

The Insiders

By
John F. McManus

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>About the Author</u>
<u>Preface</u>
<u>Introduction</u>
<u>Part I: The Carter Years</u>
<u>Part II: The Reagan Years</u>
<u>Part III: The Bush Years</u>

BACK



John F. Mcmanus

About the Author

John F. McManus joined the staff of the John Birch Society as a Field Coordinator in New England in 1966. He was promoted to the headquarters staff in 1968. In 1973, he was named the organization's Public Relations Director and worked very closely with the Society's founder, Robert Welch, until his death in 1985.

In conjunction with his public relations duties, Mr. McManus became the organization's chief spokesman. He has appeared on many hundreds of radio and television programs and given an equal number of interviews to representatives of the press. He has traveled the nation extensively and has conducted Society business in every one of the 50 states.

A native of Brooklyn, New York, Mr. McManus earned a Bachelor of Science degree from Holy Cross College in Massachusetts, served as an officer in the U.S. Marine Corps, and was employed in the early 1960s as an electronics engineer. Married in 1957, he and his wife are the parents of four.

He is a writer, film and television producer, editor, speaker, and newspaper columnist. His weekly Birch Log columns have provided valuable insight about the affairs of our nation since 1973. His first book, *An Overview of Our World* (1971), analyzed the great conspiracy against mankind and its harmful effects on contemporary civilization. In 1991, he was named President of the John Birch Society.

[BACK](#)

Preface

In addition to previously published surveys of Insider control over the administration led by President Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, this edition of *The Insiders* contains a new Part III, a survey of the control exercised by the Insiders over the administration headed by President George Bush.

A key to understanding the dominance of the Insiders over contemporary America is an understanding of the history and purpose of such organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral commission. Much of this history appears in Part I and is not repeated in Parts II and III. The definition of the term Insiders, as it was first given by John Birch Society founder Robert Welch, and as it has been employed by the John Birch Society, is provided toward the end of Part I.

Readers familiar with the author's critiques of the Carter and Reagan Administrations are encouraged to turn immediately to the survey of the Bush Administration beginning on page 47. Others who are new to the type of analysis given here would do well to skip over nothing, for the administrations led by Mr. Carter and Mr. Reagan were dominated by the Insiders, and the pattern of this dominance over America's affairs is itself an important part of the story told in this book.

We hope that this glimpse of the increasing growth of Insider control over the U.S. government will stimulate many readers to become involved in the fight to turn the Insiders out — out from their control of our nation's government and numerous other vital sectors of American life.

Each portion of this book closes with an invitation to all to join the John Birch Society. We repeat that earnestly-given invitation as we begin the Third Edition of this carefully researched book.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

JULY 1992

BACK

Introduction

If a member of your family were suddenly felled by a strange malady, you would quickly run to the family physician. So, too, would you hasten to a doctor's office when a more familiar disease struck, or when an accident caused a broken bone or torn flesh.

Once in the presence of the doctor, you would hardly waste his time or your own by demanding of him some assurance that he favors good health. You know he already does. And you know he opposes fever, earaches, broken legs, etc.

We mention this because the John Birch Society has often been accused of promoting only negativism, or of merely finding fault. Yet any honest survey of our literature demonstrates that such a charge is baseless. The doctor who wants healthy bodies doesn't take time to explain that he wants good health. Nor do we always explain that our first and foremost goal is a strong nation and a healthy civilization.

The Insiders explains much of what has gone wrong in America and who is causing her ills. We doubt that we will be accused of presuming too greatly in believing that most Americans know something is eating away at the foundations of this great nation. Unemployment national and personal indebtedness, economic slowdown, loss of faith, declining national stature, a vaguely defined "new world order, broken families, and much more have stimulated worries from coast to coast and from all sectors of our social and economic strata.

The John Birch Society believes in America—in her magnificent Constitution, her glorious traditions, and her wonderful people. Where America is strong, we seek to preserve; where she has been weakened, we seek to rebuild. Sadly, we witness the presence of powerful forces working to destroy the marvelous foundations given us by far-seeing and noble men 200 years ago.

The information and analysis given in this book will undoubtedly upset, even anger, some readers. But if the history contained in these pages is disturbing to both the reader and ourselves, we urge that the blame be directed toward those who made it, not those who published it.

Doctors can't treat patients until they identify the causes of ailments. Similarly, no citizen can act to help his nation until he or she understands what constitutes good national health and what is ravishing it. It is our hope that the information presented in these pages will assist a great many more Americans to identify our nation's diseases — and those who spread them — and then take action to speed her back to the robust health she once enjoyed.

BACK

The "Insiders"

Part I — 1979

Immediately after World War II, the American people were subjected to a massive propaganda barrage which favored the Chinese communists and frowned on the Chinese Nationalists. Newspapers, books, magazines, and experts in government did their best to convince Americans that the Red Chinese were not communists at all, but were merely "agrarian reformers" seeking fair play for the Chinese people. (1)

In the midst of this propaganda blitz, our government completely turned its back on the Nationalist Chinese in 1947, refusing even to sell them arms. By 1949, the communist forces under Mao Tse-tung had seized all of mainland China. After the communist takeover, serious students of the situation lost no time in declaring that China had been lost in Washington, not in Peking or Shanghai. And they were correct. (2)

Eventually, the full truth about the Chinese communists became widely known. A U.S. Senate subcommittee report, (3) published in 1971, contains gruesome statistics which show that the Chinese communists have murdered as many as 64 million of their countrymen. Despite current propaganda to the contrary, Communist China continues to this day to be one of the most brutal tyrannies in the history of mankind. And the Chinese Reds have exported revolution and terror to every continent.

The American people were misled thirty years ago. If the truth about China had been widely known, our government would never have intervened in the Chinese struggle as it did. China would not have fallen into communist hands; there would never have been a Korean War in the 1950s; and there would never have been a Vietnam War in the 1960s and 70s. The course of history would have taken a far different path — if only the American people had not been misled about the Chinese communists.

In the late 1950s, the American people were again misled. We were told that Fiddle Castor was the "Robin Hood of the Sierra Maestra Mountains," and that he was the "George Washington of Cuba." Some Americans knew better and tried to spread the alarm. But, in spite of their efforts, our government repeated the process it had followed in China and Castro eventually seized control of Cuba. (4)

Again, the American people had been misled. If the truth about Castro had been widely known, our press and our government would never have aided him, and he would never have succeeded in capturing Cuba and in spreading communist subversion throughout Latin America — and now even into Africa.

The question we must ask ourselves today is: Are there any other important but similarly erroneous attitudes that have been planted in the minds of the American people? The answer is that there certainly are.

One dangerously wrong attitude held by many Americans is that all prominent businessmen in America — the American capitalist as they are called — are by definition the archenemies of communism.

In fact, the mere suggestion that a prominent capitalist, like David Rockefeller, is in league with communists invites scorn or ridicule. The notion appears to many to be totally absurd because a man like David Rockefeller, it seems, would have so much to lose if the communists should ever triumph.

But, in the last few years, David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank has been favored by the Reds as the first American bank to open an office in Moscow, and also the first to do so in Peking. And this same Chase Manhattan Bank has bankrolled the building of the largest truck factory in the history of mankind, at a place called the Kama River in the Soviet Union. It is totally inaccurate to consider David Rockefeller an enemy of communism.

It is also inaccurate to believe that all prominent businessmen in our nation are conservatives who are always the most determined opponents of socialistic government controls. We agree that businessmen should be anti-communists, and that they should be advocates of limited government, as given us by our Founding Fathers. But many are not.

As communism continues to advance toward total world domination, as America's place in the world slips from undisputed leadership to second-rate status, and as our own federal government's control over all of us grows with each passing day, many Americans are looking for an explanation of what they see happening.

We believe that the first step toward learning what is really going on in our country is the realization that some so-called capitalists are neither conservative nor anti-communist. Instead, they are power-seekers who are using their great wealth and influence to achieve political control. What follows will take a hard look at what we perceive as an on-going drive for power. Not only the kind of power that flows from great wealth, but absolute power, the kind that can only be achieved politically. We are going to take a look behind the headlines at the men who really run our country, the men whom Jimmy Carter called "the Insiders."

Who Is Running America?

One of President Jimmy Carter's favorite themes during his campaign for the Presidency in 1976 was that, if he were elected, he would bring new faces and new ideas to Washington. He repeatedly told campaign audiences that he was not part of the federal government and not beholden to the Washington-and-New York-based Establishment that had been running things for so long.

Perhaps the clearest example of his campaign oratory against what he called the Insiders was given at a Carter-for-President Rally in Boston on February 17, 1976. What he said on that occasion showed up in a widely distributed paperback *'I'll Never Lie To You'* — Jimmy Carter In His Own Words. (6) On page 48, Mr. Carter's statement at that Boston Rally is given as follows:

The people of this country know from bitter experience that we are not going to get these changes merely by shifting around the same groups of insiders.... The insiders have had their chance and they have not delivered.

The message undoubtedly persuaded a good many Americans to cast their ballots for Jimmy

Carter, for the existence of such an inside group running things is both widely suspected and widely resented. And yet, while the former governor of Georgia played up to this resentment throughout the campaign, he carefully avoided naming any names or discussing any of the organizational ties of the easily identifiable Insiders.

This, we intend to do. For we agree with Mr. Carter's campaign oratory, that for several decades, America has been run by a group of Establishment Insiders. We also intend to show that, despite his strong pledge to the contrary, Jimmy Carter has literally filled his Administration with these same individuals. Since Jimmy Carter moved into Washington, it has been business as usual for the Insiders who are running the United States.

The man popularly credited with devising the strategy that landed Jimmy Carter in the White House is Hamilton Jordan. A few weeks prior to the November 1976 election, he stated:

If, after the inauguration, you find a Cy Vance as Secretary of State and Zbigniew Brzezinski as head of National Security, then I would say we failed. And I would quit. You're going to see new faces and new ideas. (6)

After the election, Mr. Carter promptly named Cyrus Vance to be his Secretary of State and Zbigniew Brzezinski to be the head of National Security, exactly what Mr. Jordan had said would never happen. But the real question is: What is it about Mr. Vance and Mr. Brzezinski that prompted Jordan to make such a statement? And the answer is that these two men are pillars of the very Establishment that candidate Carter so often attacked.

When Jimmy Carter appointed him to be Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance was a Wall Street lawyer, the Chairman of the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, and a veteran of service in the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon Administrations.

Zbigniew Brzezinski had taught at Harvard and Columbia Universities, served in the State Department during the Johnson Administration, and authored numerous books and articles for various Establishment publishers and periodicals.

But, beyond all of these Establishment credentials, at the time of their appointment by Jimmy Carter, both Vance and Brzezinski were members of the Board of Directors of a little-known organization called the Council on Foreign Relations. Also, each was a member of the very exclusive Trilateral Commission. Most Americans have never heard of these two organizations. But knowing something about them is essential to understanding what has been going on in America for several decades. So, let us examine, first, the Council on Foreign Relations and then, later on, the Trilateral Commission.

The House Blueprint

The Council on Foreign Relations (7) was incorporated in 1921. It is a private group which is headquartered at the corner of Park Avenue and 68th Street in New York City, in a building given to the organization in 1929.

The CFR's founder, Edward Mandell House, had been the chief adviser of President Woodrow Wilson. House was not only Wilson's most prominent aide, he actually

dominated the President. Woodrow Wilson referred to House as "my alter ego" (my other self), and it is totally accurate to say that House, not Wilson, was the most powerful individual in our nation during the Wilson Administration, from 1913 until 1921.

Unfortunately for America, it is also true that Edward Mandell House was a Marxist whose goal was to socialize the United States. In 1912 House wrote the book, *Philip Dru: Administrator*; (8) In it, he said he was working for "Socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx." The original edition of the book did not name House as its author, but he made it clear in numerous ways that he indeed was its creator.

In *Philip Dru: Administrator*, Edward Mandell House laid out a fictionalized plan for the conquest of America. He told of a "conspiracy" (the word is his) which would gain control of both the Democratic and Republican parties, and use them as instruments in the creation of a socialistic world government.

The book called for passage of a graduated income tax and for the establishment of a state-controlled central bank as steps toward the ultimate goal. Both of these proposals are planks in *The Communist Manifesto*.(9) And both became law in 1913, during the very first year of the House-dominated Wilson Administration.

The House plan called for the United States to give up its sovereignty to the League of Nations at the close of World War I. But when the U.S. Senate refused to ratify America's entry into the League, Edward Mandell House's drive toward world government was slowed down. Disappointed, but not beaten, House and his friends then formed the Council on Foreign Relations, whose purpose right from its inception was to destroy the freedom and independence of the United States and lead our nation into a world government — if not through the League of Nations, then through another world organization that would be started after another world war. The control of that world government, of course, was to be in the hands of House and like-minded individuals.

From its beginning in 1921, the CFR began to attract men of power and influence. In the late 1920s, important financing for the CFR came from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation. In 1940, at the invitation of President Roosevelt, members of the CFR gained domination over the State Department, and they have maintained that domination ever since.

The Making of Presidents

By 1944, Edward Mandell House was deceased but his plan for taking control of our nation's major political parties began to be realized. In 1944 and in 1948, the Republican candidate for President, Thomas Dewey, was a CFR member. In later years, the CFR could boast that Republicans Eisenhower and Nixon were members, as were Democrats Stevenson, Kennedy, Humphrey, and McGovern. The American people were told they had a choice when they voted for President. But with precious few exceptions, Presidential candidates for decades have been CFR members.

But the CFR's influence had also spread to other vital areas of American life. Its members have run, or are running, NBC and CBS, the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Des Moines Register, and many other important newspapers. The leaders of Time, Life,

Newsweek, Fortune, Business Week, and numerous other publications are CFR members. The organization's members also dominate the academic world, top corporations, the huge tax-exempt foundations, labor unions, the military, and just about every segment of American life. (10)

Let's look at the Council's Annual Report published in 1978. The organization's membership list names 1,878 members, and the list reads like a Who's Who in America. Eleven CFR members are U.S. senators; (11) even more congressmen belong to the organization. Sitting on top of this immensely powerful pyramid, as Chairman of the Board, is David Rockefeller.

As can be seen in that CFR Annual Report, 284 of its members are U.S. government officials. Any organization which can boast that 284 of its members are U.S. government officials should be well-known. Yet most Americans have never even heard of the Council on Foreign Relations.

One reason why this is so is that 171 journalists, correspondents and communications executives are also CFR members, and they don't write about the organization. In fact, CFR members rarely talk about the organization inasmuch as it is an express condition of membership that any disclosure of what goes on at CFR meetings shall be regarded as grounds for termination of membership. (12)

Carter and CFR Clout

And so, very few Americans knew that something was wrong when Jimmy Carter packed his Administration with the same crowd that has been running things for decades. When he won the Democratic Party's nomination, Jimmy Carter chose CFR member Walter Mondale to be his running mate. After the election, Mr. Carter chose CFR members Cyrus Vance, Harold Brown, and W. Michael Blumenthal to be the Secretaries of State, Defense and Treasury — the top three cabinet positions.

Other top Carter appointees who are CFR member include Joseph Califano, Secretary of HEW; Patricia Roberts Harris, Secretary of HUD; Stansfield Turner, CIA Director; Zbigniew Brzezinski, National Security Advisor; and Andrew Young, Ambassador to the United Nations. The names of

Toward World Government

The CFR publishes a very informative quarterly journal called Foreign Affairs. More often than not, important new shifts in U.S. policy or highly indicative attitudes of political figures have been telegraphed in its pages. When he was preparing to run for the Presidency in 1967, for instance Richard Nixon made himself acceptable to the Insiders of the Establishment with an article in the October 1967 issue of Foreign Affairs. (14) In it, he called for a new policy of openness toward Red China, a policy which he himself later initiated in 1972.

The April 1974 issue of Foreign Affairs carried a very explicit recommendation for carrying out the world-government scheme of CFR founder Edward Mandell House. Authored by

State Department veteran and Columbia University Professor Richard N. Gardner (himself a CFR member), "The Hard Road to World Order" admits that a single leap into world government via an organization like the United Nations is unrealistic. (15)

Instead, Gardner urged the continued piecemeal delivery of our nation's sovereignty to a variety of international organizations. He called for an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece." That means an end to our nation's sovereignty.

And he named as organizations to accomplish his goal the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Law of the Sea Conference, the World Food Conference, the World Population Conference, disarmament programs, and a United Nations military force. This approach, Gardner said, "can produce some remarkable concessions of sovereignty that could not be achieved on an across-the-board basis."

Richard Gardner's preference for destroying the freedom and independence of the United States in favor of the CFR's goal of world government thoroughly dominates top circles in our nation today. The men who would scrap our nation's Constitution are praised as "progressives" and "far-sighted thinkers." The only question that remains among these powerful Insiders is which method to use to carry out their treasonous plan.

The Trilateral Angle

Unfortunately, the Council on Foreign Relations is not the only group proposing an end to the sovereignty of the United States. In 1973, another organization which now thoroughly dominates the Carter Administration first saw the light of day. Also based in New York City, this one is called the Trilateral Commission.

The Trilateral Commission's roots stem from the book *Between Two Ages* (16) written by Zbigniew Brzezinski in 1970. The following quotations from that book show how closely Brzezinski's thinking parallels that of CFR founder Edward Mandell House.

On page 72, Brzezinski writes: "Marxism is simultaneously a victory of the external, active man over the inner, passive man and a victory of reason over belief."

On page 83, he states: "Marxism, disseminated on the popular level in the form of Communism, represented a major advance in man's ability to conceptualize his relationship to his world."

And on page 123, we find: "Marxism supplied the best available insight into contemporary reality."

Nowhere does Mr. Brzezinski tell his readers that the Marxism "in the form of Communism," which he praises, has been responsible for the murder of approximately 100 million human beings in the Twentieth Century, has brought about the enslavement of over a billion more, and has caused want, privation and despair for all but the few criminals who run the communist-dominated nations.

On page 198, after discussing America's shortcomings, Brzezinski writes: "America is

undergoing a new revolution" which "unmasks its obsolescence." We disagree; America is not becoming obsolete.

On page 260, he proposes "Deliberate management of the American future...with the...planner as the key social legislator and manipulator." The central planning he wants for our country is a cardinal underpinning of communism and the opposite of the way things are done in a free country.

On page 296, Mr. Brzezinski suggests piecemeal "Movement toward a larger community of the developed nations...through a variety of indirect ties and already developing limitations on national sovereignty." Here, we have the same proposal that has been offered by Richard Gardner in the CFR publication Foreign Affairs.

Brzezinski then calls for the forging of community links among the United States, Western Europe, and Japan; and the extension of these links to more advanced communist countries. Finally, on page 308 of his 309-page hook, he lets us know that what he really wants is "the goal of world government".

A Meeting of Minds

Zbigniew Brzezinski's *Between Two Ages* was published in 1970 while he was a professor in New York City. What happened, quite simply, is that David Rockefeller read the book. And, in 1973, Mr. Rockefeller launched the new Trilateral Commission whose purposes include linking North America, Western Europe, and Japan "in their economic relations, their political and defense relations, their relations with developing countries, and their relations with communist countries." (17)

The original literature of the Trilateral Commission also states, exactly as Brzezinski's book had proposed, that the more advanced communist states could become partners in the alliance leading to world government. In short, David Rockefeller implemented Brzezinski's proposal. The only change was the addition of Canada, so that the Trilateral Commission presently includes members from North America, Western Europe, and Japan, not just the United States, Western Europe, and Japan.

Then, David Rockefeller hired Zbigniew Brzezinski away from Columbia University and appointed him to be the Director of the Trilateral Commission. Later, in 1973, the little known former Governor of Georgia, Jimmy Carter, was invited to become a founding member of the Trilateral Commission. When asked about this relationship, Mr. Carter stated:

Membership on this Commission has provided me with a splendid learning opportunity, and many of the members have helped me in my study of foreign affairs (18)

We don't doubt that for a minute!

Carter's Trilateral Team

When Jimmy Carter won the nomination of the Democratic Party, he chose CFR member

and Trilateralist Walter Mondale to be his running mate. Then, the man who told America that he would clean the Insiders out chose Cyrus Vance, W. Michael Blumenthal, and Harold Brown for the top three cabinet posts, and each of these men is a Trilateralist, as well as a CFR member. Other Trilateralists appointed by Mr. Carter include Zbigniew Brzezinski as National Security Advisor; Andrew Young as Ambassador to the United Nations; Richard N. Gardner as Ambassador to Italy; and several others as top government officials.

The membership list of the Trilateral Commission now notes seventeen "Former Members in Public Service" including Carter, Mondale, Vance, etc. Their places on the Commission have been taken by other influential Americans so that approximately eighty Americans, along with ten Canadians, ninety Western Europeans, and seventy-five Japanese are members today. Among the current Trilateralists can be found six Senators; four Congressmen; two Governors; Hedley Donovan, the Editor-in-Chief of Time Incorporated; Winston Lord, President of the Council on Foreign Relations; William E. Brock, Chairman of the Republican National Committee; and Dr. Henry Kissinger. (19)

As with the CFR, we do not believe that every member of the Trilateral Commission is fully committed to the destruction of the United States. Some of these men actually believe that the world would be a better place if the United States would give up its independence in the interests of world government. Others go along for the ride, a ride which means a ticket to fame, comfortable living, and constant flattery. Some, of course, really do run things and really do want to scrap our nation's independence.

On March 21, 1978, the New York Times featured an article about Zbigniew Brzezinski's close relationship with the President. (20) In part, it reads:

The two men met for the first time four years ago when Mr. Brzezinski was executive director of the Trilateral Commission...and had the foresight to ask the then obscure former Governor of Georgia to join its distinguished ranks. Their initial teacher-student relationship blossomed during the campaign and appears to have grown closer still.

The teacher in this relationship praises Marxism, thinks the United States is becoming obsolete, and is the brains behind a scheme to end the sovereignty of the United States for the purpose of building a world government. And the student is the President of the United States.

What It All Means

Let's summarize the situation we have been describing in three short statements.

1. President Carter, who was a member of the Insider-controlled Trilateral Commission as early as 1973, repeatedly told the nation during the 1976 political campaign that he was going to get rid of the Establishment Insiders if he became President. But when he took office, he promptly filled his Administration with members of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission, the most prominent Insider organizations in America.

2. The Council on Foreign Relations was conceived by a Marxist, Edward Mandell House,

for the purpose of creating a one-world government by destroying the freedom and independence of all nations, especially including our own. Its Chairman of the Board is David Rockefeller. And its members have immense control over our government and much of American life.

3. The Trilateral Commission was conceived by Zbigniew Brzezinski, who praises Marxism, who thinks the United States is becoming obsolete, and who also wants to create a one-world government. Its founder and driving force is also David Rockefeller. And it, too, exercises extraordinary control over the government of the United States.

The effect of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission on the affairs of our nation is easy to see. Our own government no longer acts in its own interest; we no longer win any wars we fight; and we constantly tie ourselves to international agreements, pacts and conventions. And, our leaders have developed blatant preferences for Communist USSR, Communist Cuba, and Communist China, while they continue to work for world government, which has always been the goal of communism.

The Insider domination of our government is why America's leaders now give the backs of their hands to anti-communist nations such as South Korea, Rhodesia, Chile and our loyal allies in Taiwan. These few nations do not want to join with communists in a world government. and therefore, they are being suppressed. In short, our government has become pro-communist.

More Observations

The Carter Administration, unfortunately, is only the current manifestation of this problem that has infected our nation for decades. Previous administrations, however, have carefully pretended to be anti-communist and pro-American. But there is very little pretense in an Administration which arranges to give the Panama Canal to a communist-dominated government in Panama, and paid the Reds \$400 million to take it. Or, when our President turns his back on America's allies in China and diplomatically recognizes the Red Chinese, who run the most brutal tyranny on earth. Or, when our President continues to disarm and weaken the United States, even as he presses for more aid and trade with Red China and Red Russia.

The foreign policy of the Carter Administration, which is totally dominated by CFR and Trilateral Commission members, could hardly be worse. But the domestic policies of our government also fit into the scheme to weaken the United States and destroy the freedom of our people. Government caused inflation continues to weaken the dollar and destroy the economy of our nation. Federal controls continue to hamstring America's productive might. And the Carter energy policy can be summed up very simply as a program to deny America the use of its own energy resources and to bring this nation to its knees through shortages and dependence on foreign suppliers.

The real goal of our own government's leaders is to make the United States into a carbon copy of a communist state, and then to merge all nations into a one-world system run by a powerful few. And in 1953, one of the individuals committed to exactly that goal said as much in a very explicit way.

That individual was H. Rowan Gaither, a CFR member who was the president of the very powerful Ford Foundation. It was during the preliminary stages of a Congressional investigation into the activities of the huge tax-exempt foundations that Mr. Gaither invited Norman Dodd, the Director of Research for the Congressional Committee, to Ford Foundation headquarters in New York City. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the reasons why Congress wanted to investigate the foundations. At the meeting, Rowan Gaither brazenly told Norman Dodd that he and others who had worked for the State Department, the United Nations, and other federal agencies had for years

...operated under directives issued by the White House, the substance of which was that we should make every effort to so alter life in the United States as to make possible a comfortable merger with the Soviet Union.

Then he added, "We are continuing to be guided by just such directives."

When the thoroughly shocked Norman Dodd asked Rowan Gaither if he would repeat that statement to the full House Committee so that the American people would know exactly what such powerful individuals were trying to accomplish, Gaither said: "This we would not think of doing. (21)

As further proof of just how powerful these subversive influences already were in the early 1950s, the Committee, headed by Congressman Carroll Reece of Tennessee, never did get to the bottom of its investigation of the tax-exempt foundations, (22) and it was soon disbanded. A summary of what was learned appears in Rene Wormser's book, *Foundations, Their Power And Influence*, (23)

"World Order" Nightmare

But the drive toward a merger of the United States with communism continues. The final goal, as we have already stated, is a world government ruled by a powerful few. And lest anyone think that such a development will be beneficial to the world or agreeable to himself, let us list four certain consequences of world government.

One: Rather than improve the standard of living for other nations, world government will mean a forced redistribution of all wealth and a sharp reduction in the standard of living for Americans.

Two: Strict regimentation will become commonplace, and there will no longer be any freedom of movement, freedom of worship, private property rights, free speech, or the right to publish.

Three: World government will mean that this once glorious land of opportunity will become another socialistic nightmare where no amount of effort will produce a just reward.

Four: World order will be enforced by agents of the world government in the same way that agents of the Kremlin enforce their rule throughout Soviet Russia today.

That is not the kind of world that anyone should have to tolerate. And it is surely not the kind of an existence that a parent should leave for a child. Yet, that is what is on our near

horizon right now, unless enough Americans stop it.

Or a Better World

The John Birch Society was organized in part to stop the drive toward world government. In 1966, Robert Welch, the founder and leader of the John Birch Society, delivered a speech which he called *The Truth In Time*. (24)

One of the most important sections in this valuable survey is Robert Welch's discussion of the individuals who are carrying out the Conspiracy's goals, but who have never been communists. Mr. Welch coined a word to describe these powerful men. He called them the *Insiders*.

Strangely enough, we have seen that Jimmy Carter attacked what he, too, called *Insiders* during his campaign for the office of President. We are, however, making no inference that Mr. Carter used the word because Robert Welch had. The amazing aspect of this coincidence is that, in using the word "*Insiders*," both Jimmy Carter and Robert Welch were referring to the same individuals, and to the same force. But Jimmy Carter had obviously thrown in his lot with them, and was dishonestly seeking votes by condemning them.

Robert Welch, on the other hand, has condemned the *Insiders*, named the *Insiders*, and formed the John Birch Society to stop what they are doing to our country and to the world.

The *Insiders* must be stopped. The control they have over our government must be broken. And the disastrous policies of our leaders must be changed. The way to accomplish these urgent tasks is to expose the *Insiders* and their conspiracy. The American people must be made aware of what is happening to our country and who is doing it. If sufficient awareness can be created in time, the *Insiders* and their whole sinister plan will be stopped. This is the goal of the John Birch Society. Education is our strategy and truth is our weapon. (25) But more hands are needed to do the job. More hands are needed to wake the town and tell the people.

You don't have to be political scientist, or an economist, or a Ph.D. in world history to be a member of the John Birch Society. The most important single requirement has always been a sense of right and wrong, and a preference for what is right. If you want to do your part to save your country, and to stop the Insider-controlled drive toward a communist-style world government, then you ought to join the Society now.

The John Birch Society has the organization, the experience, the tools, and the determination to get the job done. God help us all if, for want of willing hands, we fail!

Footnotes

1. John T. Flynn, *While You Slept* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1951, and Boston: Western Islands, 1965).
2. Robert Welch, *May God Forgive Us* (Chicago: Regnery, 1952) and *Again May God*

Forgive Us (Boston, Belmont Publishing Co., 1963).

3. Human Cost Of Communism In China, Report issued by Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, Ninety-Second Congress, 1971.

4. Nathaniel Weyl, Red Star Over Cuba (New York: Devin-Adair, 1960).

5. Richard L. Turner, "I'll Never Lie To You" - Jimmy Carter In His Own Words (New York: Ballantine Books, 1976).

6. Sam Smith, "Carter's Crimson Tide, Boston Globe. January 29, 1978.

7. Dan Smoot, The Invisible Government (Boston: Western Islands, 1977).

8. Philip Dru: Administrator (New York, 1912).

9. Karl Marx, The Communist Manifesto (Boston: American Opinion, 1974).

10. Dan Smoot, The Invisible Government.

11. The eleven United States Senators listed as members of the Council on Foreign Relations in 1978 are: Howard H. Baker; John C. Culver; Daniel P. Moynihan; Claiborne Pell; Jacob K. Javits; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.; George McGovern; Abraham Ribicoff; William V. Roth, Jr.; Paul S. Sarbanes; and Adlai E. Stevenson III. See Annual Report 1977-1978, Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., New York.

12. June 1978 By-Laws of the Council on Foreign Relations, Article II: "It is an express condition of membership in the Council, to which condition every member accedes by virtue of his membership, that members will observe such rules and regulations as may be prescribed from time to time by the Board of Directors concerning the conduct of Council meetings or the attribution of statements made therein, and that any disclosure, publication, or other action by a member in contravention thereof may be regarded by the Board of Directors in its sole discretion as ground for termination or suspension of membership pursuant to Article I of the By-Laws." Annual Report 1977-1978.

13. Examples of former CFR members who did what they could to expose the purposes of the organization are former Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden (see Dan Smoot, The Invisible Government) and retired Rear Admiral Chester Ward (see Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward, Kissinger On The Couch, New York: Arlington House, 1975).

14. Richard Nixon, "Asia After Vietnam," Foreign Affairs, October, 1967.

15. Richard N. Gardner, "The Hard Road to World Order," Foreign Affairs, April 1974.

16. Zbigniew Brzezinski, Between Two Ages (New York: Viking Press, 1970, and New York: Penguin Books, 1976).

17. Report of Purposes and Objectives, by Trilateral Commission March 15, 1973.

18. Jimmy Carter, *Why Not The Best?* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1975).
19. Membership list of the Trilateral Commission, January 31, 1978.
20. Terence Smith, "Brzezinski, Foreign Policy Advisor, Sees Role as Stiffening U.S. Position" *New York Times*, March 21, 1978.
21. Norman Dodd in letter to Howard E. Kershner, December 29, 1962.
22. *Tax-Exempt Foundations, Report of the Special House Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (Reece Committee), Eighty-Third Congress, 1954.*
23. Rene A. Wormser, *Foundations, Their Power And Influence* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1958).
24. Robert Welch, *The Truth In Time* (Boston: American Opinion, 1966).
25. Robert Welch, *The Blue Book of The John Birch Society* (Boston: Western Islands, 1959).

BACK

Part II — 1983

The John Birch Society's survey entitled *The Insiders* was released early in 1979. Over twelve hundred copies were purchased and put into use by members in a matter of months. Several hundred thousand copies of the printed text, in booklet form, were also purchased and distributed throughout the nation. In addition, reprint permission was granted to several other publishers, and their efforts undoubtedly doubled the readership of this analysis of the powerful few who dictate American policy.

It is impossible to know how many Americans saw or read *The Insiders* or one of the many similar treatises which paralleled it or were stimulated by it. Millions, for sure. Tens of millions, most likely.

By early 1980, the accumulated exposure of the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations, the two most identifiable Insider organizations, had begun to produce some dramatic effects. For one, these organizations became well enough known to be "hot topics" on the campaign circuit. Informed voters from coast to coast, especially those who were disenchanted with the Carter Administration, began to seek candidates who were not tied to either of these groups.

In New Hampshire, for instance, where the first presidential primary is held every fourth February, most of the candidates for the Republican nomination were happily responding to voters that they were "not now and never have been" members of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission or his Council on Foreign Relations. But Republican candidates George Bush and John Anderson could not join in such a response because each had connections to both of these elitist organizations.

This issue was not confined solely to New Hampshire either. It was a nationwide phenomenon. Witness a February 8, 1980 article in the *New York Times*. (26) Reporting on a Ronald Reagan campaign trip through the South during the first week of February, the article stated that Mr. Reagan had attacked President Carter's foreign policy because he had found that "19 key members of the Administration are or have been members of the Trilateral Commission." It also noted that when Mr. Reagan was pressed to back up his charge, an aide listed the names of President Carter, Vice President Mondale, Secretary of State Vance, Secretary of Defense Brown, and fifteen other Carter officials.

The report further stated that Reagan advisor Edwin Meese told the reporters: "...all of these people come out of an international economic-industrial organization with a pattern of thinking on world affairs." He made the very interesting comment that their influence led to a "softening" of our nation's defense capability. Both he and Mr. Reagan could have added that practically all of these Carter Administration officials were also members of the Council on Foreign Relations. But neither chose to do so.

Anti-Elitist Reversals

The history of that period shows that Ronald Reagan exploited this issue very capably. On February 26th, in New Hampshire where the matter had become the deciding issue in the primary, voters gave him a lopsided victory. His strong showing and the correspondingly weak showing by George Bush delighted the nation's conservatives and set a pattern for future victories that carried Mr. Reagan all the way to the White House.

But something else happened on February 26, 1980 that should have raised many more eyebrows than it did. On the very day that Ronald Reagan convincingly won the nation's first primary, he replaced his campaign manager with longtime Council on Foreign Relations member William J. Casey. Mr. Casey served as the Reagan campaign manager for the balance of the campaign, and was later rewarded with an appointment as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The selection of William J. Casey in the strategically important position of campaign manager was highly significant. He is a New York lawyer who served the Nixon Administration in several positions including Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank. In those two posts especially, he gained a reputation as a crusader for U.S. taxpayer-financed aid and trade with communist nations.

During this same period, while serving as an official of the State Department, Casey declared in a public speech given in Garden City, New York, that he favored U.S. policies leading to interdependence among nations and to the sacrificing of our nation's independence. (27) These attitudes are thoroughly in agreement with the long-term objectives of the Insiders, but are not at all consistent with the public positions taken by Mr. Reagan. But very few made note of the Casey appointment because very few knew anything about Mr. Casey.

With CFR member William J. Casey on the team, the Reagan campaign was still able to focus attention on the Trilateral Commission and on fellow Republican George Bush's ties to it. But nothing was said about the older, larger, and more dangerously influential Council on Foreign Relations.

Rockefeller Ties

In April 1980, Mr. Reagan told an interviewer from the Christian Science Monitor (28) that he would shun the directions of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission. But George Bush, who had recently resigned both from the Trilateral Commission and from the Board of Directors of the Council on Foreign Relations, could not shake the stigma of his Insider connection.

In Florida, understanding about the Trilateral Commission led to widespread use of a political advertisement which claimed, "The same people who gave you Jimmy Carter want now to give you George Bush." (29) An identical ad appeared in Texas. The Reagan bandwagon, propelled in part by its attack on the Insiders, began to score one primary victory after another.

Eventually, Ronald Reagan convincingly won the Republican nomination. Conservatives across the nation were delighted That is, they were delighted until he shocked his supporters by selecting George Bush as his running mate. George Bush was the very epitome of the

Insider Establishment type that had made so many of these people strong Reagan backers in the first place. That night, at the Republican convention, the word "betrayal" was in common usage.

Ronald Reagan had repeatedly and publicly promised that he would pick a running mate who shared his well-known conservative views. But, of all the Republicans available, he picked the man who was the darling of the Rockefellers. Nor was the Rockefeller-Bush relationship any secret.

Campaign finance information had already revealed that prior to December 31, 1979, the Bush for President campaign had received individual \$1,000 contributions (the highest amount allowed by law) from David Rockefeller, Edwin Rockefeller, Helen Rockefeller, Laurance Rockefeller, Mary Rockefeller, Godfrey Rockefeller, and several other Rockefeller relatives and employees.

Staunch Reagan supporters frantically tried to stop the Bush nomination. But political considerations quickly forced them to go along. One after another, they began to state that their man was still at the top of the ticket. "It was Reagan-Bush, not Bush-Reagan," they said. But all had to admit that the issue of Trilateral domination of the Carter Administration could hardly be used with a Trilateralist veteran like Bush on the ticket.

From the time William Casey joined the Reagan team in February, the issue of CFR domination of America could not be used. And when George Bush was tapped as the Reagan running mate, the Trilateral issue was also dead. Only a very few realized that when those two issues were lost, the hope that future President Reagan would keep Insiders from key positions in government was also lost.

As the summer of 1980 faded into fall, Insiders were showing up in every conceivable part of the Reagan campaign. In September, a casual "Prelude to Victory" party was given by the Reagans at their rented East Coast home in Middleburg, Virginia. A photo taken at the party shows that the place of honor, at Mr. Reagan's immediate right, was given to none other than David Rockefeller, the leader of the CFR and the Trilateral Commission. Guests at this party included Dr. Henry Kissinger and other CFR and Trilateral members. (30)

Two weeks before the election, the front page of the New York Times carried a photo showing the future President campaigning in Cincinnati. Alongside him as his foreign policy advisors who the President said would answer questions for him, were Senator Howard Baker, former Ambassador Anne Armstrong, and former Secretaries of State William P. Rogers and Henry Kissinger. All were members of either the CFR or the Trilateral Commission or both. (31)

Stacking the Cabinet

Election Day 1980 produced a Reagan landslide. Caught up in misguided euphoria, conservatives began talking about the return of fiscal and diplomatic sanity to the federal government. But the shock they felt when their man had chosen George Bush as his running mate returned when President-elect Reagan announced his selections for the new cabinet.

For Secretary of State, he chose Alexander Haig, a member of the Council on Foreign

Relations. For Secretary of the Treasury, Donald Regan, and for Secretary of Commerce, Malcolm Baldrige — both members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Back in February, Edwin Meese had told reporters that Mr. Reagan opposed the Trilateral Commission because the organization's influence led to a "softening of defense." Yet, he chose for his Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger, a member of the Trilateral Commission. Men from the same Insider team were still in power!

Five months after Mr. Reagan had been sworn in as President, the Council on Foreign Relations noted in its Annual Report that 257 of its members were serving as U.S. government officials. As in previous administrations, these individuals filled many of the important Assistant Secretary and Deputy Secretary posts at the State Department, Defense Department, Treasury Department, and so on.

For the critically important post of White House Chief of Staff, Mr. Reagan named James Baker III. The White House Chief of Staff determines who gets to see the President, what reading material will appear on his desk, and what his policy options might be on any given situation. But James Baker had fought against Ronald Reagan as the campaign manager for George Bush in 1980, and as a campaign staffer for Gerald Ford in 1976. He is a confirmed liberal who was an opponent of the philosophy enunciated by Mr. Reagan during the 1980 campaign. In his White House post, he leads a team of like-minded men who have virtually isolated the President from the many conservatives who supported his election bid.

Policy Reversals

As President, Mr. Reagan has been given the image of a tough anti-communist and a frugal budget-cutter. But the images do not hold up under close scrutiny. Only one year after taking office, he acquiesced in the taxpayer-funded bailout of Poland's indebtedness to large international banks. Even worse, he skirted the law which mandates that any nation in such financial difficulty must be formally declared in default before the U.S. government could assume its debts. What made this action doubly revealing was that it occurred at the very time that thousands of Polish citizens had been incarcerated in a typical communist crackdown against even a slight semblance of freedom.

During 1981 and 1982, Ronald Reagan personally signed authorizations for the U.S. Export-Import Bank to finance nuclear steam turbines for communist Rumania and power generation equipment and a steel plant for communist China. (32) Tens of millions of U.S. taxpayers' dollars are being provided for the industrialization of these Red tyrannies.

Also, Reagan Administration officials announced plans to sell arms to Red China; they told anti-communist businessmen in El Salvador that the U.S. would oppose efforts by any anti-communist Salvadorans to gain control of their country; and these same Administration officials refused to honor a pledge to supply Free Chinese on Taiwan with the fighter planes deemed necessary by the Chinese for defense.

When the President authorized a joint Peking-Washington communique which stated that military support for the Free Chinese is no longer our nation's "long term policy," even CFR member Dan Rather of CBS News called the document a startling reversal of frequently stated Reagan rhetoric.

On the domestic front, the record of reversals is just as dramatic. When Mr. Reagan campaigned against Jimmy Carter, he said he would cut two percent (\$13 billion) from the fiscal 1981 budget which he would inherit if elected.³³ He did nothing about that budget. Instead, he went to work immediately on the budget for the following year.

On February 18, 1981, in one of his first speeches to the nation as President, he delivered his own budget proposals. In that address, he stated: "It is important to note that we are reducing the rate of increase in taxing and spending. We are not attempting to cut either spending or taxing to a level below that which we presently have." (Emphasis added.) Yet, America was inundated with propaganda which had practically everyone believing that the Reagan economic package contained a substantial reduction in federal spending. Supposed budget cuts were labelled "massive," "drastic," "historic," and "cruel." But simple arithmetic showed that what President Reagan proposed for fiscal 1982 was \$40 billion more spending than could be found in the 1981 budget. By the end of fiscal 1982, instead of being reduced as candidate Reagan had promised, that figure had grown to a \$70 billion increase over spending from 1981. And the deficit associated with it soared to \$110 billion.

But the Reagan reputation, which had been gained by his campaign oratory and by erroneous descriptions of his economic program, continued to delight conservatives and anger liberals. At a press conference one year later on March 31, 1982, a reporter asked the President to respond to the accusation that he cared little for the nation's poor. Part of his lengthy response included the following statement: "Maybe this is the time with all the talk that's going around to expose once and for all the fairy tale, the myth, that we somehow are, overall, cutting government spending.... We're not gutting the programs for the needy." He then heatedly boasted that federal spending for student loans, welfare, meals, rents, job training, and social security was higher than it had been under Jimmy Carter's last budget.

It was the Reagan-led conservative philosophy that won a decisive victory in the 1980 elections. Promises to get tough with the communists, to cut spending, to balance the budget, and to abolish the Departments of Education and Energy appealed to millions. But there has been no change in the government's direction. America continues to help communists and to harm our nation's anticommunist friends. Federal spending continues to grow, and deficits are skyrocketing. And the bureaucrats at the Departments of Education and Energy are still in place.

More Reagan Duplicity

At the halfway point of the Reagan four-year Presidential term, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office forecast budget deficits in the \$150 billion range for the Reagan-directed fiscal years 1982, 1984 and 1985.³⁴ Others insisted that the deficits would be even higher. The largest deficit in the nation's history, prior to the Reagan Administration, was \$66 billion during the Ford years. Budget deficits, of course, translate into inflation, high interest rates, business slowdown, higher taxes, and unemployment. If federal spending were no more than federal revenue, if we had the benefit of a balanced budget in other words, some of these problems would be far less severe.

Shortly after he took office, Mr. Reagan twisted the arms of conservative senators and congressmen to get them to raise the ceiling on the national debt. Had he insisted on no further increases, the spiralling growth of government could have been checked. But instead, he used his influence to authorize more debt. Then he did the very same thing again

eight months later, and again in 1982. As a result, interest on the debt alone grew to \$117 billion for fiscal 1982.

In his State of the Union address on January 26, 1982, President Reagan again appealed to conservative Americans when he stated:

Raising taxes won't balance the budget. It will encourage more government spending and less private investment. Raising taxes will slow economic growth, reduce production and destroy future jobs.... So, I will not ask you to try to balance the budget on the backs of the American taxpayers. I will seek no tax increases this year.

But, in August 1982, his actions again failed to parallel his rhetoric, and he used all the muscle he could muster to get Congress to pass the largest tax increase in our nation's history — \$227 billion over five years. Opponents of this huge tax increase were the principled conservatives who had supported his election bid. The President's allies on the tax increases included big spending liberals like Senator Edward Kennedy and Speaker of the House "Tip" O'Neill.

One result of the failure of the Reagan Administration to stand by the philosophy which brought the President to the White House is that conservatives everywhere have been blamed for the nation's woes. The congressional elections of 1982 amounted to a significant setback for the entire conservative movement. It seemed to many voters that the conservative program had been tried and found wanting. The truth is that the conservative program has yet to be tried. And the reason why it has not been tried is that the Insiders who surround Ronald Reagan are still in control.

The President himself supplied dramatic evidence of the existence of this control in comments he made about the \$5.5 billion increase in gasoline taxes he signed into law on January 5, 1983.

At his press conference on September 28, 1982, he was asked: "Knowing of your great distaste for taxes and tax increases, can you assure the American people now that you will flatly rule out any tax increases, revenue enhancers or specifically an increase in the gasoline tax?"

Mr. Reagan responded: "Unless there's a palace coup and I'm overtaken or overthrown, no, I don't see the necessity for that. I see the necessity for more economies, more reductions in government spending...."

Less than three months later, he was vigorously promoting that increase in the gasoline tax. Call it a "palace coup" or whatever, the chain of events certainly suggests that someone other than the President is in control.

CFR Lineage

When CFR member Alexander Haig resigned as Secretary of State, CFR board member George P. Shultz was immediately named to replace him. During confirmation hearings, several senators and a number of political writers worried openly about what became known

as "the Bechtel Connection." It seemed almost sinister to them to have Mr. Shultz join another former Bechtel Corporation executive, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, in the Reagan Cabinet's inner circle. But the senators and the supposedly hard-nosed, prying reporters were assured that there was no cause for alarm, and the matter died.

If a common corporate lineage of these two cabinet officials stirs concern, however, why is there no concern whatsoever over the fact that both are current members of the Council on Foreign Relations? And why not even a bare mention of the fact that Mr. Shultz would be the tenth Secretary of State in a row to hold CFR membership before or immediately after his tenure?

That the CFR owns the State Department can hardly be denied. But it can be ignored, which is precisely what has been going on in America for decades. The result? Most Americans remain totally unaware that the same powerful Insiders still control our government.

The Council on Foreign Relations rarely receives any press coverage. When confronted by adversaries, spokesmen for the organization repeatedly insist that it is merely a glorified study group which takes no positions and has no stated policy on foreign or domestic affairs. Rather, they insist, the CFR merely offers the diverse thinking given by important students of world affairs.

Yet, in an unusually frank article about the Council appearing in the New York Times for October 30, 1982, author Richard Bernstein obviously reflected the attitude of the CFR executives with whom he had spoken when he wrote: "It [the Council] numbers among its achievements much of the country's post World War II planning, the basic ideas for reconciliation with China and the framework for an end to military involvement in Indochina." (35)

If an organization takes no positions and has no stated policies, how can it list as "achievements" the shaping of some of our government's most important decisions over the past forty years? And what "achievements" these have been!

Post World War II planning has seen the United States descend from undisputed world leadership and the admiration of virtually all nations to being militarily threatened by the USSR and being despised by almost everyone else. Post World War II planning, for which the CFR claims credit, has seen the United States bumble its way from a defeat here to a setback there to an error in judgment somewhere else, while freedom has retreated everywhere and the world increasingly falls under communist control.

Reconciliation with China, rather than being an achievement, puts our nation in bed with the world's most brutal tyranny and is making us adversaries of the friendly, productive, free and honorable Chinese on Taiwan.

Nor is the disgraceful conclusion to our military involvement in Indochina anything of which to be proud. The end saw three nations — Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam — fall to typically brutal communist tyranny. The toll in human slaughter which had followed in the wake of our nation's pullout from Southeast Asia is indescribable. And those who said that these nations would not fall like dominoes are now strangely silent.

It is highly significant to see this corroboration of our long-held belief that the CFR helps to

shape our nation's policies. The policies noted in Bernstein's New York Times article have produced communist victories in every case. It is, therefore, even more significant to have this admission of the remarkable dovetailing of CFR and communist goals.

Double Jeopardy Elitism

The Trilateral Commission also attempts to convey the impression that it exists simply as a high-level discussion group which merely fosters economic and political cooperation. In 1982, the Commission released *East-West Trade At A Crossroads* which it quickly claimed contained only the views of its authors. (36)

This study recommends an increase in the trade with communist nations that fuels their military capabilities. Even after noting that the communist bloc nations are already heavily in debt to the West, and that previous trade had "produced no significant change in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union," the study also recommends supplying even more credit to stimulate greater trade. That credit, of course, is to be supplied by America's taxpayers. Nor is this any departure from previously held positions published by the Commission, or enunciated by its members.

What is most significant is that the recommendations given by this Trilateral Commission report are wholly in tune with the policies both of the U.S. government and the governments of the communist bloc nations. The American people *do* supply the communist nations with equipment, technology and credit, even while communist troops crush Poland and ravage Afghanistan, and while Soviet missiles are menacing the United States. What this Trilateral Commission publication recommends is no less consistent with Soviet desires than have been the so-called achievements of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The Insiders of the Council on Foreign Relations and the newer Trilateral Commission have been controlling U.S. policy for decades. Unfortunately, these same individuals are still running things, despite the fact that the nomination and election of Ronald Reagan can be substantially attributed to a growing national revulsion at years of Insider control of this nation.

The Reagan Enigma

How then can one explain Ronald Reagan, the man on whom so many Americans placed such great hope? All we can say is that there are several theories to choose from, all of which fall in the realm of speculation.

One theory holds that he is a good man with fine instincts and excellent intentions, but is such a hater of confrontation that he has effectively been steamrolled by the non-conservatives who surround him.

Another theory holds that he was never a real conservative in the first place, but is a very capable orator who can read a good speech and produce a convincing image. The United Republicans of California published such a view in 1975, after having experienced all of the years that Ronald Reagan governed their state.(37)

One individual who shares the view that Mr. Reagan's political effect has never been conservative is Thomas Gale Moore of Stanford University's Hoover Institution. In a syndicated column appearing in May 1981, (38) he discussed the much-publicized Reagan plans to cut spending and reduce bureaucratic regulation. But Mr. Moore then cautioned:

Skeptics find President Reagan's record as governor, often alluded to during the campaign, far from reassuring, especially since he used much the same rhetoric during his gubernatorial campaigns as appeared later during his campaign for the presidency.

While in Sacramento, he converted the state income tax into one of the most progressive in the nation, introduced withholding taxes, raised sales taxes, and sharply increased taxes on business.

While he was in office, California government expenditures increased faster than was typical of other states. Notwithstanding his campaign rhetoric, welfare expenditures alone escalated 61 percent in real terms during his two terms as governor.

That is hardly a record that should merit the label "conservative."

A third theory would excuse the President by holding that government is out of control in the fiscal sense, and that previously arranged international entanglements are so binding that not even a President can reverse runaway spending or call a halt to the increasingly obvious pro-communist stance taken by Washington. Happily, there are not too many who believe that this theory has any validity.

Finally, another theory, which is not inconsistent with certain aspects of the first two given above, is that, while Ronald Reagan is indeed the President, he is not the boss. Nor have a number of his predecessors really been in charge. Instead, the Insiders who really run America select a man whom they then permit to occupy the White House. But it is they who still run the government through like-minded individuals with whom they surround the President.

When Ronald Reagan announced that CFR member Donald Regan was to be his Secretary of the Treasury, an aide pointed out that Mr. Regan had donated \$1,000, the maximum personal contribution allowed by law, to Jimmy Carter's reelection campaign. And that, in 1980, Donald Regan had also contributed to and raised money for left-wing congressmen who were engaged in tight races with conservative, Reagan-backed challengers. When an aide asked then President-elect Reagan why he would choose a man with such a background, Mr. Reagan is reported to have said: "Why didn't anyone tell me?" (39)

Why indeed did Ronald Reagan place Donald Regan in his cabinet? We suggest that he did not make the selection, but that the Insiders made it and have made many others, and that such a practice has been the rule rather than the exception for years.

In late 1960, when John Kennedy formed his cabinet, his selections included Robert McNamara for Secretary of Defense. At a gathering prior to their taking office, Mr. Kennedy had to be introduced to Mr. McNamara. Could he logically have picked a man to be Secretary of Defense whom he had never met? Or, is it not more reasonable to assume

that the selection had been made for him? As Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara did a great deal to destroy our nation's then-unchallenged military advantage.

Time magazine reported that Richard Nixon selected Henry Kissinger for the White House post of Director of National Security based on having once met him at a cocktail party, and having read one of his books. Yet, CFR member Henry Kissinger was widely reported to have wept publicly when his patron Nelson Rockefeller lost the 1968 Republican nomination to Richard Nixon. Did Nixon choose Kissinger? Or, were the reports in U.S. News & World Report and elsewhere correct when they openly stated the Rockefellers placed Kissinger in the Nixon Administration's inner circle?

Routing the Insiders

There is, of course, nothing wrong with any President relying on the advice of others in selecting his top assistants. What is vitally important is whose advice is being followed, what type of individuals are named to the positions, and what they do with the power given to them.

It is our view, as we implied earlier, that a tightly knit and very powerful group has run America far more than has any recent President. Its effect on our nation has been horrible. We call this group *The Insiders* and we dare to label their activity a conspiracy — a conspiracy that must be exposed and routed if the disastrous national policies of the past several decades are to be reversed.

The route that must be followed in order to accomplish this reversal must begin by placing the mass of evidence about this conspiracy before the American people. A well-informed public will then work to see that it is represented by men and women at the congressional level who will not be intimidated or corrupted by Insider influence in government, the press, the academic world, the big labor unions, or anywhere else. The Insiders may indeed have working control of the presidency and the mechanisms for choosing a president, but their clout at the congressional and senatorial levels is a great deal less and exists largely through bluff. In time, a sufficiently aware public can even break the Insiders' grip on the White House itself.

Will America continue on a path which amounts to fiscal suicide? Will our government continue to build and support communism everywhere, while it works simultaneously to destroy the few remaining anti-communist nations? The John Birch Society wants to put an end to Insider control of the policies of this nation. If we are to succeed, the active help of many more Americans is needed in a massive educational crusade. Whether or not you decide to help will count heavily toward whether the future for this nation will be enslavement or freedom.

The Insiders are hoping that you will do nothing. But true Americans everywhere are asking for and counting on your help. The best kind of help you can give is active support for and membership in the John Birch Society.

Footnotes

26. "Reagan Steps Up Attack on Carter's Foreign Policy," New York Times, February 8, 1980.
27. "The Reshaping of the World Economy," an address by Acting Secretary of State William J. Casey at Adelphi University, March 3, 1974.
28. "The Strange Tale of How Ronald Reagan Sold Out to the Trilateralist-tinged Republican Establishment," Kevin Phillips, Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, August 4, 1980.
29. Newsweek, March 24, 1980.
30. W Magazine, September 26, 1980.
31. "A Day With Reagan," James Reston, New York Times, October 27, 1980; also, New York Times, October 21, 1980.
32. Federal Register, May 29, 1981, Page 28833; Federal Register, September 9, 1982, Page 39655.
33. Televised address of October 24, 1980.
34. The Review Of The News, August 11, 1982.
35. "An Elite Group On U.S. Policy Is Diversifying," Richard Bernstein, New York Times, October 30, 1982.
36. East-West Trade At A Crossroads, Robert V. Roosa, Armin Gutowski, and Michaya Matsukawa, Trilateral Commission, 1982.
37. Oppose Candidacy of Reagan, United Republicans of California, San Gabriel, California, May 4, 1975. The UROC Resolution said of Ronald Reagan that his "deeds have served the liberals"; he "doubled the State Budget and raised taxes"; he "promoted regional government contrary to his expressed philosophy of local government"; and he "betrayed conservative principles in the areas of property rights, income tax withholding, gun control, medicine, mental health, welfare reform, crime control, etc." 38.
38. "Did Liberal Hearts Beat Under GOP Conservative Clothing?" Thomas Gale Moore, Boston Herald-American, May 12, 1981. Mr. Moore also showed that, after World War II, government always grew at a faster pace while Republicans occupied the White House (Eisenhower, Nixon and Ford) than it grew while Democrats held the Presidency (Truman, Kennedy and Johnson). He wrote, "In fact, the evidence suggests that a voter who wants a liberal policy should vote Republican; if he yearns for a conservative policy, he should cast his ballot for a Democrat."
39. Regan At Treasury, Gary Allen, American Opinion, February, 1981.

BACK

Part III — 1992

The grip on the reins of the U.S. government possessed by the Insiders grew dramatically when George Bush entered the White House. Far from being an opponent of the powerful few who dictate America's policies, Mr. Bush is a long-standing member of the Insider clique, sometimes known simply as "the Establishment."

Staff reporter Sidney Blumenthal could write in the February 10, 1988 issue of the Insider-led Washington Post: "George Bush, in fact, has been a dues-paying member of the Establishment, if it is succinctly defined as the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission." In his article, Blumenthal noted that Mr. Bush severed his formal ties with both organizations in 1979. But the Post reporter sought comments about Mr. Bush's twin resignations from David Rockefeller, the powerful Insider who had been chairman of both organizations when the future President began his quest for the White House. Mr. Rockefeller told Blumenthal in 1988:

Bush has the knowledge and has the background and has had the posts. If he were President, he would be in a better position than anyone else to pull together the people in the country who believe that we are in fact living in one world and have to act that way.... I don't know what I would have done [about certain criticism for holding memberships in both the CFR and the TC]. I don't think he really accomplished what he hoped. It was still used against him. He has since spoken to the Council and the Trilateral and has been fully supportive of their activities. Even though he has resigned, he hasn't walked away from them.

Clearly, George Bush may have resigned formal memberships in the CFR and TC in 1979, but his heart was still with both organizations. On March 29, 1981, only nine weeks after he took the oath of office as Vice President, he addressed a Trilateral Commission meeting held in Washington. The next day was to have been the occasion of a meeting of Trilateral officials with President Reagan in the Oval Office. But it had to be canceled because of John Hinckley's attempt on the President's life that very morning. (40)

Early in the 1980 campaign, Mr. Bush distributed a statement about his affiliation with the Trilateral Commission. Given on "George Bush For President" stationery, it said: "I personally severed my association with the Trilateral Commission as well as with many other groups I had been involved with because I didn't have time to attend the endless conferences." Once an elected Vice President, however, he managed to find enough time even to deliver a speech at one of those "endless" Trilateral conferences.

The Bush Path to the White House

There wasn't much doubt that George Bush would receive the Republican nomination for President in 1988. For eight years, he had dutifully followed the lead set by President Ronald Reagan and all of the CFR-member appointees dominating that administration. How many CFR members were part of the Reagan-Bush team? CFR Annual Reports for 1981

and 1988 show that in the early months of the Reagan Presidency, 257 CFR members held posts as U.S. government officials. By mid-1988, however, the number had risen to 313. Ronald Reagan was ultimately responsible for this growing CFR dominance, but George Bush was surely not complaining about it.

As Vice Presidents are expected to do, Mr. Bush stayed out of the limelight. He spent those years representing the United States at scores of foreign funerals, making appearances at Republican fundraising events, sitting behind Mr. Reagan in full view of the television cameras during each of the State of the Union addresses, and nodding in approval at whatever the President was saying or doing. It wasn't difficult for him because, even though Mr. Reagan had at times uttered some conservative sounding sentiments and seemed like an opponent of the Insider Establishment, the President's actions were very much in keeping with the agenda of the Insiders. The Reagan performance rarely matched the Reagan rhetoric, and it continuously indicated that the President didn't really mean what he was saying.

Good Republican soldier George Bush was even willing to suppress his stinging characterization of candidate Reagan's 1980 economic plans as "voodoo economics." The Reagan program called for increased defense spending and decreased taxation, all of which the former California governor claimed could be accomplished while still producing a balanced budget.

Spend more, take in less, and balance the budget? While George Bush was still contesting for the 1980 Republican nomination, he was on the attack. and his choice of the word "voodoo" to describe the Reagan plan was both reasonable and colorful. When the economic reality dawned (the \$110 billion deficit for fiscal 1982, the first full year of the Reagan Administration, was the highest in U.S. history), one wag suggested that Reaganomics was giving voodoo a bad name. But, as a stalwart Insider even more than as a member of the Reagan team, George Bush dutifully bit his tongue and supported the piling up of huge deficits for the next generation to shoulder — even as they grew larger and more threatening. How bad did it get? The average annual deficit for the eight years of the Reagan Administration exceeded \$200 billion. If the vaunted "Reagan revolution" had promised anything, it had promised fiscal responsibility. Yet, the Insiders whom Mr. Reagan placed in charge gave the nation exactly the opposite.

The fiscal profligacy was there for anyone to see. When the Republicans took office in January 1981, the accumulated national debt amassed over the 200-year history of the United States stood at \$935 billion. Then, on September 30, 1988 (four months before the end of the Reagan Presidency and the end of the last full fiscal year of the Reagan era), that debt had just about tripled and stood at \$2,572 billion.

During those eight years, the United States went from being the world's largest creditor nation to becoming its largest debtor. No more could we scoff at Mexico, Argentina or Brazil. We were in worse shape. The future of the American people and their nation was being mortgaged by the Insiders running the Reagan-Bush team, but George Bush's political future dictated that he keep quiet about it. And the Insider-dominated media, that should have repeatedly reminded him of his "voodoo" remark, ignored the plunge into debt and gave the impression that there wasn't anything anyone could or should do about

it. Why this conspiracy of silence? Because deficits leading to socialist control of the American people were exactly what the Insiders wanted. Because no one knew this better

than the Vice President whose ties to the Insiders were both numerous and unbroken. And because the media itself was Insider dominated.

The Loaded Resumé

There has never been a Presidential candidate who could produce a more impressive — and a more Insider-connected-resume than the one George Bush offered in 1988. He had served virtually everywhere. Other than his two terms as a Republican congressman from Houston, however, he'd been appointed by Insiders to every position he ever held. With connections orchestrated early in his career by his father, Prescott Bush, a Wall Street international banking Insider who served as a liberal Republican senator from Connecticut during the 1950s, George had access to many of the "right" people.

And he had other early connections too, such as his membership in the very prestigious yet downright spooky Skull & Bones Society at Yale. According to a 1977 article in Esquire magazine, this little-known Society forces its members to participate in arcane rituals, maintain deep secrecy, and swear unswerving loyalty to the organization itself. (41) Each year at Yale, fifteen seniors are welcomed into the group. The Skull & Bones roster lists some extremely prominent and influential Americans, many of whom are distinguished for having been lifelong internationalists. These include W. Averell Harriman, Henry Stimson, Henry Luce, McGeorge Bundy, William Bundy, Winston Lord, and Robert Lovett.

Questions to members about what goes on within Skull & Bones always go unanswered, inviting the charge that something is indeed being hidden. The late Gary Allen [Gary Allen wrote the landmark book: *None Dare Call it Conspiracy*] believed the group to be a "recruiting ground for the international banking clique, the CIA, and politics." It is hardly surprising that Mr. Bush chose Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart to administer his oath of office as Vice President in January 1981. A 1937 graduate of Yale, Justice Stewart was himself a Skull & Bones member. A presidential candidate's membership in a secret society such as Skull & Bones ought to evoke numerous questions from the mass media and the public. But because the group is so little known, there is virtually no controversy about it or about the President's affiliation with it.

In 1970, George Bush was soundly defeated in his bid for a U.S. Senate seat from Texas. Council on Foreign Relations veteran Richard Nixon rescued him from potential obscurity by naming him U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. The new appointee began his duties by recommending the seating of Red China alongside Nationalist China. When the UN voted to seat only the Communist Chinese, and their delegate used his maiden speech to condemn the United States, Mr. Bush expressed mere "disappointment."

A better man would have walked out of that nest of anti-American tyrants, which is exactly the response Mr. Bush once advocated. In 1964, he declared: "If Red China should be admitted to the UN, then the UN is hopeless and we should withdraw." (42) Rhetoric is one thing and, as this statement and what followed surely proves, performance is frequently quite the opposite. What is also true is that a better person than the man sitting in that UN post would never have accepted appointment to it in the first place.

How seriously our nation was hated at the UN could be gauged by the spectacle of delegates actually dancing in the aisles when the General Assembly ousted Free China, gave China's

seat to the communist regime and delivered an intentional insult to the United States. Ambassador Bush responded meekly and then proceeded to welcome the emissary of the Peking tyranny to the Security Council seat from which the anticommunist Chinese had just been expelled.

He then found no difficulty supporting Mr. Nixon's growing friendship with Peking's murderous tyrants, and he helped to make the grovelling 1972 Nixon pilgrimage to the land of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En Lai a much-needed source of legitimacy for the Red Chinese regime. During that highly publicized visit, President Nixon's formal banquet toast to Chairman Mao and Premier Chou included his revealing assurance that their history-making meeting was taking place because of "the hope that each of us has to build a new world order." (43) The use of the phrase was unsettling to Americans who knew that Insiders had been employing it for generations. But it didn't upset George Bush. And claims in 1991 by the White House that Mr. Bush and National Security Advisor Scowcroft had dreamed it up themselves during a boat ride off Kennebunkport in August 1990 were bald-faced lies. (44)

After Red China had been completely accepted at the United Nations, and after the future President had spent a considerable amount of his time trying to repair the UN's sagging reputation with the American people, George Bush abandoned the UN post in early 1973 to accept "election" as National Chairman of the Republican Party. (This was essentially another appointment even though party regulars went through the formality of electing him.) Almost immediately he found himself embroiled in the Watergate travails of his good friend Richard Nixon. He managed to survive that curious episode in American history although Nixon did not.

Then, given his choice of posts by President Gerald Ford, whose Administration was in the hands of such highly placed Insiders as Henry Kissinger, Mr. Bush opted in October 1974 to lead the U.S. Liaison Office in Peking. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's 1971 report entitled Human Cost of Communism in China (45) had detailed the systematic liquidation of tens of millions of Chinese by the forces controlled by Mao and Chou. Mass murder and other forms of inhuman treatment of the Chinese and Tibetan peoples were still going on. But none of that deterred Mr. Bush from doing what he could to provide the murderers with much-needed legitimacy. It was Insider policy to bring Mainland China into the community of nations,

President Ford then enabled Mr. Bush to add another item to his resume by appointing him Director of the Central Intelligence Agency in December 1975. He lasted only a year at CIA because his newest patron, Gerald Ford, lost to Jimmy Carter in the 1976 Presidential race.

The final entry in the Bush resume, of course, focussed on his eight years as Vice President under Ronald Reagan. All in all, a stunningly impressive listing of credentials: two terms in Congress; Ambassador to the UN; Chairman of the Republican Party; chief of the U.S. Liaison office in Peking; CIA Director; and Vice President of the United States. These were his open credentials, the ones George Bush wanted everyone to be aware of.

Insider Credentials

But George Bush had other credentials that he kept quiet-although he wanted them known within Insider circles. He had accepted membership in the Council on Foreign Relations

during 1971 (46) and a place on the roster of the Trilateral Commission during 1977. (47) As all members of these elite groups always do, he avoided publicity about his Insider connections because a growing number of Americans had learned about their goals and didn't want what each advocated.

Unlike the CFR that delights in listing its important members, the Trilateral Commission has a policy of denying or suspending membership to holders of national government posts. The group periodically publishes a list naming "Former Members in Public Service" along with its fewer than 300 members (a third each from North America, Europe and Japan). As soon as their government service is completed, however, these individuals are frequently welcomed back into the organization. Had he not been serving in government posts, Mr. Bush would likely have been tapped for Trilateral membership earlier than 1977. The Commission, formed in 1973 by CFR leaders David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski to promote world government, was made to order for an ambitious implementer of Insider objectives.

Out of government service early in 1977, Mr. Bush immediately signed on with the Trilateral elite, and also accepted a post on the 25-member Board of Directors of the CFR. (48) Over the years, many CFR members have sought to defend their own participation in this world-government-promoting group by insisting that they were trying to bring a more patriotic perspective into the group's proceedings. It is safe to say, however, that no one trying to challenge the overall thrust of the CFR ended up on its Board of Directors.

With duties surrounding his Board of Directors service in the CFR and his new membership in the TC (the twin pillars of the Establishment, both led by David Rockefeller), Mr. Bush was kept very busy. But he also began spending time in Houston where he teamed up with James A. Baker III, the man who made a name for himself during the 1976 Republican sweepstakes both with his strong support for Establishment favorite Gerald Ford and his equally strong distaste for Ronald Reagan's conservative pronouncements. The two began planning for a 1980 Bush run at the White House.

Atlantic Council

Another credential Mr. Bush didn't publicize was his mid-1970s membership on the Board of Directors of the Atlantic Council of the United States (AC). Formed in the 1960s by former Secretary of State Christian Herter, the AC's formal Policy Statement, approved on May 10, 1976, was endorsed by George Bush when he became an AC board member in 1978. It claims that the changing world "can no longer be accommodated by political forms and sovereignties developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries." (49)

What this means in the view of the Atlantic Council's planners, of course, is that the independent United States of America formed in the Eighteenth Century is an anachronism. The AC Policy Statement boldly enunciated a desire to form institutions "to deal adequately with problems with which no existing nation-state can cope successfully alone." In other words, let's do away with nation-states, like the United States.

Atlantic Council founder Christian Herter was one of the proteges of CFR founder Edward Mandell House, perhaps the most prominent Insider within the U.S. in the Twentieth Century. Herter was with his mentor at the 1919 meeting in Paris when the contingent of

Americans led by House and a group from Britain holding similar distaste for independent nations formed America's Council on Foreign Relations and the British Royal Institute for International Affairs. (60) It can truly be said of Herter and other Insiders at the CFR's launching (John Foster Dulles and Allen Dulles were also there) that they spent their lives seeking to cancel the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.

The Atlantic Council's 1975 report entitled *Beyond Diplomacy* gave proof of the group's utter disdain for national sovereignty in passages such as: "Interdependence, whether we like it or not, is the overriding international fact of the last half of the 20th Century." Of the anti-American UN, an AC publication entitled *The Future of the United Nations* praised the idea of "global interdependence" and stated, "The UN system...can and should perform the bulk of the global functions."

Other members of the Atlantic Council's Board who served alongside George Bush included such prominent Insider CFR stalwarts as Henry Kissinger, Paul Nitze, William J. Casey, Brent Scowcroft, Harlan Cleveland, and Eugene Rostow. The organization's publication *Issues and Opinions* also noted that its Board of Directors included "George S. Franklin Jr., Coordinator, The Trilateral Commission" and "Winston Lord, President, Council on Foreign Relations." Interlocking memberships and directorates in these Insider organizations have always been common. Insider enthusiasm for one of their own to occupy the President's office has been just as common.

An Insider in the White House

Mr. Bush won the 1988 race for the Presidency against Democratic candidate Michael Dukakis by characterizing himself as a conservative and his Massachusetts governor opponent as an archliberal. He was honest only about Dukakis. Yet Dukakis was seeking Insider approval himself as indicated by his appearance at CFR headquarters to give a speech about his views in December 22, 1987. CFR leaders thought favorably enough of him to include his photo in the organization's 1988 Annual Report (page 40). Then, in the 1989 Annual Report, who should be listed as a new member of the CFR but Michael Dukakis?

The exact date of the Dukakis entry into the rarified atmosphere of this Insider nest has not been publicized. It did occur between June 30, 1988 and June 30, 1989. It is entirely possible, therefore, that during the heat of the 1988 presidential race, Michael Dukakis was already a CFR member. The Insiders knew they could count on George Bush to carry their ball but they made sure their influence would be present even if the Massachusetts Governor confounded the experts and won the 1988 election. As usual in national politics, the CFR had all the bases covered.

As President, Mr. Bush dutifully awarded the following key posts to Insiders of the CFR: Secretary of Defense went to Dick Cheney (like Mr. Bush, Cheney had been a CFR board member), Secretary of the Treasury was given to Nicholas Brady, National Security Advisor to Brent Scowcroft (another CFR Board member), Attorney General to Richard Thornburgh, CIA Director to William Webster, Deputy Secretary of State to Lawrence Eagleburger, Office of Management of Budget Director to Richard Darman, Federal Reserve Chairman to Alan Greenspan, and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman to General Colin Powell. As of February 4, 1991, the Trilateral Commission — hardly a disqualifying credential for service on the Bush team — could proudly list as "Former Members in

Public Service": George Bush, Richard Darman, Lawrence Eagleburger, Alan Greenspan, and Brent Scowcroft.

The absence of Secretary of State James A. Baker III's name from any CFR roster breaks the string of ten Secretaries of State in a row (starting with Dean Acheson in the Truman Administration) who held membership in the organization. Why Baker has never been appointed, or why he has declined an invitation if one were ever offered, is unknown. He is ideologically in tune with everything the CFR wants for America and has himself chosen CFR members as his top advisors.

According to a lengthy article in the October 28, 1991 issue of the Insider-led Washington Post, the Secretary of State's closest aides, both of whom are credited with "a major role in many of the Bush "administration's foreign policy triumphs and failures" and who are "Baker's two principal idea men" are Dennis Ross and Robert B. Zoellick. (51) The Post didn't tell readers but both are CFR members. With Ross and Zoellick right next to Baker, and numerous other CFR members serving in the State Department as Deputy Secretary and Assistant Secretaries, the State Department remains CFR-occupied territory.

The Baker-led State Department shocked even its most intense critics in late April 1990 with its invitation to Tim Wheeler to be the featured speaker at a May Day luncheon in the department's plush reception rooms. At the time, Wheeler was the veteran Washington correspondent for the People's Daily World, the official newspaper of the Communist Party USA. (52)

With CFR members dominating State, this invitation is not too surprising. It calls to mind a revealing comment about Anatoly Dobrynin, Soviet Russia's valued ambassador to the U.S. from 1962 until 1986. A very suave spokesman for his tyrannical government, this ex officio head of the KGB in the United States had actually befriended many American leaders during his long stay in Washington. Writing about him in the May 13, 1984 New York Times Magazine, Madeline G. Kalb noted his distaste for speeches and interviews but revealed that he had always kept "in touch with influential journalists and top people at such organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations." Communist officials always found CFR leaders far more compatible than any anticommunist Americans.

What CFR Membership Means

Let us digress from the Bush record for a moment to repeat a long-standing assessment of those who affiliate with the CFR. It is that a CFR member is not necessarily a fully committed plotter dedicated to the destruction of the United States. The CFR frequently invites individuals to membership in order to influence them. A new member who grabs hold of the thinking and direction of the organization's leaders will likely be rewarded in his or her profession by other CFR members, or might be invited to take a government position, or might even be named to the group's Board of Directors. Names frequently disappear from the CFR list. These persons probably never caught on to what is expected of them or, if they did figure out what the CFR really intended, and wanted nothing further to do with the organization, they were simply dropped.

Too many ambitious and unprincipled individuals, however, are delighted to join groups like the CFR and TC. Their initial motivation usually stems from a desire to advance their

personal careers. They don't care about patriotism or national independence, just self. They will follow the lead of whoever seems to be winning and would even become hard-working patriots if doing so became the way to move ahead. But others who affiliate with the Insiders are committed to the world-government aspirations of CFR founder Edward Mandell House, and they are unalterably committed to destroying the sovereignty of the United States. If they hold a government post where an oath to support the U.S. Constitution is required, they have perjured themselves.

According to the CFR's 1991 Annual Report, a whopping 382 of its members were serving the Bush Administration as U.S. government officials. The organization's total membership numbers only 2,790, meaning that 14 percent of those who have joined this leading Insider group hold high government positions. No other remotely similar organization can claim such clout within the government. This startling dominance over the nation's affairs ought to be a burning issue, but similar CFR dominance of the mass media keeps most Americans totally unaware of who is really running the U.S. government. The Insiders, of course, hope that they remain unaware.

Iraq Invades Kuwait

On August 2, 1990, Iraq's armed forces invaded neighboring Kuwait. The defining moment of the Bush Administration's foreign policy had arrived. Far more than the remarkable events occurring in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, it was Iraq's warlike aggression that drew from the President words and deeds fully in accord with the long-standing political goals of the Insiders.

A virtual green light given to Saddam Hussein in Baghdad by U.S. Ambassador April Glaspie one week before the invasion convinced the Iraqi dictator he had nothing to fear from any U.S. response. The transcript of her face-to-face confrontation with Hussein just prior to the Iraqi assault was actually released by Iraq. In it, Ms. Glaspie told the Iraqi dictator that the U.S. had "no opinion on Arab-Arab conflicts like your border dispute with Kuwait." (63)

Back in the United States, Ms. Glaspie immediately became "unavailable for comment." Then, in March 1991, after all the shooting had ended, she was brought before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where she insisted that the Iraqis had lied about her conversation with Hussein. In July, however, the same Senate committee obtained copies of the secret cables she had sent from Iraq summarizing the meeting. They showed her far more conciliatory toward Hussein than she had described herself and also showed that the Iraqis had not lied about her remarks to Hussein. Believing they had been "misled" by the Ambassador, the senators voiced their displeasure to Secretary of State Baker.

Then in September 1991, a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee conducted more hearings into the matter. Their effort showed that State Department official Margaret Tutwiler had publicly stated essentially the same message given by Glaspie a day prior to the Glaspie-Hussein meeting in Baghdad. Also, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and Far Eastern Affairs John H. Kelly (CFR) had repeated the identical "no commitment to defend Kuwait" stance when questioned by House members two days before the invasion. The New York Times reported about these congressional hearings with such headlines as "Senators ... Misled," and "Before Invasion, Soft Words for Iraq." (54)

It is hard to believe that April Glaspie was not relaying the attitude of the Bush Administration when she gave Hussein what everyone later considered to be a green light for his invasion. It is harder to believe that she was not also following the Administration's line when she sought to deceive senators in March — Why did she engage in deceit about what she said to Hussein? Why did the State Department try to keep her from the press and the congressional committees? Could the answer be that she was, wittingly or unwittingly, a player in an unfolding plan to have hostilities break out in the Middle East so that the Bush Administration could launch a war to promote the "new world order"?

The "New World Order"

President Bush reacted to the Iraqi attack by immediately sending U.S. military forces to the Middle East. He furiously gathered support for a coalition-backed effort to confront Saddam Hussein. He went to the United Nations where he supported economic sanctions against Iraq, even as he was stepping up his own anti-Hussein rhetoric and sending increasing numbers of U.S. troops into the region. He turned to the United Nations, not the U.S. Constitution to which he'd sworn a solemn oath, for authorization for his military moves. He then began to state his goals — over and over again.

- **September 11, 1990 televised address:** "Out of these troubled times, our fifth objective — a new world order — can emerge.... We are now in sight of a United Nations that performs as envisioned by its founders."
- **January 7, 1991 interview in *U.S. News & World Report*:** "I think that what's at stake here is the new world order. What's at stake here is whether we can have disputes peacefully resolved in the future by a reinvigorated United Nations."
- **January 9, 1991 Press Conference:** "[The Gulf crisis] has to do with a new world order. And that new world order is only going to be enhanced if this newly activated peacekeeping function of the United Nations proves to be effective."
- **January 16, 1991 televised address:** "When we are successful, and we will be, we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the UN's founders."
- **August 1991 National Security Strategy of the United States issued by the White House and personally signed by George Bush:** "In the Gulf, we saw the United Nations playing the role dreamed of by its founders.... I hope history will record that the Gulf crisis was the crucible of the new world order."

Two common themes are present in each of these pronouncements: 1. The President is clearly committed to a "new world order"; and 2. his view of this "new world order" includes his boosting of the prestige and power of the United Nations.

What he didn't explain is that the phrase "new world order" has been used for generations by individuals seeking to control the world. Those employing it have sought socialism (economic control) and world government (political control) over mankind. And, as we intend to demonstrate in what follows, this goal has become Mr. Bush's exact agenda for our nation and for the world.

Who are some of these advocates of centralized world control who have used the phrase "new world order" during the past few generations? Some prominent individuals who have called for a "new world order" by name include Socialist H.G. Wells, National Socialist (Nazi) Adolph Hitler, Insider Nelson Rockefeller, Communist Fidel Castro, CFR theoretician Richard N. Gardner, Insider Henry Kissinger, and Communist/Socialist

Mikhail Gorbachev — to name just a few. (55)

In addition to advocating socialism — economic control of the people by government via taxation, regulations and bureaucracy — each wanted world government either by military conquest or through the route of a world political organization such as the United Nations. Some early advocates of the "new world order" sought world political control through the now-defunct League of Nations. The successor to the League, formed in 1945 by Insiders of that era, is the United Nations.

The War for a "Reinvigorated" UN

Mr. Bush's revealing statements called for a United Nations as envisioned by its "founders." It becomes critically important, therefore, to know who these founders were. A leading member of the U.S. delegation at the founding UN conference in 1945 was Alger Hiss, later shown to have been a secret communist. There were 15 other government officials working for the establishment of the UN who were also later discovered to have been secret communists. (55) One of the more important of these was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Harry Dexter White, the architect of the International Monetary Fund to which Mr. Bush advocates giving huge amounts of U.S. taxpayers' money.

Added to the listing of communists busily working to create the UN were 43 current or future CFR members. Men of prominence in this group included CFR founder House's protege John Foster Dulles. (67) Also, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Adlai E. Stevenson, Edward R. Stettinius, Ralph Bunche, Philip C. Jessup, and future CFR Chairman John J. McCloy. (58)

There was, of course, a delegation from the USSR. It was led by Andrei Gromyko who, along with all of his Soviet colleagues, was a communist. Other delegations from the total of 50 nations participating in the founding were top-heavy with socialists, communists, internationalists, one-worlders, and despisers of national sovereignty. There were also a few starey-eyed dreamers who believed they were participating in the founding of a totally benign peace-making organization, not something designed by its many founders as an organization meant to take control of the world.

The real "vision" of the UN founders should hardly be a mystery to anyone. All communists who have ever walked the earth have sought world government, an end to national sovereignty, the end of personal freedom, and the domination of the many by the few. And every socialist has always sought government control of everyone economically, a tactic that leads more subtly to the same goals sought by communists. The UN was literally made to order for totalitarians — which is exactly why those who seek political or economic domination worked so hard to bring the organization into being.

Also, wouldn't it be quite ridiculous to suggest that the likes of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Andrei Gromyko, John Foster Dulles, and John J. McCloy were duped into supporting an organization that would thwart their one-world designs? These men are prime examples of those who envisioned a world run by the UN that they would control.

These UN founders, including the top Insiders of their day, wanted the U.S. in the world body and they knew that the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution would

have to be scrapped along the way. Therefore, Mr. Bush's determination to use the Gulf War to see the United Nations "reinvigorated" according to the wishes of its "founders" is both revealing and frightening. His hope that the war would be the "crucible of the new world order" says it all.

Sad to say, the President's desires are being realized. An ill-informed American public has applauded the boost in prestige Mr. Bush's actions have given the world body. Publicity praising the UN as a "peace organization" is everywhere. Few take the time to cut through the propaganda and realize that the UN Charter itself (59) explicitly authorizes war, certainly including the kind waged in the Middle East by U.S. forces with President Bush's hearty approval.

Is the UN a peace organization? Ask what's left of the civilian population of Baghdad. These Iraqi civilians have undoubtedly figured out that UN-style peace either means total submission to UN will or a UN-authorized force will bomb them to kingdom come. It is worth noting that Mr. Bush stated very clearly in his September 11, 1991 address to the nation. "Our enemy is Saddam Hussein, not the Iraqi people." Yet, when the shooting stopped, Saddam Hussein was given free reign to destroy his Shiite and Kurdish adversaries, which is exactly what he proceeded to do. And the war left tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians dead. Like "Read my lips, no new taxes," a complete turnaround of Mr. Bush's statement naming his enemy would have revealed what was about to transpire.

During much of the 1980s, the U.S. government willingly cooperated in the use of economic sanctions against friendly South Africa. But sanctions were never given a chance against Saddam Hussein. Had sanctions been employed against the Iraqi dictator, the United Nations would not have been "reinvigorated" as it clearly has been in the aftermath of that strange war.

A War to Create World Government

Liberal Senator Paul Simon (D-IL) addressed his Senate colleagues on January 10, 1991, a few days before President Bush gave the go-ahead to unleash the U.S. military. With war a virtual certainty, he criticized the President for "giving up on the sanctions option." He said his concern was shared by others including Senator George Mitchell (D-ME), who had earlier that same day given his opinion that the being made prematurely. The two senators had toured the Middle East and even visited U.S. bases only three weeks earlier.

Hoping to influence the President to stick with sanctions and avoid bloodshed, Simon and Mitchell had gone immediately to the White House upon returning from their December trip and were dismayed to find Mr. Bush eager for war. Simon reported that during their conversation, the President spelled out his reason for the course he intended to pursue as follows: "If we use the military, we can make the United Nations a really meaningful effective voice for peace and stability in the future." (60)

According to the President himself, therefore, his overriding objective in sending 500,000 U.S. troops into combat was to build the clout of the United Nations. How many of the men and women wearing the uniform of this nation understood that as they were sent into battle? How many understand it today?

On February 27, 1991, during his address to the nation from the Oval Office in the White House, Mr. Bush was basking in the glory of victory over the ragtag Iraqi forces. In mid-speech, he again summed up the whole operation, saying "This is a victory for the United Nations."

As Mr. Bush's private and public pronouncements frequently indicated, his goal in the war he unleashed against Iraq had far less to do with liberating Kuwait than it had to do with building the prestige and power of the United Nations. History confirms that war has always been big government's best friend. In this instance, war was used by the President of the United States to be world government's best friend. Without question, the Insiders were delighted.

Similar instances of the exercise of such imperial power throughout history had once prompted a young Abraham Lincoln to remind a law partner why the founding fathers had so carefully assigned war-making power solely to Congress. In a letter he wrote to William Hendon on February 15, 1848, Lincoln said:

Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions; and they resolved so to frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. (61)

Can there be a better summation anywhere of the wrongness, even the unconstitutionality, of the way Mr. Bush used our nation's military?

During the period leading up to the military assault against Iraqi forces, Mr. Bush repeatedly maintained that he possessed full authority as commander-in-chief to commit U.S. forces to action without the approval of Congress. As commander-in-chief, the President has always had the power to commit troops in order to defend U.S. property or personnel from any sudden provocation. But there was nothing sudden about the operation being planned here. The President had shifted the entire purpose of the troops from the defensive mode to protect Saudi Arabia to an offensive force designed to attack Iraq.

As early as October 17 and 18, 1990 (three months prior to the start of the war), Secretary of State Baker emphatically rejected the idea that the Administration was obliged to obtain approval from Congress before launching offensive military operations against Saddam Hussein's forces. (62)

Congress finally got around to expressing its opinion about the coming war and the President's highhandedness on January 12, 1991. With the House voting 250-183 and the Senate 52-47, both Houses approved a Congressional Joint Resolution authorizing the President "to use U.S. Armed Forces pursuant to UN Security Council Resolution 678." (63) In no way was this a declaration of war as called for by the Constitution. Congress meekly authorized the President to do what he intended to do anyway.

The transfer of authority here is immense. The new attitudes coming out of this incident hold that Congress will pass a resolution supporting what the President intends to do, and the President can seek authority to make war not from Congress but from the United Nations.

An Ominous View From the President

Five times each year, the Council on Foreign Relations publishes its weighty journal, *Foreign Affairs*. Early in 1991, in an unusual departure from its norm, Volume 70, Number 1 led off on page one with an unsigned four-page editorial. Headlined "The Road To War," its text began:

Never before in American history was there a period quite like it. For 48 days the United States moved inexorably toward war, acting on authority granted by an international organization. On November 29, 1990, in an unprecedented step, the United Nations Security Council authorized the use after January 15, 1991, of "all necessary means" to achieve the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from the territory of Kuwait. On January 12 the Congress of the United States authorized President Bush to use American armed forces to implement that resolution. This too was unprecedented. (64)

While only CFR members and like-minded individuals could applaud such remarkable developments, who can argue with this poignant assessment? The vote of the U.S. Congress authorizing President Bush to use U.S. troops to implement a UN resolution was perhaps the more chilling of the "unprecedented" steps described by *Foreign Affairs*. Any search of the U.S. Constitution will produce no basis whatsoever for either the President's action or the weak-kneed congressional sanction of what he was determined to do — with or without congressional approval. With President Bush's determined effort and the delight of both the UN and the Insiders, America's military had become the policemen of the world.

A few months later, on September 23, 1991, Mr. Bush went to UN headquarters in New York to urge the formation of what he called a "Pax Universalis." In his speech, he discussed the need for "collective settlement of disputes," and he very clearly supported international action to settle "nationalist passions" even within the borders of sovereign nations. He applauded the continuation of UN sanctions against Iraq, and stated that he wanted them kept in force for as long as Saddam Hussein "remains in power."

With this speech, the President of the United States called for the use of UN-created international sanctions against a targeted regime, not merely to roll back its aggression against another nation but to dictate its internal political makeup. He also put a stamp of approval on UN action to eliminate an unapproved (by the Insiders) government of a sovereign state.

If the UN assumes the power Mr. Bush has endorsed, aren't all nations threatened? Even our own? Hasn't the President sanctioned the use of UN force to remove political leaders, restructure a nation's government, even demand the alteration of its internal policies? He has opened the door for UN force to settle internal problems existing within any nation's borders, including problems here in the United States. Even veteran CFR member Leslie H. Gelb writing in the *New York Times* was forced to comment: "What could be more revolutionary, more threatening to the regimes that inhabit the UN?" He went on to ask who would decide when and which states had violated the standards named by Mr. Bush. "The UN? The U.S.? And who would intervene to protect the oppressed, and how?" (65)

When a prominent CFR member describes Mr. Bush's proposals as "revolutionary" and "threatening," everyone should take notice. Can there be any doubt that this President is

following a plan to sacrifice national sovereignty and have the world run by the United Nations?

Even before he formally opposed Mr. Bush for the Republican nomination for President, journalist Patrick Buchanan said what many Americans had been longing to hear from a Presidential candidate. Attacking the President's policies only weeks after the campaign against Saddam Hussein had begun, he wrote:

The Trilateralist-CFR, Wall Street-Big Business elite: the neo-conservative intellectuals who dominate the think tanks and op-ed pages; the Old Left, with its one-world, collective-security, UN uber alles dream: All have come together behind the "new world order." Everyone is on board, or so it seems. But out there, trying to break through is the old, authentic voice of American patriotism, of nationalism, of America First, saying hell, no, we won't go. (66)

He was clearly challenging both the Insiders' goals and their favored President who was busily promoting their cause. And he refused to back down in the face of angry and vicious attacks. On December 10, 1991, in his New Hampshire speech announcing his candidacy for the nomination, Buchanan said of the President:

He is a globalist and we are nationalists. He believes in some "Pax Universalis"; we believe in the Old Republic. He would put America's wealth and power at the service of some vague new world order; we will put America first.

Back in 1975, a former Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy named Chester Ward had spoken out about the CFR's purposes. After holding membership in the organization for 20 years, the retired admiral stated in a book he co-authored that the CFR's goal was the "submergence of U.S. sovereignty and national independence into an all-powerful one-world government." And he added: "In the entire CFR lexicon, there is no term of revulsion carrying a meaning as deep as 'America First.'" (67)

Without naming them, Buchanan had attacked the Insiders at their core and their favored President where he was most vulnerable. His use of the term "America First" was certainly not overlooked by the Insiders. Quicker than a wink, he was attacked for supposed "anti-Semitism," "jingoism," "nativism," "racism," and even "fascism." But the attacks didn't come from certifiable liberals; they came from individuals dubbed "conservatives" by the Establishment's Insiders.

Of these Insider-connected journalists, most are "conservatives" who threw the nasty adjectives at Buchanan. Yet, the following dozen who attacked Buchanan are members of the Council on Foreign Relations: A.M. Rosenthal, William F. Buckley, Jr., George Will, Charles Krauthammer, R. Emmett Tyrrell, Paul A. Gigot, George Weigel, Gen. P.X. Kelley, Newt Gingrich, Irving Kristol, Michael Novak, and Norman Podhoretz.

The Insiders, always anxious to have all the bases covered, have certainly covered much of the conservative movement. When Buchanan offered a challenge to their leadership, these toadies of the Insiders pounced on him like piranha. The CFR to which they belong would have it no other way.

Dragging America Down

While world government is an ingredient of the "new world order," it is only half of what the phrase means. The other half is socialism: economic control of the people by government. Socialism doesn't require government ownership of your property, but it certainly includes control. The hallmarks of socialist domination are oppressive taxation, bureaucratic controls, numbing regulations, and Big Brother-type government. Sound that this is precisely what the Insiders are doing to them and their nation.

What will it mean if the trend is not reversed? In other nations where both economic and political control has been established, the authorities slew over 100 million innocent victims. They were aided in the acquisition of total power every step of the way by Insiders in our government who supplied them with aid, trade, legitimacy, credit, equipment and technology during all of their years of domination. Does anyone think for a minute that complete control of this nation by the Insiders will somehow be benign? That all we have to worry about is taxation and control? That we don't have to fear for our very lives? Make no mistake about this: The goal of the Insiders is not the completion of some academic exercise. They mean to rule and, if history is any guide, they mean to rule with savage brutality.

The steps being taken to create socialism in the United States and elsewhere are annoying, but the eventual use of the power being accumulated can't help but lead to a repeat of the human slaughter suffered by the peoples of Russia, Ukraine, Eastern Europe, China and wherever total government took over. To think of the Insiders as anything else but a power-hungry and totally ruthless clique of conspirators is to miss the point entirely.

One of the more sinister tactics employed by socialists to gain economic control of the people involves accumulating huge national indebtedness. Paying interest on the debt then gives government leaders the excuse to impose more and more taxation. Another well-used tactic involves inviting — or forcing — massive numbers of citizens on to welfare rolls where they become dependent upon government. And still another calls for burdening the productive sector with costly, unnecessary and downright production-inhibiting regulations. The Bush Administration is guilty of all of these socialism-building tactics even as the President dramatically boosts the world-government prospects of the United Nations.

Immediately after taking office in January 1989, President Bush unveiled a federal budget containing economic forecasts, as required by law, for several years into the future. On that occasion, the President's projections included \$1,249 billion in spending for fiscal year 1992 with a sharp decline in the deficit to \$30.6 billion. His forecast for fiscal 1993 estimated spending at \$1,284 billion with a surplus of \$2.5 billion.

Three years later, in January 1992, the same President was forced to admit that the deficit for fiscal year 1992 (ending September 30, 1992) would top out at \$399 billion, missing his earlier forecast by an astounding \$368 billion! The deficit alone now exceeds the total federal budget during the height of the Vietnam War. He also announced that the 1991 fiscal year had been completed with a deficit of \$267 billion.

In addition, his January 1992 forecast included a spending level of \$1,520 billion for fiscal 1993 (up \$236 billion from his 1989 projection) with a projected deficit of \$352 billion instead of the modest surplus.

The President's defenders pointed to the costs of the Persian Gulf War as if it was acceptable to spend huge amounts of money to build the power of the United Nations. They also sidestepped the fact that some payments were made by many of the "allies" during the conflict, and the further fact that military spending has actually been reduced, both as a percentage of the entire federal budget and in dollar amount.

They pleaded that the deficit was caused by the S&L bailout when that government-inspired fiasco cost only 20 percent as much as the enormous increase in domestic spending during the first three years of the Bush Administration. Then, they blamed the recession on reductions in expected federal revenues. But no Bush partisan wanted to talk about the huge deficits of the Reagan-Bush era that had contributed to America's slowdown and had thereby diminished the revenue collected by Uncle Sam.

The simple truth is that the huge increase in spending was due mainly to huge increases in domestic spending for interest on debt and for an escalating number of share-the-wealth schemes that are hallmarks of socialist takeover. And, as history shows, a socialist takeover leads to consequences that are far more damaging than empty wallets.

In addition, the huge increases in the deficit totals under George Bush-making even Ronald Reagan's \$200 billion per year average seem thrifty-have boosted the annual payment for interest on the debt to a staggering \$303 billion. With a national population of 240 million, that's \$1,260 for every man, woman and child in America. But not all men, women and children pay taxes. Excluding children and other non-earners, the average government take for interest alone is over \$3,000 per taxpayer.

This bill for interest on the national debt already exceeds the entire defense budget and is rising rapidly. In July 1990, Budget Director Richard Darman (CFR & TC) gave lip-service to the threatening situation he was helping to arrange by warning: "Drastic consequences would occur if a way could not be found to reduce the deficit." He was correct, and the deficits have indeed grown larger as the nation slipped into the deepest recession since the 1930s. One year after Darman's remark, conservative columnist Paul Craig Roberts, a former Treasury Department official in the Reagan Administration, advised readers in his syndicated column, "Get ready to sell your home to pay your taxes!" (68)

If the productive sector has to come up with over \$300 billion just for interest on the national debt (20 percent of the federal budget!), and if it has to provide more hundreds of billions for an increasing number of share-the-wealth and control-the-productive-sector programs, is it any wonder that America has slowed down? Blame Congress for going along with the President, but realize that the President is fully backing the spending binge that is killing the U.S. economy. The Insiders could hardly be more pleased.

"Read My Lips, No New Taxes!"

Most Americans remember the famous pledge given by candidate Bush in 1988. "Read my lips, no new taxes!" was the catchiest campaign slogan the nation had heard in many years. Yet, in October 1990, the President signed one of the largest tax increases in American history, \$164 billion over five years. It was another body blow delivered to the nation's producers.

If any economic tinkering can help the nation out of a recession, it certainly isn't a tax increase. Yet, in the midst of the most severe economic slowdown since the great depression, the President cooperated in making it even worse by supporting the huge tax increase. A freshman economics student would tell you that you don't gobble up more consumer money with taxes when consumer spending is needed to spur economic recovery.

As bad as the Bush deficit and taxation picture is, it is closely rivaled by the President's support for the Insiders' goal of strangling business with additional regulations and controls. He supported the Clean Air Act that competent scientists say is completely unnecessary. It will add \$40 billion of regulatory requirements to business and industry. He burdened business with the costly provisions of the Americans With Disabilities Act; he supported an extension of unemployment taxes; and he backed the 25 percent boost in the minimum wage. These and other burdens must be borne by productive Americans, and each new burden reduces the number of those who are still able to produce and provide jobs for others.

As early as December 1990, Newhouse News Service reporter Tom Baden wrote:

The federal government's regulatory watch dogs, muzzled in the Reagan administration, have been unleashed in the first two years of the Bush presidency.

The Transportation Department has issued tougher auto safety standards. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration has levied record fines on corporate violators. The Food and Drug Administration has devised strict rules for health claims on food labels. And 7,400 employees have been added to the 51 major regulatory agencies, according to one academic study. (69)

The President then signed the 1991 Civil Rights bill, saying it was a "compromise" measure that did not contain racial hiring quotas. (Put the words "civil rights" in front of any piece of legislation, no matter how costly or destructive of real rights it is, and watch venal politicians line up to support it.) This particular bill places the burden of proof regarding bigotry on the employer. The employer is guilty as soon as he's accused, and he stays guilty until he can prove himself innocent, often at great cost in time and legal fees.

If businessmen (or businesswomen) fail to demonstrate that their firm's hiring practices are necessary, or if the racial composition of their employees does not meet government "guidelines," they can see both their reputations and their companies destroyed. Unscrupulous lawyers will have a field day with this destructive and race-based legislation. Seeking out malcontents in order to wage war against private citizens trying to engage in the business of America will become the latest form of lawyer abuse directed against productive Americans.

What can an employer be expected to do when faced with these threats other than try to meet the "guidelines" before getting hauled into court? The President said the bill didn't have any quotas. Senator Bob Smith (R-NH) bluntly disagreed and stated, "This is a quota bill." Either meet the "guidelines" or face the prospect of big trouble.

Also, this bill can't help but increase racial tensions while it solidifies an already prevalent Marxist principle in the minds of millions of Americans. The basic thinking it employs is

that rights (such as the right to a job—which is no right at all!) belong to a group, not to an individual. Karl Marx agreed that individuals don't count, only the groups to which they belonged.

Only a few days after moving into the White House in 1989, Mr. Bush announced, "I am an environmentalist." Later, he outlined plans to make the Environmental Protection Agency a cabinet level department, a move that will surely give it increased clout to wreak more havoc on productive America. It is hardly surprising to note the name of EPA chief William Reilly on the CFR's membership list. He is one of many Insiders championing environmental legislation.

On January 3, 1990, the President gave a huge boost to the radical environmental movement in America by proclaiming April 22nd as Earth Day. The Insider-controlled press gave the project publicity that would ordinarily cost billions. In remarks given while issuing that proclamation, he stated his desire to "heighten public awareness of the need for active participation in the protection of the environment and to promote the formation of an international alliance that responds to global environmental concerns." Insiders everywhere were delighted to hear his call for an "international alliance."

Following Insider Guidelines

As recounted in Part I of this book, an Insider guru named Richard N. Gardner authored "The Hard Road To World Order" for the Spring 1974 edition of the CFR journal Foreign Affairs. Boldly calling for world government and piecemeal delivery of the U.S. into its clutches, he actually advocated performing "an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece." To accomplish his twin goals, he urged the use of such agencies as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, even a UN military force.

On January 19, 1988, the New York Times announced that President Reagan "has opened the door to Soviet memberships in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade." Reporter Clyde Farnsworth noted, "The new position contrasts with the President's strongly stated opposition last year." It also contrasted sharply with Mr. Reagan's earlier characterization of the Soviet Union as an "evil empire." The Reagan turnaround made Gardner's "hard road to world order" a great deal softer. Early in 1992, President Bush announced that he would apply strong pressure to have Congress approve a contribution of \$12 billion more to the IMF for immediate transfer to the former Soviet Union.

Currently a law professor at Columbia University in New York, Richard Gardner has been a potent influence within the clique of Insiders no matter who occupies the President's office. A protege of Harlan B. Cleveland, he is a product of Harvard University, Yale Law School, and the Rhodes Scholar program — Cleveland, a member of the CFR from 1953, was appointed Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs in 1961 by President John F. Kennedy. Security evaluators at State ruled against granting him a security clearance, however, because of his ties to communist-controlled organizations within our nation.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk (CFR) promptly waived the security clearance and Cleveland

took the post. He immediately tapped Gardner as his Deputy Assistant Secretary. Three years later, Gardner authored a full-length book entitled: *In Pursuit of World Order*. (70) The book contains a glowing Foreword by Cleveland calling for the building of a "decent world order...brick by brick" and touting Gardner as a man who "understands the process of international institution-building as clearly and as deeply" as anyone. And Gardner notes in the Introduction to his own book that "the person responsible for bringing me to Washington and the guiding force in the development of the ideas contained in this book has been Harlan Cleveland."

The book was clearly written to promote the United Nations. In it, Gardner writes, "Discussion of whether or not we should be in the United Nations is about as useful as discussion of whether or not we should have a United States Congress." And casting all modesty aside, he notes that he "has helped to shape the policy of our government on most of the subjects discussed in this book."

Figuring prominently in Gardner's 1964 opus is the matter of disarmament under UN auspices. Though he doesn't say so explicitly, he surely had a hand in crafting the infamous State Department disarmament proposal entitled *Freedom From War*. (71) It calls for the succession of steps toward disarmament already taken by our government and culminates in the complete turning over of national military forces to the UN. The text actually states that, eventually "no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. Peace Force." A UN Peace Force has certainly been "progressively strengthened" as a result of the war in the Persian Gulf. And disarmament proceeds according to this truly subversive plan.

But Gardner has also laid out other paths for taking the United States and the rest of mankind into the UN. The man is determined to see an end to an independent United States. In its Spring 1988 issue, *Foreign Affairs* featured "The Case For Practical Internationalism" written by this very busy Insider. It urged continued use of the IMF, World Bank, and GATT to accomplish the Insiders' internationalism. But it also urged taking advantage of opportunities presented by five other challenges, each of which he discussed at length: nuclear safety, AIDS, drug abuse, overpopulation and environmental destruction.

Picking up where Gardner had left off, CFR member Jessica Tuchman Mathews, a Vice President of World Resources Institute, stated in her own *Foreign Affairs* article in the Spring 1989 issue, "Environmental strains that transcend national borders are already beginning to break down the sacred boundaries of national sovereignty...." In the July/August 1990 issue of this CFR journal, she approvingly said that "environmental imperatives" are leading to "economic interdependence; and diverse invasions of national sovereignty."

Recall that shortly after he took office, Mr. Bush announced, "I am an environmentalist." Both his statements and his actions confirm that his self-description is correct. Richard Gardner ended his 1988 article in *Foreign Affairs* with, "The next president will need to convince the American people that strengthening international institutions...will serve a more stable and cooperative world order." Mr. Bush could have added that he intends to be that president.

Keeping Congress Liberal

President Bush customarily resorts to bashing Congress when he gets pinned down about spending, the growth of government power, or the nation's economic woes. He will insist that Congress is too heavily laden with liberal Democrats. If liberal Democrats are to blame, one would expect the President to work extremely hard to fill the Congress with Republicans-especially conservative Republicans. One would also expect the President to propose reductions in federal spending along with balanced budgets, neither of which has been forthcoming from Mr. Bush.

But as the 1990 congressional elections drew to a close, Time magazine for November 5, 1992 (72) published its assessment of Mr. Bush's counterproductive efforts on behalf of Republican candidates. Half in jest, the Time article concluded, "George Bush is a Democrat in disguise."

Why? In June, the President gave away the Republican Party's best campaign issue when he reversed himself on his pledge for "No new taxes!" and signed one of the largest tax increases in the nation's history. Just before the election, he arranged to have Ed Rollins, the co-chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee, fired from the staff. Charged with helping Republican candidates win, Rollins had advised all of them, "Do not hesitate to oppose either the President or proposals being advanced in Congress." It was the kind of good advice a Republican should follow, but it cost the man who gave it his job.

Incumbent Vermont Republican Peter Smith publicly differed with the President during a breakfast meeting in Vermont while Mr. Bush was sitting alongside. Even that didn't help as he lost to Socialist Bernie Sanders, the first avowed socialist elected to Congress in 50 years. At a fund-raising luncheon in New Hampshire for the earnestly conservative Bob Smith, who was trying to move from the House to the Senate, the President was there but Smith managed to stay away. Unwilling to be photographed with the increasingly unpopular President, he won.

Moving on to Connecticut, the President announced that he was "confused." Time quoted Democratic National Committee staffer Paul Tully as saying, "The President has been our best ally.... We're just trying to stay out of his way."

Opposition to Insider plans for America has always been more likely found in the Congress among Republicans than among Democrats. Insiders, therefore, would obviously prefer that Republicans not gain a majority in the House and Senate. President Bush's activity certainly helped to keep Republicans as the minority party.

Communism Collapses Into Socialism

Recent remarkable changes in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union have been effusively described by the President as "the dawning of freedom." He has repeatedly heaped great praise on his "good friend" Mikhail Gorbachev, referred to the Soviet Union as "our ally," and taken numerous steps to see that America's taxpayers foot the bill for bailing out the failed socialist systems in Russia and elsewhere. The Bush Administration claims that the American people must save the "reformers" or the nasty old communists will return to power. The truth is that the nasty old communists merely took off their communist faces and are now presenting themselves to the entire world as socialist reformers.

Another important truth is that the U.S. government—guided by a succession of Insiders—supplied the nasty communists with massive amounts of loans, credits, equipment and technology. (73) It kept successive communist regimes afloat and even enabled them to threaten the West with periodic bursts of nuclear sabre rattling.

The aid given to Moscow also had the result of persuading many Americans to favor world government under the UN as a way to avoid the alternative to Soviet-launched nuclear bombs. Corroboration about this important aspect of Insider strategy came in 1962 with the release of a taxpayer-funded State Department report entitled *A World Effectively Controlled By the United Nations*. (74)

Authored by CFR member Lincoln P. Bloomfield, it placed great emphasis on Soviet military might and noted "...if the communist dynamic were greatly abated, the West might lose whatever incentive it has for world government." Clearly, the Insider-directed policy of helping the communists acquire and brandish their missiles had as its goal the acceptance of world government by the American people.

Even though the communists in what was once the Soviet Union are now merely socialist reformers," the Insiders are still telling Americans that we must fear a nuclear threat and want a UN-directed world government because the communists might return to power. They would have America's taxpayers send massive amounts of aid to leaders who only yesterday decided to renounce communism. Not surprisingly, these new leaders are determined supporters of the United Nations.

Understanding the charade being acted out here is enormously important. Everyone should realize that a communist is and always has been a socialist. To be more precise, a communist is a socialist who seeks speedy imposition of economic control with brute force and terror. Communists don't work for years persuading their victims to choose economic slavery; they force it on those they capture in lightning quick steps. But the end result is the same whether it is achieved slowly through the route of socialism or swiftly through communist conquest.

The full name of the former USSR was Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. So, if communists decide to be mere socialists, why should our President proclaim victory over the forces of totalitarianism? Socialists are totalitarians. And why should he insist that our nation's best interests are served by taxing the American people to keep socialists in power in Russia — or anywhere else?

The Insiders don't really care what route they follow in order to achieve total control of the planet. They can gain economic control via socialism, fascism, communism, syndicalism, monarchism or any one of numerous other isms. If attempting to reach their goal through communist conquest hasn't worked out, then why not shift gears slightly and travel down the road labelled socialism? The end result is all that really matters, and the end result for the Insiders is the acquisition of political and economic power—totalitarianism—over the rest of mankind.

Anyone who concludes that threats to personal freedom no longer exist because communism has faded away doesn't know what socialism really means. It is just as destructive of basic rights as communism because it calls for the same goal as communism. Socialists want control over the lives and actions of the people, exactly what the U.S.

government is rapidly acquiring over Americans. Famed British playwright George Bernard Shaw spent his entire adult life as a determined socialist. In 1928, his *Intelligent Woman's Guide To Socialism* confirmed the tyrannical nature of socialism. He wrote:

I also made it clear that Socialism means equality of income or nothing, and that under Socialism you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught and employed whether you liked it or not. If it were discovered that you had not the character and industry enough to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner; but whilst you were permitted to live you would have to live well.

There is not now and never has been any room for freedom under socialism. It means just what it has always meant: power for a few with regimentation, prison-like equality, enforced conformity, extermination of adversaries, and a low standard of living for everyone but rulers. This is what Americans are currently facing as socialism replaces freedom here. Along with socialism, the drive toward making the United Nations the world's all-powerful political force constitutes the second of the two prongs of the "new world order." And George Bush is doing all that he can to see that both prongs dig deeply into the American people.

Gorbachev, Perestroika and Yeltsin

The individual given most of the credit for the changes in the former Soviet Union is Mikhail Gorbachev. His program for change is called "perestroika," a Russian word for restructuring. If he were to seek a restructuring that threw out all vestiges of socialism and allowed the people to practice unfettered free enterprise, he wouldn't want or need help from the West. But there are two reasons why he has never even tried to bring such a change to his country. First, he remains a socialist and keeps reminding us that he is. And second, discarding socialism does not fit into the plans of the world's Insiders to create their "new world order." Were Gorbachev to attempt something other than cooperating with the Insiders who intend to establish economic control and world government, he'd likely develop a terminal illness — maybe even stop a bullet.

But Gorbachev is a willing player in this sinister game. And he has been very open about his intentions. Throughout his 1987 book, *Perestroika*, he stated his unshakable preference for socialism. In one passage, he wrote:

To put an end to all the rumors and speculations that abound in the West about this, I would like to point out once again that we are conducting all our reforms in accordance with the socialist choice. We are looking within socialism, rather than outside it, for the answers to all the questions that arise. We assess our successes and errors alike by socialist standards. Those who hope that we will move away from the socialist standard will be greatly disappointed. (75)

President Bush had to be aware of Gorbachev's commitment to socialism when he stated in his November 22, 1989 televised message to the American people that "there is no greater advocate of perestroika than the President of the United States." He continued to defend Gorbachev no matter what the Soviet leader did, even when the Soviet leader consolidated power for himself in December 1990. (76)

Then, in his 1991 book entitled *The August Coup*, Gorbachev reiterated his socialist conviction, stating "I am a confirmed supporter of the idea of socialism." In keeping with his turning away from force and turning to persuasive-style socialism, he set himself apart from the communism his nation has endured for 70 years. He even criticized the Soviet Union's past because it featured "the forcible imposition of the Stalinist model of society." Ever the socialist, he had departed from forcing it and now wanted socialism to be chosen. (77)

Is Russia now free? Of course not. Yes, elections were held but all the candidates were communists, former communists, or socialists, most of whom had spent their entire adult lives as communist apparatchiks. The same can be said of the elections in other former Soviet republics and in the nations that once made up the Eastern European Soviet bloc.

President Proposes Aid for Russia

Boris Yeltsin is currently the fair-haired hero of America's Insiders. Welcomed to New York City by David Rockefeller in September 1989, he was brought to CFR headquarters (58 East 68th Street, New York NY 10021) for a closed-door session presided over by the powerful former CFR Chairman. (78) The Russian leader went first to CFR headquarters and then to Washington to meet with President Bush. (79)

Eventually talking to reporters, Yeltsin lamented that "only one of the five classical components of socialism has been implemented — the nationalization of property." Yeltsin says he doesn't want a totally state-controlled economy, just 85 to 90 percent control. Let the people own 10 to 15 percent, he argues. He, too, is a socialist through and through. (80)

But in June 1991, President Bush named Robert S. Strauss to be U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Strauss is a lifelong Democrat who led his party from 1972 to 1977. He was the top Democrat working for the election of Jimmy Carter in 1976. Carter's opponent at the time, Gerald Ford, had a campaign manager named James A. Baker III. Baker is now Strauss's boss as Secretary of State for George Bush. The Insiders care little which political party anyone belongs to, only whether a person is willing to promote Insider goals. They know that membership in either political party is virtually meaningless.

Why did the Republican President and his Republican Secretary of State choose Strauss? Two reasons. First, Strauss had enormous experience in setting up business deals with Soviet Russia, and the Administration wants him in Moscow to arrange for transactions that will help keep the new socialist regime in power. Second, Strauss is a veteran member of the CFR who can be counted on to work for the goals of the Insiders. His yearly salary earned as an Insider-connected Washington lawyer totalled over \$4 million per year. As ambassador, he will receive \$115,300. Chalk it up as another indication of loyalty to the cause of the "new world order" from another Insider. (81)

The struggle for leadership in Russia between Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin has been won — at least temporarily — by Yeltsin. But the fight between these two has always been like the Insider-take-all struggles between George Bush (TC and CFR) and Michael Dukakis (CFR), or between Gerald Ford (CFR) and Jimmy Carter (TC), or between Richard Nixon (CFR) and Hubert Humphrey (CFR), or between Dwight

Eisenhower (CFR) and Adlai Stevenson (CFR). (82) Each of these U.S. politicians willingly cooperated with the Insiders whose organizations they were happy to join. So too do Gorbachev and Yeltsin cooperate with the same Insiders.

Something about the leaders of Russia needs to be said here. Both Gorbachev and Yeltsin are among the many former communists who share enormous guilt for the murder, terror and denial of basic human rights for millions in the former USSR and its captive nations. Both should be held accountable for their part in those crimes and for the slaughter of 1.4 million Afghan civilians during the 1980s. As members of the USSR's ruling Politburo during the incredibly cruel rape of Afghanistan, they are and should be classified arch-criminals. And if they are not, there is no such thing as an arch-criminal.

But President Bush — backed by the Insiders in government, the media, and elsewhere — is doing everything within his power to sustain such monsters in power. Promises of direct U.S. aid have been kept; commitments for more in the future have been given; and pledges of indirect aid from the International Monetary Fund have also been made. Early in 1992, Mr. Bush asked Congress to boost the U.S. commitment to IMF by \$12 billion so that this organization could assist the socialists in Russia. He did so even while informing the nation that the U.S. government would, in that same year, add \$400 billion more to its red ink totals.

Still Friendly With Red China

Supporting the socialists who lead Russia and the other European nations formerly labelled communist is a fixed policy of the Bush Administration. Just as fixed is its support for China's socialists who still maintain their rule with the communist iron fist.

In June 1989, Chinese tanks rolled into Tiananmen Square crushing the unarmed students demonstrating for freedom. While most Americans can recall the horror and brutality marking the event, few recall that President Bush had actually encouraged the students to "fight for what you believe in" two weeks before.

Yet, even after videotapes of elements of the crackdown had been shown on U.S. television, the Bush response amounted to a few stern words and a handful of slap-on-the-wrist sanctions. Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger (CFR) excused the Chinese brutality on U.S. television and in his syndicated newspaper column. (83) Six months later, Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger and National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft — two CFR members who are also proteges and former employees of Kissinger Associates — were in Beijing arranging for removal of the minor sanctions. Upon their return, the President canceled restrictions on Export-Import bank loans. (84)

While they were in China in December, word leaked out that Scowcroft and Eagleburger had also been to Beijing in July, only one month after the Tiananmen Square massacre. Confronted with the information about this betrayal of the brave Chinese students, Secretary of State Baker initially lied about the July trip, then admitted a few days later he had "mised" the public about it. Former U.S. Ambassador to Romania David B. Funderburk has supplied valuable details about the Kissinger-Eagleburger-Scowcroft relationship in his hard-hitting book about President Bush's appeasement of communist dictators, *Betrayal of America*. (86)

To make certain that the U.S. response to Chinese tanks rolling over unarmed students in Beijing didn't jeopardize Insider plans, CFR member Winston Lord took the first opportunity available to him to write in the Fall 1989 issue of Foreign Affairs that "the administration has wisely chosen to suspend rather than dismantle relationships." And he applauded the continued existence of an "impressive web of legislation, umbrella agreements and consultative mechanisms under which a broad range of visits and projects go forward."

Winston Lord served as U.S. Ambassador to China from November 1985 until April 1989, two months prior to the bloody crackdown in Tiananmen Square. Prior to that, he served under David Rockefeller as President of the Council on Foreign Relations for eight years. He is another Insider's Insider whose policy guidelines are closely monitored and acted upon by the administration in power.

On October 2, 1989, less than four months after the tanks rolled over the students, Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen showed up at CFR headquarters for another of the organization's closed-to-the-press sessions. (86) While in New York, Qian arrogantly refused to allow any discussion of the incident involving the students, claiming that any criticism of his government's actions amounted to "interference in China's internal affairs." A few months later, the Bush Administration lifted opposition to World Bank loans for China.

During Mr. Bush's frantic gathering of support at the UN for his "new world order" moves against Iraq, China did him a favor by abstaining on the Security Council vote to authorize force. Had China voted against the resolution, it could not have passed because China is one of only five nations possessing veto power. On the day following what Foreign Affairs labelled the "unprecedented" UN vote, the Chinese foreign minister met with President Bush, the first contact China enjoyed with the President after the Tiananmen Square murders. The price paid for China's willingness to go along with President Bush's plans for a new world order even included American abandonment of the cause of the Chinese students.

Business as usual then grew more dramatically with the totally unapologetic murderers in Beijing. In May 1991, President Bush proposed a continuation of Most Favored Nation status for China. In January 1992, Chinese Prime Minister Li Peng, the man who actually ordered the troops to crush the students, journeyed to New York along with the leaders of 16 other nations for a session of the United Nations Security Council.

Li told his UN audience China stands "opposed to interference in the affairs of other countries, using human rights as an excuse." President Bush then met privately with the Chinese tyrant. Six weeks later, the President vetoed an attempt by Congress to impose trade restrictions on China in the wake of China's continuing violations of human rights. (87)

There is virtually nothing a communist or socialist can do to earn meaningful ostracism for himself or his nation from the Insiders. They want power and, if any national leader gains power and is willing to follow the guidelines set down by the Insiders, he gets help to stay in power. When Adolf Hitler, a socialist who had come to power in his nation, attacked the USSR, he became the worldwide target of the Insiders who have by numerous deeds over many decades shown little opposition and plenty of favoritism for communists.

Nations not dominated by the type of socialism or communism favored by the Insiders stand as obstructions to the plans for a "new world order." It is these that earn sanctions and pressures designed to destroy them or force them to change their internal policies. The treatment accorded South Africa is an example of selective isolation strictly enforced sanctions and pressures designed to destroy them or force them to change their internal policies. The treatment accorded South Africa is an example of selective isolation, strictly enforced sanctions, and international pressures of every conceivable type short of military assault. South Africa was never part of the "new world order," but is being made over for an admitted socialist like Nelson Mandela so that it can be. If it means bloodshed and terror, so be it. Proponents of the new world order never let the blood of tens of millions bother them; and they won't be bothered one little bit by a river of bloodshed in South Africa.

Stopping the Insiders a Must

In the CFR's Annual Report for 1989, Peter Tarnoff, the organization's president, announced plans to create a larger office for the CFR in the nation's capital. Once built, he explained, the organization "will be better able to grow in Washington, and to attract many more Senate and House members and their staffs to our programs." CFR intentions to increase Insider influence over our nation's government were clearly enunciated.

On April 10, 1990, the Wall Street Journal published a small excerpt from a speech given by veteran CFR member Paul H. Nitze. The occasion for his remarks was the March 12th opening of that new Council on Foreign Relations office in Washington. Nitze described the great influence held by the "enormously important New York business and intellectual community," referring, of course, to CFR members who continue to reside in the New York area.

But while noting that Washington's importance within the CFR had grown dramatically, Nitze stated quite clearly exactly how the CFR had dominated U.S. policy from New York for 70 years. Beginning with a description of the Council's influence during the period of the 1920s and 1930s, he said:

The State Department and White House might conduct diplomacy in peace and raise and command armies in war, but policy was made by serious people, men with a longer view, i.e. the great men of finance and their advisers. New York was where they were to be found.

Then, this veteran Insider from within the CFR, who has served in numerous administrations, added:

In the postwar years, the Council has continued to represent an invaluable way for many of us Washingtonians to tap the enormously important New York business and intellectual community. (88)

In other words, national policy was set and continues to be set in New York, not by the elected leaders of this nation, but by members of "the Council." Over these years, national policy has included financing tyranny and destroying liberty all over the globe. (89) And President Bush has placed more CFR members in government posts than any predecessor. These Insiders, along with dozens of CFR members in the House and Senate, (90) plus those in New York who have not taken government posts but who retain great influence

over national affairs, are leading this nation into the long-desired, tyrannical new world order."

No American worthy of the name wants a "new world order." The world government it calls for would mean an end to the nation we inherited, and the destruction of the greatest experiment in human liberty in the history of mankind. It would also establish socialism in place of the free market system, a certain route to conversion of this nation into another Third World deadend. And, even worse, it would mean that tyranny had replaced liberty, a kind of tyranny that has been experienced by countless millions throughout the Twentieth Century — a century of unparalleled barbarism created, sustained and favored by the Insiders of the most powerful conspiracy in the history of mankind.

The Insiders have taken us far down the various paths toward their satanically-inspired goal. And time is running out if we are to save our nation and ourselves from their designs.

Real Americans who love their country and want to remain free don't have to lose this struggle. It can be won if enough seize the opportunity to take the U.S. government away from the Insiders and return it to individuals who believe in national independence and individual liberty, and who are not working for the "new world order." And there is still time to thwart the plans of the Insiders and climb out of the tyrannical straight-jacket they have prepared for us.

Understanding the domination of the Bush Administration by the Insiders is an essential beginning step toward achieving victory over the whole rotten cabal. The enemy faced by Americans is a conspiracy, an organized group of Insiders seeking tyrannical control of this nation, and all nations. Its plans and its agents can be exposed and routed by an opposing force firmly rooted in principle and unwaveringly propelled by courage. The John Birch Society is such a force. Diligent adherence to the program of the Society by enough determined Americans is exactly what's needed to thwart the Insiders and to keep America free.

Your inquiry about how to get started on the climb back to full independence for our nation and economic freedom for yourself will be most welcome. We invite you to contact us without delay.

Footnotes

40. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "Bush and the Trilateral Commission," St. Petersburg Times, April 12, 1981.

41. Ron Rosenbaum, "The Last Secrets of Skull & Bones," Esquire, September 1977.

42. J. A. Engles, "U.N. Envoy Brash, Flexible," Rochester (NY) Times-Union, October 12, 1971.

43. United Press International dispatch from Peking, February 25, 1972.

44. Doyle McManus, "A New World Order: Bush's vision still fuzzy," Milwaukee Journal,

February 24,1991.

45. Human Cost of Communism in China, 1971 Report issued by the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws.

46. Annual Report 1972, Council on Foreign Relations, 58 East 68th Street, New York, NY 10021.

47. "Membership List as of July 26, 1977," issued by The Trilateral Commission, 345 East 46th Street, New York, NY 10021.

48. Annual Report 1978, Council on Foreign Relations.

49. Issues and Opinions: The Work Program of the Atlantic Council of the United States, 1978, Atlantic Council, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, DC 2006

50. Whitney H. Shepardson, Early History of the Council on Foreign Relations, 1960. Overbrook Press, Stamford, CT. Shepardson was one of the founding members of the CFR and served on its Board of Directors from 1921 to 1966.

51. David Hoffman, "Little-Known Aide Plays Major Role in Foreign Policy," Washington Post, October 28,1991.

52. News item, Appleton (WI) Post-Crescent, April 22, 1990.

53. Jim Hoagland, "U.S. tempted Saddam to invade Kuwait," Boston Herald, September 18, 1990.

54. Elaine Sciolino, "Envoy's Testimony on Iraq is Assailed, Senators Say Glaspie Misled Them on Hussein Talks," New York Times July 13, 1991; and Elaine Sciolino with Michael R. Gordon, "U.S. Gave Iraq Little Reason Not to Mount Kuwait Assault," New York Times, September 23, 1991.

55. Dennis L. Cuddy, Ph.D., The New World Order, 1992, America's Future Inc., Milford, PA 18337.

56. G. Edward Griffin, The Fearful Master, 1964, Western Islands, Appleton, WI 54913.

57. Alan Stang, The Actor: The True Story of John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, 1953-1959, 1968, Western Islands, Appleton, WI 54913. Mr. Stang's critical biography of John Foster Dulles supplies an excellent introduction to the conspiratorial view of history.

58. Robert W. Lee, The United Nations Conspiracy, 1981, Western Islands, Appleton, WI 54913.

59. United Nations Charter; See Articles 42-45. Article 42 states in part that the Security Council may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace or security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations."

60. Congressional Record, January 10, 1991, Pages S106-S107. Senator Simon supplied constituents with copies of these pages of the CR containing his full statement to fellow senators.
61. Lincoln On Democracy, Edited by Mario M. Cuomo and Harold Holzer, 1990, HarperCollins.
62. George de Luna, "Baker blunt: Bush needs a free hand," Chicago Tribune, October 18, 1990; George de Luna, "Baker rejects partial Iraq pullout," Chicago Tribune, October 19, 1990.
63. "U.S. Congress Authorizes Use of Force Against Iraq," Facts On File, January 17, 1991, Page 32.
64. Foreign Affairs, "America and the World 1990-1991,"
65. Leslie H. Gelb, "Why the UN Dog Didn't Bark," New York Times, September 25, 1991.
66. Patrick J. Buchanan, "The Gulf Crisis Is the Last Hurrah of the Globalists," Union Leader, Manchester, NH, September 26, 1990.
67. Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward, Kissinger On The Couch, 1975, Arlington House, New York.
68. Paul Craig Roberts, August 3, 1991, quoted by Phoebe Courtney, TAX FAX No. 235, "Why a Tax Revolt Is Brewing," Independent American, P.O. Box 636, Littleton, CO 80160.
69. Tom Baden, "Red tape rolls as Bush unchains regulatory watchdogs," Houston Chronicle, December 30, 1990.
70. Richard N. Gardner, In Pursuit Of World Order, 1964, Praeger Publishing Company, New York.
71. John F. McManus, Whose Side Are They On?, 1991, The John Birch Society, Appleton, WI 54913. This booklet contains a complete photographic reproduction of the 24-page 1961 State Department Document No. 7277 entitled Freedom From War: The U.S. Program For General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World.
72. Michael Duffy, "The Perfect Spy," Time, November 5, 1990.
73. Antony C. Sutton, The Best Enemy Money Can Buy, 1986, Liberty House Press, Billings, MT. Dr. Sutton's earlier and more comprehensive works detailing the flow of Western aid to communist nations include National Suicide and the three volume Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development.
74. Lincoln P. Bloomfield, "Study Memorandum No. 7: A World Effectively Controlled By the United Nations." Dr. Bloomfield's work carried the notation, "Prepared for the Institute of Defense Analysis in support of a study submitted to the Department of State under contract No. SCC 28270, dated February 24, 1961." It was released by IDA on March 10,

1962.

75. Mikhail S. Gorbachev, *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World*, 1987, Harper & Row, New York.

76. Paul Bednrd, "Bush defends power grab by Gorbachev as necessary," *Washington Times*, December 28, 1990.

77. Mikhail S. Gorbachev, *The August Coup: The Truth and the Lessons*, 1991, HarperCollins, New York.

78. Annual Report 1990, Council on Foreign Relations.

79. Facts On File, 1989, Page 916.

80. A.M. Rosenthal, "Yeltsin fails to charm," *Milwaukee Journal*, September 21, 1989.

81. Stephen Labaton, "Strauss to Forego \$4 million in Pay to Take Moscow Post," *New York Times*, July 13, 1991.

82. During the 1992 Presidential primaries, Democratic candidate Bill Clinton's membership in both the CFR and the TC never became an issue. Opponents Paul Tsongas, Jerry Brown, Tom Harkin, and Bob Kerrey were not themselves formal members of either of the Insider group. Their refusal to make an issue out of Clinton's memberships, especially the fact that his ties to these organizations linked him to George Bush, can only mean that they would like to hold such memberships themselves and are not going to jeopardize the possibility of being invited to join either or both in the future.

83. John J. Fialka, "Mr. Kissinger Has Opinions on China - And Business Ties," *Wall Street Journal*, September 15, 1989.

84. James J. Drummey, *The Establishment's Man*, 1991, Western Islands, Appleton, WI 54913.

85. David B. Funderburk, *Betrayal of America: Bush's Appeasement of Communist Dictators Betrays American Principles*, distributed by Betrayal of America, Dunn, NC 28334. Dr. Funderburk served as U.S. Ambassador to Romania during the early years of the Reagan Administration. His book supplies details about then-Vice President George Bush's friendliness to Romanian dictator Nicolai Ceausescu and Mr. Bush's refusal to consider Dr. Funderburk's critical assessment about the conditions in Romania and the unreliable personnel in the State Department.

86. Annual Report 1990, Council on Foreign Relations.

87. "Bush to Renew China's Trade Privileges," *New York Times*, May 28, 1991.

88. "Notable & Quotable," *Wall Street Journal*, April 10, 1991. Four top leaders of the Wall Street Journal hold membership in the CFR: Chairman & Publisher Peter R. Kann; Executive Editor Norman Pearlstine; Editor Robert L. Bartley; and Managing Editor Paul E. Steiger.

89. For a comprehensive and revealing history of the Council on Foreign Relations using its own source documents for evidence of its intentions to destroy national sovereignty and abolish personal freedom, see James Perloffs *The Shadows of Power*, 1988, Western Islands, Appleton, WI 54913.

90. As of June 30, 1991, the CFR Annual Report 1991 lists the following U.S. Senators as CFR members: Boren (OK), Chafee (RI), Cohen (ME), Dodd (CT), Graham (FL), Lieberman (CT), Mitchell (ME), Moynihan (NY), Pell (RI), Pressler (SD), Robb (VA), Rockefeller (WV), Roth (DE), Rudman (NH), Sanford (NC), Wirth (CO), and Wofford (PA).

The following are some of the CFR members in the U.S. House of Representatives: Aspin (WI), Fascell (FL), Foley (WA), Gejdenson (CT), Gephardt (MO), Gingrich (GA), Houghton (NY), Hyde (IL), Johnson (CT), Levine (CA), McCurdy (OK), Moody (WI), Petri (WI), Schroeder (CO), Snowe (ME), Solarz (NY), Spratt (SC), Stokes (OH), and Wolpe (MI).

In April 1991, the Trilateral Commission listed the following U.S. Senators as members: Chafee (RI), Cohen (ME), Robb (VA), Rockefeller (WV), and Roth (DE).

And the TC listed the following U.S. Representatives as members: Foley (WA), Leach (IA), and Rangel, (NY).

BACK