; and the Institute of Pacific Relations, the most notorious Communist front in the United States. The Rockefellers appeared as directors of this group, funneling money to it through their financial advisor, Lewis Lichtenstein Strauss, of Kuhn, Loeb Company.

The Rockefellers have maintained their controlling interest in the Chase Manhattan Bank, owning five per cent of the stock. Through this one asset they control $42.5 billion worth of assets. Chase Manhattan interlocks closely with the Big Four insurance companies, of which three, Metropolitan, Equitable and New York Life had $113 billion in assets in 1969.

With the advent of the Reagan Administration in 1980, the Rockefeller interests sought to obscure their longtime support of world Communism by bringing to Washington a vocally "anti-Communist" administration. Reagan was soon wining and dining Soviet premiers as enthusiastically as had his predecessor Jimmy Carter. The Reagan campaign had been managed by two officials of Bechtel Corporation, its president, George Pratt Schultz, a Standard Oil heir, and his counsel, Casper Weinberger. Shultz was named Secretary of State, Weinberger, Secretary of Defense, Bechtel had been financed by the
Schröder-Rockefeller Company, the 1936 alliance between the Schröder Bank and the Rockefeller heirs.

The Rockefeller influence also remains preeminent in the monetary field. Since November, 1910, when Senator Nelson Aldrich chaired the secret conference at Jekyll Island which gave us the Federal Reserve Act, the Rockefellers have kept us within the sphere of the London Connection. During the Carter Administration, David Rockefeller generously sent his personal assistant, Paul Volcker, to Washington to head the Federal Reserve Board. Reagan finally replaced him in 1987 with Alan Greenspan, a partner of J.P. Morgan Company. Their influence on our banking system has remained constant through many financial coups on their part, one of the most profitable being the confiscation of privately owned gold from American citizens by Roosevelt's edict. Our citizens had to turn over their gold to the privately owned Federal Reserve System. The Constitution permits confiscation for purposes of eminent domain, but prohibits confiscation for private gain. The gold's new owners then had the gold revalued from $20 an ounce to $35, giving them an enormous profit.

In reviewing the all-pervasive influence of the Rockefellers and their foreign controllers, the Rothschilds, in every aspect of American life, the citizen must ask himself, "What can be done?" Right can prevail only when the citizen actively seeks justice. Justice can prevail only when each citizen realizes that it is his God-given duty to mete out justice. History has documented all of the crimes of the usurpers of our Constitution. We have learned the painful lesson that the Rockefeller monopolists exercise their evil power almost solely through federal and state agents. At this writing, former Congressman Ron Paul is running for the Presidency of the United States on an eminently sensible and practical campaign - abolish the Federal Reserve System - abolish the FBI - abolish the Internal Revenue Service - and abolish the CIA. It has been known for years that 90% of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, ostensibly set up to "fight crime" has been to harass and isolate political dissidents.

The criminal syndicalists are now looting the American nation of one trillion dollars each year, of which about one-third, more than three hundred billion dollars per year, represents the profitable depredations of the Drug Trust and its medical subsidiaries. Before a sustained effort to combat these depredations can be mounted, Americans must make every effort to regain their health. As Ezra Pound demanded in one of his famous radio broadcasts, "Health, dammit!" America became the greatest and most productive nation in the world because we had the healthiest citizens in the world. When the Rockefeller Syndicate began its takeover of our medical profession in 1910, our citizens went into a sharp decline. Today, we suffer from a host of debilitating ailments, both mental and physical, nearly all of which can be traced directly to the operations of the chemical and drug monopoly and which pose the greatest threat to our continued existence as a nation. Unite now to restore our national health - the result will be the restoration of our national pride, the resumption of our role as the inventors and producers of the modern world, and the custodian of the world's hopes and dreams of liberty and freedom.
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